DRAFT

RESOLUTION NO.__________


WHEREAS, on March 23, 2010, the City Council of the City of Vacaville authorized the Community Development Director to enter into a contract with Design, Community, & Environment (DC&E) for the preparation of a General Plan, General Plan EIR and Climate Action Plan.

WHEREAS, on February 11, 2011, a Notice of Preparation (NOP) was prepared and circulated through the State of California Governor’s Office of Planning and Research for a programmatic EIR for the Vacaville General Plan Update and Climate Action Plan (SCH# 2011022043). The NOP review and comment period began on February 11, 2011 and concluded on March 14, 2011.

WHEREAS, on March 10, 2011, the City of Vacaville held a duly noticed public scoping meeting for the General Plan Update and Climate Action Plan programmatic EIR at the City of Vacaville City Council Chambers, located at 650 Merchant Street.

WHEREAS, on December 13, 2011, the City Council of the City of Vacaville identified the preferred land use alternative for the General Plan to be analyzed in the draft the General Plan Update and Climate Action Plan programmatic EIR.

WHEREAS, on October 25, 2013, a Notice of Completion for the draft General Plan Update and Energy and Conservation Action Strategy (formerly referred to as the Climate Action Plan) programmatic EIR was prepared and circulated through the State of California Governor’s Office of Planning and Research. The 55-day public review and comment period took place between October 25, 2013 and December 18, 2013.

WHEREAS, on October 25, 2013, a Notice of Availability (NOA) for the draft General Plan Update and Energy and Conservation Action Strategy programmatic EIR was distributed to responsible agencies, local and federal agencies, interested groups,

WHEREAS, on October 25, 2013, a Notice of Availability (NOA) for the General Plan Update and Energy and Conservation Action Strategy programmatic EIR was published in The Report, Vacaville’s local newspaper.
WHEREAS, on December 17, 2013, the Planning Commission of the City of Vacaville held a duly noticed public comment hearing on the draft General Plan Update and Energy and Conservation Action Strategy programmatic EIR.

WHEREAS, on June 13, 2014, the Final General Plan Update and Energy and Conservation Action Strategy programmatic EIR, which included response to comments received on the Draft EIR, was published.

WHEREAS, on August 5, 2014, the Planning Commission of the City of Vacaville held a duly noticed public hearing to review and approve proposed changes to the General Plan and Energy and Conservation Action Strategy as prescribed by the Final General Plan Update and Energy and Conservation Action Strategy programmatic EIR, and as proposed in response to comments received on the Draft EIR.

WHEREAS, on August 19, 2014, the Planning Commission of the City of Vacaville held duly noticed public hearing regarding the proposed General Plan and the Energy & Conservation Action Strategy Environmental Impact Report, Adoption of Findings of Fact, Statement of Overriding Considerations, Mitigation Monitoring and Reporting Plan, and Draft General Plan and the Energy and Conservation & Action Plan, and voted _____ to recommend that the City Council approve said actions.

WHEREAS, the City Council of the City of Vacaville held a duly noticed public hearing to consider the proposed General Plan and the Energy and Conservation Action Strategy Final EIR on __________, 2014.

WHEREAS, the City Council of the City of Vacaville held a duly noticed public hearing on the Final EIR and project on __________, 2014 and received testimony from City staff, the City’s General Plan Update consultants, property owners and all interested persons, and reviewed the information contained in the Final EIR and finds:

EIR Findings:

1. Changes or alterations have been incorporated into the project which mitigate or avoid the significant effects on the environment, including as incorporated into the Mitigation Monitoring and Reporting Plan to be adopted for the project (Exhibit B, attached); and

2. Those changes or alterations that are within the responsibility and jurisdiction of another public agency and have been, or can and should be, adopted by that other agency; and

3. That specific economic, legal, social, technological, or other considerations identified in detail in the attached Exhibit A, Findings of Fact and Statement of Overriding Considerations, make infeasible certain mitigation measures or the alternatives identified in the final EIR; and

4. The benefits of the proposed project outweigh the unavoidable adverse environmental effects thus the adverse effects of the project are found to be acceptable as detailed in the attached Exhibit A, Findings of Fact and Statement of Overriding Considerations; and
5. That the reasons why the significant effects which cannot be mitigated are found to be acceptable to support approval of the project are based upon information provided in the EIR and information in the project record as described in Exhibit A, Findings of Fact and Statement of Overriding Considerations.

NOW, THEREFORE BE IT RESOLVED that the City Council of the City of Vacaville does hereby certify that the Final and EIR has been completed in compliance with CEQA, and;

The City Council of the City of Vacaville has reviewed and considered the information contained in the EIR prior to approving the Vacaville General Plan and the Energy and Conservation Action Strategy, and;

The City Council of the City of Vacaville finds that the Final EIR for the Vacaville General Plan and the Energy and Conservation Action Strategy reflects the independent judgment of the City acting as lead agency for the project.

I HEREBY CERTIFY that the foregoing resolution was introduced and passed at a regular meeting of the City Council of the City of Vacaville, held on the ______ day of _______ 2014, by the following vote:

AYES:

NOES:

ABSENT:

ATTEST:

Michelle A. Thornbrugh, City Clerk


B – Vacaville General Plan and the Energy and Conservation Action Strategy Mitigation Monitoring and Reporting Plan
A RESOLUTION OF THE CITY COUNCIL OF THE CITY OF VACAVILLE CERTIFYING THE FINAL ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACT REPORT FOR THE CITY OF VACAVILLE GENERAL PLAN AND ENERGY AND CONSERVATION ACTION STRATEGY, ADOPTING FINDINGS OF FACT, ADOPTING MITIGATION MEASURES, REJECTING ALTERNATIVES AND ADOPTING A STATEMENT OF OVERRIDING CONSIDERATIONS

I. INTRODUCTION

The overall purpose of the proposed Vacaville General Plan is to create a policy framework that articulates a vision for the city’s long-term physical form and development, while preserving and enhancing the quality of life for Vacaville’s residents. The key components of the Plan include broad community goals for the future of Vacaville and specific policies and implementing actions that will help meet the goals. The Vacaville General Plan contains the following elements:

♦ Land Use
♦ Transportation
♦ Conservation and Open Space
♦ Parks and Recreation
♦ Public Facilities and Services
♦ Safety
♦ Noise

The State of California encourages cities to look beyond their borders when undertaking the sort of comprehensive planning required of a General Plan. For this reason, the General Plan delineates three areas known as the Sphere of Influence (SOI), Urban Growth Boundary (UGB), and Planning Area, all of which are larger than the city limits. These planning boundaries are shown in Figure 3-2 and described below. The City only has jurisdiction over land that is within the city limits. However, it is probable that much of the land within the UGB and/or SOI will be annexed by the City of Vacaville within the horizon of the proposed General Plan, and would therefore be under Vacaville’s jurisdiction in the future. Therefore, this EIR focuses on the analysis of potential changes within the city limits, SOI, and UGB. These areas are collectively called the EIR Study Area. The Study Area boundary is shown on Figure 3-2, Planning Boundaries, of the Draft EIR. As shown in the figure, the Study Area boundary is slightly larger than the combined city limits, SOI, and UGB in the southern and eastern portions of the Study Area. This is because the Study Area boundary follows parcel boundaries, whereas the SOI and UGB do not follow parcel boundaries in these areas.

The proposed Energy and Conservation Action Strategy (ECAS) is a separate document that sets targets consistent with Assembly Bill (AB) 32, the Global Warming Solutions Act of 2006, and establishes measures to reduce GHG emissions in Vacaville. The ECAS identifies baseline GHG emissions and includes measures to help reduce future emissions that result from land use, transportation, energy, water, wastewater, and solid waste. The ECAS implements the General Plan and its general policies and actions supporting the reduction of GHG emissions. As an implementing document, the ECAS provides more specific direction to the City than the General Plan, and the ECAS will be monitored and updated more often than the General Plan.
In compliance with the California Environmental Quality Act (CEQA), General Plan and ECAS EIR describes the potential environmental impacts associated with the adoption and implementation of the Vacaville General Plan and ECAS. Section 15125 of the CEQA Guidelines establishes that the physical environmental conditions at the time of the issuance of the Notice of Preparation (NOP) constitute the baseline conditions by which it is determined whether an impact is significant. The NOP for the Vacaville General Plan and ECAS EIR was published on February 10, 2011 (State Clearinghouse #20110222043). The City of Vacaville Community Development Department is the Lead Agency for the environmental review of the proposed project.

II. FINDINGS FOR CERTIFICATION OF THE ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACT REPORT FOR THE COMPREHENSIVE GENERAL PLAN UPDATE AND THE ENERGY & CONSERVATION ACTION STRATEGY

The City Council finds, based on substantial evidence in the record of this proceeding, that the Final EIR for the Comprehensive General Plan Update and the Energy and Conservation Action Strategy, which consists of the Draft EIR and Technical Appendices, the Final EIR, and the Compilation of Comments Received on the General Plan Update and Addendum has been completed in accordance with the requirements of the CEQA, the CEQA Guidelines, the Vacaville Land Use and Development Code and all other applicable laws and regulations.¹

Specifically, the City Council finds, based on substantial evidence in the record of this proceeding, that:

1. The City of Vacaville caused an EIR for the proposed project to be prepared pursuant to CEQA, the CEQA Guidelines, and the City of Vacaville Land Use and Development Code.

2. A Notice of Preparation (NOP) of the Draft EIR was filed with the Governor’s Office of Planning and Research on February 11, 2011 and was circulated for public comments from February 11, 2011 to March 14, 2011. Notices for the NOP were mailed to other agencies (local and Federal) and to interested persons and adjacent property owners. Notices for the NOP were also posted on and near the project area, at the County Clerk’s Office and in Vacaville City Hall.

3. On March 10, 2011, the City held a public meeting to conduct a scoping session for the Draft EIR. Comments were received on the NOP and were subsequently incorporated into the Draft General Plan Update and Climate Action Plan programmatic EIR.

4. A Notice of Completion (NOC) and copies of the Draft EIR were distributed to the State Clearinghouse on October 25, 2013 to those public agencies that have jurisdiction by law with respect to the project and to other interested parties and agencies. The comments of such persons and agencies were sought, including by direct communication to agency staff. Additional copies of the Draft EIR were distributed (delivered or mailed) by the City to persons and agencies who requested them. The 55-day public review period extended to December 18, 2013.

¹ CEQA is codified at sections 21000, et seq. of the California Public Resources Code. The CEQA Guidelines are set forth at California Code of Regulations, Title 14, sections 15000, et seq. The Vacaville Land Use and Development Code is set forth at Title 14 of the Vacaville Municipal Code. The custodian of the record of this proceeding is the City of Vacaville, Community Development Department, 650 Merchant Street, Vacaville, California.
5. A Notice of Availability (NOA) for the Draft EIR was distributed to all responsible and trustee agencies, other local and Federal agencies, interested groups, organizations, adjacent property owners and businesses, and individuals on October 25, 2013 for the Draft EIR. Copies of the NOA were posted in and around the project area on October 25, 2013. The NOA stated that the City of Vacaville had completed the Draft EIR and that copies were available at the City of Vacaville, Planning Division, 650 Merchant Street, Vacaville, at the Solano County Library, 1000 Ulatis Drive, Vacaville and that the document was posted on the City of Vacaville website. The notice also indicated that the official public review period for the Draft EIR would be from October 25, 2011 to December 18, 2013.

6. On December 17, 2013, the City Planning Commission held a public hearing to accept verbal comments on the Draft EIR. Comments received at that hearing are included and responded to in the Final EIR.

7. On June 13, 2014, the Final Environmental Impact Report (FEIR), which includes responses to comments received on the Draft EIR, was published for public review. On __________, the City emailed notices to interested persons, adjacent and nearby property owners, State, Federal and local agencies advising that the Final EIR would be available and advising of a Planning Commission meeting to discuss the project and EIR on August 19, 2013. The City posted notices advising of the Final EIR availability on the Vacaville General Plan Update website and on the City’s website. The City made the Responses to Comments and Final EIR available to the public at the City’s offices, on the City’s website, at the Town Square Library in downtown Vacaville, and at the Solano County Library, 1000 Ulatis Drive, Vacaville. The Final EIR was also posted on the City’s General Plan Update website.

8. On July 26, 2014, the City posted a 1/8th page ad in The Reporter, the city’s local newspaper, advertising the August 5, 2014 and August 19, 2014 meeting of the City of Vacaville Planning Commission to discuss and to make a recommendation to the City Council regarding the Final EIR for the General Plan and Energy and Conservation Action Strategy (ECAS), and the Draft General Plan and ECAS. A notice advertsing these meetings was also sent to all responsible and trustee agencies, other local and Federal agencies, interested groups, organizations, adjacent property owners and businesses, and individuals.

9. Testimony, documentary evidence, and all correspondence submitted or delivered to the City in connection with the Planning Commission and City Council hearings on this project and the associated EIR.

10. All staff reports, memoranda, maps, letters, minutes of meetings, and other documents relied upon or prepared by City staff relating to the project, including but not limited to, City of Vacaville General Plan and the Draft and Final Environmental Impact Report for the City of Vacaville General Plan Update.

Based on the foregoing, and all substantial evidence in the record of this proceeding, the City Council hereby finds, declares, and certifies that:

1. The EIR was prepared, published, circulated and reviewed and completed in accordance with the requirements of CEQA, the CEQA Guidelines and the Vacaville Land Use and Development Code, and constitutes an adequate, accurate, objective and complete
Final EIR in accordance with the requirements of CEQA, the CEQA Guidelines and the Vacaville Land Use and Development Code.

2. The EIR consists of the Draft EIR, the Final EIR, appendices, and any documents or materials incorporated in the EIR by reference.

3. The EIR has been presented to the City Council and that the City Council has reviewed it, and considered the information contained therein prior to acting on the proposed project and finds that the EIR reflects the independent judgment and analysis of the City of Vacaville.

4. The EIR reflects the best efforts of the City of Vacaville to undertake all reasonably feasible and prudent actions to discover, analyze, disclose and mitigate all potentially significant environmental impacts of the proposed project.

5. The changes and additions to the Draft EIR made in Response to Comments and Additional Information and Analysis do not constitute “significant new information” within the meaning of Public Resources Code section 21092.1, and therefore recirculation of the Draft EIR and/or Responses to Comments for public review and comment is not required.

6. The EIR has been presented to the City Council and that the City Council has reviewed and considered the information contained therein and in the record supporting the EIR prior to making these findings or taking action on the proposed Vanden Meadows Specific Plan and Development Project and applications related thereto.

7. The City Council hereby adopts the attached Findings of Fact and Statement of Overriding Considerations, and a Mitigation Monitoring Plan to require and ensure that all mitigation measures found to be reasonably feasible and effective are implemented as conditions of project approval.

III. FINDINGS OF FACT REGARDING THE ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACT REPORT FOR THE PROPOSED COMPREHENSIVE GENERAL PLAN UPDATE AND THE ENERGY & CONSERVATION ACTION STRATEGY INCLUDING THE MITIGATION MEASURES ANALYZED AND RECOMMENDED IN THE ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACT REPORT

The EIR for the Comprehensive General Plan Update and the Energy and Conservation Action Strategy evaluates all potentially significant environmental impacts that could result from the approval of the proposed project, alternatives to the proposed project and measures designed to mitigate or avoid the potentially significant impacts of the proposed project. This section lists all identified potentially significant or significant impacts and, where applicable, mitigation measures adopted to reduce or attempt to reduce those impacts to a less-than-significant level or avoid those impacts.

A. Potentially Significant Impacts that are Avoided or Reduced to a Less-than-Significant Level.

Finding: As authorized by Public Resources Code section 21081 and CEQA Guidelines 15091, 15092, and 15093, the City finds that, unless otherwise stated, all of the changes or alterations to the proposed project listed below have been required in, or incorporated into, the project...
which mitigate or avoid the significant or potentially significant environmental impacts listed below, as identified in the EIR, that these mitigation measures will be effective to reduce or avoid the potentially significant impact as described in the EIR, and that these mitigation measures are feasible to implement and are within the responsibility and jurisdiction of the City of Vacaville to implement or enforce. These Findings of Fact are supported by substantial evidence in the record of proceedings before the City as stated below.

Biological Resources

a. **Less than Significant Impact**

*Implementation of the Solano HCP and the proposed General Plan policies and actions, in combination with federal and State laws, would reduce potential impacts to a less-than-significant level. However, since the HCP is not currently adopted, in order to ensure that mitigation requirements consistent with the Solano HCP are enforced, Mitigation Measures BIO-1 through BIO-14 are included.*

b. **Facts in Support of Findings**

Impacts are less than significant prior to any mitigation measures. The following are new measures added to the Final Environmental Impact Report.

**Mitigation Measure**

**BIO-1:** Preservation and restoration of habitat for species identified in Tables 4.4-2 and 4.4-3 of the Draft EIR shall occur in the same level or higher level conservation area as the direct impact occurs (i.e. impacts to habitat in Medium Value Conservation Areas will be mitigated in Medium to High Value Conservation Areas, but impacts to habitat in Low Value Conservation Areas shall be mitigated in either Low or Medium Value Conservation Areas). Compensation for indirect impacts will be assessed on the location/conservation value of the habitat that is indirectly impacted and not the location of project activity (i.e. if a project activity will indirectly impact a habitat for species in a Medium Value Conservation Area but the project is located in a Low Value Conservation Area, compensatory mitigation shall be based on the type of habitat that is being indirectly impacted (in this case Medium Value Conservation Area) rather than the lower value project area. All mitigation ratios are based on impacts as assessed by acreage.

1. **Medium Value Conservation Areas** (see Subareas 2C, 2D, and 2N in Figure 4.4-3).

   a. **Wetland Component Direct Impacts:** Preserve vernal pool and swale habitats at a ratio of 2:1, and restore vernal pool and swale habitats at a ratio of 1:1 if restored habitats are in place and functional at the time of impact or at a 2:1 ratio if habitats are restored concurrent with the impact.

   b. **Wetland Component Indirect Impacts:** Preserve vernal pool and swale habitats at a ratio of 1:1 for avoided wetlands within 250 feet of proposed development.

   c. **Upland Component Direct Impacts:** In Subarea 2C, preserve upland habitat at a ratio of 3:1. In the remaining subareas, pre-serve upland habitat at a ratio of 2:1.
d. **Upland Component Indirect Impacts:** Preserve avoided up-land habitat at a ratio of 1:1 within 250 feet of proposed development.

2. **Low Value Conservation Areas and Seasonal Wetlands in Agricultural Areas Outside of a Medium Value Conservation Area** (see Subarea 3 in Figure 4.43).
   a. **Wetland Component Direct Impacts:** Preserve vernal pool and swale habitats at a ratio of 1:1, and restore vernal pool and swale habitats at a ratio of 1:1 if restored habitats are in place and functional at the time of impact or at a 2:1 ratio if habitats are restored concurrent with the impact.
   
   b. **Wetland Component Indirect Impacts:** Preserve vernal pool and swale habitats at a ratio of 1:1 within 100 feet of proposed development.

3. **Mitigation for Temporary Impacts to Seasonal Wetlands and Uplands in all Conservation Areas:** Temporary impacts to seasonal wetlands and uplands in all vernal pool conservation areas shall be subject to the mitigation and monitoring requirements described below. Temporary impacts to wetlands shall be calculated for the entire wetland in which the impact occurs and not just the portion disturbed by the temporary impact.

   a. **Temporary and Short-Term Impacts:** All temporary impacts lasting no more than one growing season to seasonal wetlands and uplands in all vernal pool conservation areas shall be mitigated by restoring the existing wetlands and uplands and providing additional preservation of wetlands and uplands at a 1:1 ratio. Impacts lasting no more than two growing seasons shall be mitigated by restoring the existing habitats and providing additional wetland and upland preservation at a 1.5:1 ratio. Impacts lasting longer than two growing seasons shall be mitigated at the standard Conservation Area ratios described above under conditions BIO-1-1 and BIO-1-2.

   b. **Restoration and Monitoring Plan:** The applicant shall provide a restoration plan consistent with the requirements in the Solano HCP or standardized policies developed by the City per pro-posed General Plan Action COS-A1.1 that shall be based on the principles found in the current working draft of the Solano HCP, including acceptable financial assurances, for review and approval by the City and other applicable regulatory agencies, to ensure successful implementation of the habitat restoration. All temporarily impacted wetlands shall be monitored for a minimum of two wet seasons to document that hydrology has been restored to pre-project conditions. Additional monitoring and remedial measures may be required if hydrology is not reestablished.

   The mitigation ratios described above are applicable to all season wetlands (i.e. saturated, seasonally flooded, and areas subject to temporary flooding sufficient to create wetlands). Conservation actions for streams and semi-permanently to permanently flooded wetlands in the valley floor grassland and vernal pool natural community are addressed under Mitigation Measures BIO-5, BIO-6, BIO-7, and BIO-9.
**BIO-2:** All impacted seasonal wetlands shall be characterized according to the types below and mitigated by preservation of the same category of wetland according to the ratios in Mitigation Measure BIO-1.

Seasonal wetland categories are as follows:

♦ **Pools:** Greater than 1 inch of standing water for more than ten continuous days with short (less than three weeks) to long (more than three weeks) durations of standing water, clear to moderate turbidity, and exhibiting significant vegetation cover.

♦ **Playa Pools:** Greater than 1 inch of standing water for more than ten continuous days with long (more than three weeks) to very long durations of standing water, moderate to high turbidity, and exhibiting sparse vegetation cover (typically found in association with Pescadero Series Soils; often referred to as playa-type pools).

♦ **Swales or Mesic Grassland:** Shallow, standing water (generally less than 1 inch) present for fewer than ten continuous days.

♦ **Alkaline Flats and Meadows:** Shallow, standing water (generally less than 1 inch) present for fewer than ten continuous days and exhibiting indicators of high alkalinity (salt deposits on soil surface, presence of salt-tolerant plants).

Deviations in the required mitigation acreage by type or category may be permitted by the City and other applicable regulatory agencies. Under Mitigation Measure BIO-1, conservation habitats shall be proportional to impacts to the species and their associations (e.g., impacts to pool-dependent species such as vernal pool fairy shrimp shall not be mitigated by preservation of more abundant swale or mesic grasslands that do not support the species).

**BIO-3:** All direct impacts to extant stands of Contra Costa goldfields shall be mitigated by establishing new, self-reproducing populations of Contra Costa goldfields at a ratio of 4:1 (acres protected to acres impacted). This restoration requirement may be met by establishing new Contra Costa goldfield populations at a single-project mitigation site or by purchasing credits at an approved mitigation bank authorized to sell credits for this species in an amount equal to the 4:1 mitigation ratio. Guidelines for establishing Contra Costa goldfields and the release schedule for mitigation credits at the commercial mitigation banks will be specified in the bank-enabling agreements. Mitigation at single-project mitigation sites would be subject to the same conditions as the commercial mitigation banks. Establishment criteria shall also adhere to all the following conditions:

1. Impacted habitat area for which mitigation is required shall be equal to the entire occupied pool/swale area, and shall not just be limited to the area with Contra Costa goldfield cover in the impacted pool.

2. Contra Costa goldfield populations and other species identified in Tables 4.4-2 and 4.4-3 of the Draft EIR (including vernal pool fairy shrimp, conservancy fairy shrimp, vernal pool tadpole shrimp, and mid-valley fairy shrimp) shall be established in constructed, restored, and enhanced wetlands in the known range of these species in Solano County.
3. Seed used to establish new populations of Contra Costa goldfields may be obtained from any Core Population Area, as defined in the Solano HCP or in areas identified in standardized policies developed by the City per proposed General Plan Action COS-A1.1 that shall be based on the principles found in the current working draft of the Solano HCP. Seed collection shall not affect more than 10 percent of an individual preserved population. Seed and top soils shall be salvaged from occupied vernal pools and other wetlands in an impacted area prior to initiation of ground-disturbing activities.

4. Restoration may occur in existing preserved pools currently lacking Contra Costa goldfields or in restored pools and swales in other Core Areas as defined in the Solano HCP or in areas identified in standardized policies developed by the City per proposed General Plan Action COS-A1.1 that shall be based on the principles found in the current working draft of the Solano HCP. New populations must be established in currently unoccupied habitat.

5. Re-established populations will be considered self-reproducing when:
   a. Plants re-establish annually for a minimum of five years with no human intervention such as supplemental seeding, and habitat areas contain an occupied area and flower/plant density comparable to existing occupied habitat areas in similar pool types and Core Areas.

   If Contra Costa goldfields cannot be established at the mitigation site within five years according to the conditions above, the preserved wetland restoration acreage shall be increased by 50 percent. The applicant shall provide bonds or other acceptable financial assurances, subject to approval by the City and USFWS, to ensure implementation of such measures.

**BIO-4**: Mitigation shall be required for any impacts in the known or potential range of the California tiger salamander (see Figure 4.4-4). Mitigation shall include preservation, enhancement, and restoration/establishment of suitable upland habitat, and preservation and construction/creation of new breeding habitat consistent with the mitigation requirements specified in Mitigation Measure BIO-1, subject to the following additional requirements.

1. **Breeding Habitat Mitigation**: Direct and indirect impacts to all suitable California tiger salamander breeding habitat in the known or potential range of the species (Figure 4.4-4) will be mitigated by pre-serving known breeding habitat at a 3:1 ratio and creating new breeding habitat at a ratio of 2:1 or 0.35 acres, whichever is greater.

   All preserved and created/established breeding habitat shall be contiguous to at least 350 acres of preserved upland habitat, and created breeding habitat shall be located within 2,100 feet of known breeding habitat.

   a. All new breeding habitat shall be located within 2,100 feet of a known breeding site and be situated in a contiguous re-serve/preserve area of 350 acres or more of suitable habitats. This may include other parcels if the lands are protected by conservation easements and are managed consistent with the Solano HCP Reserve Criteria or standardized policies developed by the City per proposed General Plan Action COS-A1.1 that
shall be based on the principles found in the current working draft of the Solano HCP. For some existing preserved areas/mitigation sites, this may require that management agreements and endowments be extended to these sites.

b. New breeding habitat can consist of multiple sites within 1,300 feet of each other. All new created breeding habitats shall be 0.2 acres to 0.35 acres in size unless otherwise approved by the City, USFWS, and CDFW.

2. **Upland Habitat Mitigation**: Impacts to uplands and other movement habitats (i.e. seasonal wetland swales and meadows) in the known or potential range of the California tiger salamander (Figure 4.4-4) shall be mitigated at the ratios as described in Mitigation Measure BIO-1 for Subarea 2C (Figure 4.4-3, 2:1 ratio), subject to the following additional conditions:

   a. All upland mitigation preservation shall be within 2,100 feet of known breeding habitat or within 1,300 feet of constructed breeding habitat if the constructed breeding habitat is within 2,100 feet of known breeding habitat.

   b. New breeding habitat shall be established at a ratio of 0.001 acres per acre of upland directly and indirectly impacted by a project.

   c. Preserves established for California tiger salamander mitigation shall include measures for restoration of upland mounds, where applicable, in order to provide increased burrowing habitat for fossorial rodents and California tiger salamanders above the shallow, rainy-season water table.

**BIO-5**: Mitigation for permanent impacts to riparian, stream, and fresh-water marsh habitat associated with riverine systems in the EIR Study Area shall be provided through restoration of in-kind habitat. Restoration of riparian habitat or creation of new habitat must occur either on site, at an approved mitigation bank, or at another high-quality site, and must be capable of supporting similar quality and species as the impacted site. All Riparian Restoration Plans shall be reviewed and approved by the City and CDFW. Restoration and enhancement activities shall be directed toward severely degraded stream segments in Priority Drainages and Watersheds (Figure 4.4-5). Basic mitigation requirements are based on impact area, vegetation replacement, and designated conservation values of the riparian, stream, and freshwater marsh habitat as assessed in the Solano HCP or standardized policies developed by the City per proposed General Plan Action COS-A1.1 that shall be based on the principles found in the current working draft of the Solano HCP.

1. **Vegetation**. All native, woody vegetation greater than 1 inch in diameter shall be replaced by planting native woody vegetation to at the following minimum ratios and performance standards:

   The goal of the riparian vegetation replacement is to contribute to the establishment of a multi-story riparian community with a variety of native riparian species appropriate for the mitigation site. Plantings are not required to directly replace impacts on a species-by-species basis.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Vegetation Replacement Size (Inches)</th>
<th>Native Species (Except Oaks and Elderberry)</th>
<th>Oak Species</th>
<th>Nonnative Species</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>&lt;12</td>
<td>3:1</td>
<td>5:1</td>
<td>1:1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12-24</td>
<td>6:1</td>
<td>7:1</td>
<td>2:1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>&gt;24</td>
<td>10:1</td>
<td>12:1</td>
<td>3:1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Priority Drainages

| >12                                 | 3:1                                         | 5:1         | 1:1              |
| 12-24                               | 4:1                                         | 7:1         | 1.5:1            |
| >24                                 | 6:1                                         | 12:1        | 3:1              |

### Non-Priority Drainages

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Priority Drainages</th>
<th>Non-Priority Drainages</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Enhancement</td>
<td>Created/Restored</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4:1</td>
<td>2:1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3:1</td>
<td>2:1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note: Performance Criteria – The number of native riparian plants that become established at the end of the five-year monitoring period shall equal a minimum of 80 percent of total required plantings. Established plants may include natural regeneration and volunteer plants.

### 2. Area

Riparian mitigation planting shall also achieve the following area criteria based on whether the mitigation is achieved through enhancement (e.g. supplemental planting of existing riparian habitats) or through establishment of Woody riparian habitats (e.g. existing or created channel lacking native Woody riparian vegetation):

#### Area Ratios

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Priority Drainages</th>
<th>Non-Priority Drainages</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Enhancement</td>
<td>Created/Restored</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4:1</td>
<td>2:1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3:1</td>
<td>2:1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### 3. Hydrological and Biological Connectivity

Mitigation for permanent impacts to third and higher order streams and second order streams with riparian vegetation shall maintain the hydrologic and biological connectivity between downstream and upstream areas. Facilities such as bridges, culverts, outfalls, and grade control structures shall not create cumulative gaps in the channel or riparian corridor greater than 300 feet. Bypass or rerouted channels shall be constructed where necessary to replace impacted habitats and to limit gaps between existing riparian habitats.

Note: The intent of requiring mitigation for removal of nonnative trees and shrubs is to protect riparian habitat. It is not intended to require mitigation for the removal of nonnative trees or shrubs as a part of riparian restoration or enhancement projects.

The above measure applies to waterways subject to State regulation under Section 1602 of the Fish and Game Code and Porter-Cologne Water Quality Act and waters of the United States subject to regulation under the federal Clean Water Act.

### BIO 6

Mitigation for direct impacts to pond or freshwater marsh habitat not hydrologically connected to streams shall be provided at a 2:1 ratio. This mitigation may be achieved by

---

2 Trees shall be measured at diameter at breast height (dbh); multiple trunked trees shall be reported as the cumulative total of all trunks. Shrubs shall be measured at midpoint of the main trunk (the ground and the first major branch).

3 Elderberry replacement ratios and other associated mitigation requirements are prescribed in Mitigation Measure BIO-9. Tree and shrubs replacement requirements under this mitigation measure may be used to fulfill; all or contribute to the associated native woody riparian vegetation requirements prescribed under Mitigation Measure BIO-9.

4 Because of slow growth rates, oak species require higher replacement ratios. If acorns are used instead of seedlings (at least one year old), planting ratios shall be doubled.

5 The five-year monitoring period for documenting successful establishment may be extended if the mitigation is not performing adequately. At a minimum, the determination of success monitoring shall require at least two years without significant intervention (e.g., additional plantings or irrigation). Vegetation may need to be planted at higher ratios, depending on site conditions, in order to account for mortality of planted material.
creating/restoring on-site open space areas with a minimum 100-foot-wide buffer, establishing an endowment or other suitable funding source for long-term management of the mitigation habitat, or purchasing credits at an approved mitigation bank.

**BIO 7:** Mitigation for direct impacts to seasonal wetlands in the Inner Coast Range shall be provided at a 2:1 ratio.

**BIO 8:** Compensatory mitigation for unavoidable impacts to suitable breeding and non-breeding aquatic habitat (e.g., riparian, stream, pond, and freshwater marsh habitats) outside of the California Red-legged Frog Conservation Area shall be provided through the construction and/or restoration of similar habitats at a prescribed ratio (acres restored to acres impacted) consistent with Mitigation Measure BIO-5, and provide an endowment fund or other approved funding source to implement management plans for preserved lands in perpetuity consistent with the requirements in the Solano HCP or standardized policies developed by the City per proposed General Plan Action COS-A1.1 that shall be based on the principles found in the current working draft of the Solano HCP.

**BIO 9:** Where removal of elderberry shrubs or their stems measuring 1 inch in diameter or greater is unavoidable, these impacts shall be mitigated. Removal of elderberry shrubs or stems 1 inch in diameter or greater and associated riparian vegetation shall not create gaps in a riparian corridor greater than 300 feet. Mitigation will include salvaging and replanting of affected elderberry shrubs and planting additional elderberry shrubs and associated native riparian plants according to the following criteria:

1. **Transplanting Removed Elderberry Shrubs.** Transplant removed elderberry shrubs to an approved, secure site, such as an approved mitigation bank location in Solano County or non-bank relocation site to be approved by the City and USFWS. All non-bank relocation sites shall meet the minimum reserve standards identified in the Solano HCP or standardized policies developed by the City per proposed General Plan Action COS-A1.1 that shall be based on the principles found in the current working draft of the Solano HCP (e.g. site shall be protected by a conservation easement or other applicable protection measure, and funding shall be provided for long-term monitoring and maintenance). Transplanting shall occur between June 15 and March 15 (November through February is the optimal period for transplanting). Elderberry may not be transplanted between March 16 and June 14 except where isolated bushes are located more than 0.5 miles from other suitable valley elderberry longhorn beetle habitat and no signs of use (e.g. exit holes) have been identified.

2. **Mitigation for Whole Shrub Removal.** For each removed elderberry bush, plant a minimum of five elderberry seedlings or rooted cuttings and five associated native, woody riparian plants in the mitigation area, or purchase applicable credits from a mitigation bank approved under the Solano HCP or standardized policies developed by the City per proposed General Plan Action COS-A1.1 (that shall be based on the principles found in the current working draft of the Solano HCP) to sell valley elderberry longhorn beetle credits.

3. **Mitigation for Trimming/Removal of Stems 1 Inch in Diameter or Greater.** For every ten elderberry stem 1 inch in diameter or greater that are trimmed/removed, plant two elderberry seedlings and two associated native, woody riparian plant seedlings. Mitigation plantings shall occur, to the maximum extent practicable, in areas adjacent to the impact area and/or in existing gaps in riparian corridors. Priority areas for riparian
re-vegetation and planting of elderberry include Alamo and Ulatis Creeks. The requirements for associated native, woody riparian plant establishment may be fulfilled in combination with the woody riparian vegetation replacement requirements prescribed under Mitigation Measure BIO-5.

**BIO-10:** Long-term impacts to Swainson’s hawk foraging habitat in the irrigated agriculture conservation area (Figure 4.4-6) shall be mitigated through the preservation (conservation easement) and management of foraging habitat at a ratio of 1:1 (mitigation-to-impact). All mitigation areas shall remain in “agricultural production” provided these activities are consistent with the economics of agricultural operations. The following activities shall also be prohibited on the mitigation area in order to promote value for Swainson’s hawk foraging:

- Permanent plantings of orchards and/or vineyards for the production of fruits, nuts, or berries.
- Cultivation of perennial vegetable crops such as artichokes and asparagus, as well as the annual crops cotton and rice.
- Commercial feedlots, which are defined as any open or enclosed area where domestic livestock are grouped together for intensive feeding purposes.
- Horticultural specialties, including sod, nursery stock, ornamental shrubs, ornamental trees, Christmas trees, and flowers.
- Commercial greenhouses or plant nurseries.
- Commercial aquaculture of aquatic plants and animals and their by-products.
- Commercial wind energy development.

Mitigation shall be provided in the Irrigated Agriculture Potential Re-serve Area (as depicted in the Swainson’s Hawk Potential Reserve Areas figure in the Solano HCP) or in areas identified in standardized policies developed by the City per proposed General Plan Action COS-A1.1 that shall be based on the principles found in the current working draft of the Solano HCP.

**BIO-12:** Long-term impacts to grassland and oak savanna habitat in the Inner Coast Range conservation area (Figure 4.4-6) shall be mitigated through the preservation and management of foraging habitat at a ratio of 1:1 (mitigation-to-impact) and subject to species management requirements specified in the Solano HCP or standardized policies developed by the City per proposed General Plan Action COS-A1.1 that shall be based on the principles found in the current working draft of the Solano HCP. Mitigation shall be provided in the Irrigated Agriculture, Valley Floor Grassland, or Inner Coast Range Potential Reserve Areas (see the Vernal Pool Potential Preserve and Reserve Areas figure in the Solano HCP) or in areas identified in standardized policies developed by the City per proposed General Plan Action COS-A1.1 that shall be based on the principles found in the current working draft of the Solano HCP.

**Exceptions:** Impacts that are likely to have minimal effects on the extent and quality of Swainson’s hawk foraging habitat are exempt from Swainson’s hawk foraging habitat mitigation requirements. Such activities include: projects affecting less than one year of forage production, activities related to establishment of natural habitats (e.g. aquatic, riparian, and grassland habitats), construction of infill developments that are less than 5 acres in size and surrounded by urban development, and other minor public and private facilities accessed via existing roads or that impact less than 0.5 acres of potential Swainson’s hawk foraging habitat (e.g. pump stations, antennae sites, new irrigation canals, buried pipelines, or utilities).
BIO-13: Mitigation for the permanent (i.e. more than one season) disturbance, destruction, or conversion of burrowing owl habitat for urban development or other permanent facilities shall be provided at a 1:1 ratio. Project sites that have been occupied during the nesting season at any time during the past three years or found to be nesting at the time of pre-construction surveys will be considered occupied by owls and require additional nesting habitat mitigation (described in the Solano HCP) or standardized policies developed by the City per proposed General Plan Action COS-A1.1 that shall be based on the principles found in the current working draft of the Solano HCP. All burrowing owl habitat affected either directly, indirectly, or cumulatively by the project will be subject to the compensation requirement. Mitigation lands used to satisfy mitigation measures for other natural communities and/or species identified in Tables 4.4-2 and 4.4-3 of the Draft EIR (i.e. valley floor grassland and vernal pool natural community [excluding the wetland restoration/construction component], coastal marsh natural community, Swainson’s hawk, California red-legged frog, and callippe silverspot butterfly) can be used to satisfy burrowing owl conservation if the reserve area meets the basic burrowing owl reserve management standards and criteria specified in the Solano HCP or standardized policies developed by the City per proposed General Plan Action COS-A1.1 that shall be based on the principles found in the current working draft of the Solano HCP.

Exemptions: Infill projects less than 5 acres in size and surrounded by urban development would have minimal effects on the extent and quality of burrowing owl habitat and are exempt from burrowing owl foraging habitat mitigation requirements unless a known or active nest is present. Additionally, project proponents are obligated to avoid destruction of active burrowing owl nests and take of burrowing owls in compliance with the federal Migratory Bird Treaty Act (MBTA) and California Fish and Game Code Section 3503.5 and to meet the requirements specified in the Solano HCP or standardized policies developed by the City per proposed General Plan Action COS-A1.1 that shall be based on the principles found in the current working draft of the Solano HCP.

BIO-14: If construction of pump stations, antennae sites, new irrigation canals, buried pipelines, or utilities (but excluding restoration and reserve management activities) will result in temporary impacts to occupied burrowing owl habitat (e.g. closure, collapse due to ground disturbance, or disturbance in the construction zone), shall be mitigated according to the following criteria at all times of the year:

1. Temporary Impacts Less Than or Equal to 1 Acre in Size: Install five burrows within 330 feet of the edge of the construction area if suitable contiguous habitat remains and no more than one pair of owls without eggs or young in the nest is displaced. This condition may be waived if an approved biologist, the City, and CDFW determine that the contiguous area already contains suitable donor burrows. Maintain vegetation height at 6 inches or less around the mitigation burrows to encourage use by owls.

   a. A monitoring program will be implemented to track and document the use of nearby natural or artificial burrows by evicted owls. Monitoring will be funded by the applicant conducting the project. Monitoring results will be reported to the City and CDFW at the end of the project.

   b. Artificial burrows will be maintained by the applicant who owns the project that results in burrow or habitat destruction. Artificial burrows shall be maintained for a minimum of two years following completion of the project that resulted in the temporary impact. The construction site will be monitored annually to ensure that natural burrows have been re-established on the construction site.
1) If burrows have not been re-established on the construction site within two years but owls are using other ground squirrel burrows on or adjacent to the site, then the artificial burrows will not require maintenance beyond the two-year period and no additional mitigation will be required.

2) If the burrows have not been re-established in the construction area and owls are not using other natural burrows on or adjacent to the construction site within two years, then the impact will be considered permanent and mitigation will be required according to Mitigation Measure BIO-13.

c. The disturbed area shall also be monitored the following breeding season to determine if the owls return to the area to nest. If the owls do not return or relocate to a nearby site, impacts will be required to provide additional mitigation per the Solano HCP or standardized policies developed by the City per proposed General Plan Action COS-A1.1 that shall be based on the principles found in the current working draft of the Solano HCP.

d. If the above measures cannot be implemented because adequate habitat is not present in surrounding, contiguous lands, impacts shall be mitigated per the requirements of the Solano HCP or standardized policies developed by the City per proposed General Plan Action COS-A1.1 that shall be based on the principles found in the current working draft of the Solano HCP.

2. Temporary Impacts Greater Than 1 Acre in Size: Install ten burrows/acre within 330 feet of the construction area if at least 7 acres of contiguous habitat remains and no more than one pair of owls without eggs or young in the nest is displaced. Also maintain vegetation height at 6 inches or less around the mitigation burrows to encourage use by owls. This condition may be waived if an approved biologist, the City, and CDFW determine that the contiguous area already contains suitable donor burrows. A monitoring program will be implemented to track and document the use of nearby natural or artificial burrows by evicted owls. Monitoring will be funded by the applicant conducting the project. Monitoring results will be reported to the City and CDFW at the end of the project.

a. Artificial burrows will be maintained by the applicant that owns the project that results in burrow or habitat destruction. Artificial burrows shall be maintained for a minimum of two years following completion of the project that resulted in the temporary impact. The construction site will be monitored annually to ensure that natural burrows have been re-established on the construction site.

1) If burrows have not been re-established on the construction site but owls are using other ground squirrel burrows on or adjacent to the site, then the artificial burrows will not require maintenance beyond the two-year period and no additional mitigation will be required.

2) If the burrows have not been re-established in the construction area and owls are not using other natural burrows on or adjacent to the construction site within two years, then the impact will be considered permanent and mitigation will be required according to Mitigation Measure BIO-13.
b. Temporary impacts that cannot be mitigated with mitigation burrows due to the lack of suitable burrowing owl habitat on a project site or contiguous ownership parcels shall be mitigated by preserving burrowing owl habitat off site at a ratio of 1:1. Sites subject to temporary impacts that are occupied by more than one pair of owls likewise will be mitigated at a 1:1 ratio. All habitat areas disturbed, destroyed, or converted to non-habitat uses directly, indirectly, or cumulatively will be subject to the mitigation requirement.

Compliance with this mitigation measure does not allow for the destruction or disturbance of an active nest site.

Less than Significant (After mitigation)

Cultural Resources
Since there are no significant impacts related to cultural resources as a result of the proposed General Plan and ECAS, no mitigation measures are required.

Geology, Soils, and Mineral Resources
Since there are no significant impacts related to cultural resources as a result of the proposed General Plan and ECAS, no mitigation measures are required.

Hazards and Hazardous Materials
Since there are no significant impacts related to hazards and hazardous materials as a result of the proposed General Plan and ECAS, no mitigation measures are required.

Land Use and Planning
Since there are no significant impacts related to land use as a result of the proposed General Plan and ECAS, no mitigation measures are required.

Noise
NOI-1:

a. Significant Impact

Increased traffic from projected development allowed by the proposed General Plan would result in a significant increase in traffic noise levels of more than 5 dBA compared to existing conditions along the following roadway segments:

♦ Vaca Valley Parkway from the Interstate 505 northbound ramps to Leisure Town Road
♦ Leisure Town Road from Alamo Drive to Vanden Road
♦ Ulatis Drive from Nut Tree Road to Leisure Town Road

b. Facts in Support of Findings

After the implementation of recommended mitigation measures on the aforementioned roadway segments, potential impacts would be reduced to less than significant.

Mitigation Measures
The project applicant shall ensure that the following roadway segments shall be re-surfaced with a quiet pavement, such as Rubberized Hot Mix Asphalt – Open Graded (RHMA-O):

♦ Vaca Valley Parkway from the Interstate 505 northbound ramps to Leisure Town Road
♦ Leisure Town Road from Alamo Drive to Vanden Road
♦ Ulatis Drive from Nut Tree Road to Leisure Town Road

Less than Significant (After mitigation)

Public Services and Recreation:

Since there are no significant impacts related to public services and recreation as a result of the proposed General Plan, no mitigation measures are required.

Traffic and Transportation

TRAF-2:

a. Significant Impact

The Alamo Drive at Merchant Street intersection (5) would degrade to LOS D in the PM peak hour.

b. Facts in Support of Findings

After the implementation of the recommended mitigation measure on the westbound portion of the Alamo/Merchant intersection, potential impacts would be reduced to less than significant.

Mitigation Measures

The City of Vacaville shall implement the following measure:

♦ Westbound approach: Convert the westbound outer through lane to a through-right shared lane to provide a through lane, a through-right shared lane, a right-turn lane, and two left-turn lanes.

Less than Significant (After mitigation)

TRAF-7:

a. Significant Impact

The Leisure Town Road at Orange Drive intersection (39) would degrade to LOS D during both peak hours.

b. Facts in Support of Findings

After the implementation of recommended mitigation measures on the southbound and westbound portions of the Leisure Town/Orange intersection, potential impacts would be reduced to less than significant.
Mitigation Measures

The City of Vacaville shall implement the following measures:

♦ Southbound approach: Add a southbound left-turn lane to provide two left-turn lanes, two through lanes, and a right-turn lane; and prohibit the southbound U-turn movement.

♦ Westbound approach: Modify the traffic signal to provide overlap right-turn phasing for the westbound right-turn movement.

Less than Significant (After mitigation)

**TRAF-8:**

a. **Significant Impact**

The Monte Vista Avenue at Allison Drive intersection (57) would degrade to LOS F during the PM peak hour.

b. **Facts in Support of Findings**

After the implementation of recommended mitigation measures on the northbound and westbound portions of the Monte Vista/Allison intersection, potential impacts would be reduced to less than significant.

**Mitigation Measure**

The City of Vacaville shall implement the following measures:

♦ Northbound approach: Convert a northbound through lane to a right-turn lane to provide two left-turn lanes, one through lane, and two right-turn lanes; and modify the traffic signal phasing to provide overlap northbound right-turn movement.

♦ Westbound approach: Prohibit westbound U-turn movements; convert a westbound through lane to a left-turn lane to provide two left-turn lanes, one shared through-right turn lane.

Less than Significant (After mitigation)

**TRAF-9:**

a. **Significant Impact**

The Nut Tree Road at Elmira Road intersection (67) would degrade to below LOS mid-D during both peak hours.

b. **Facts in Support of Findings**

After the implementation of recommended mitigation measure on the southbound portion of the Nut Tree/Elmira intersection, potential impacts would be reduced to less than significant.
Mitigation Measures

The City of Vacaville shall implement the following measure:

♦ Southbound approach: Convert a southbound through lane to a left-turn lane to provide two left-turn lanes, one through lane, and one through-right shared lane.

Less than Significant (After mitigation)

**TRAF-10:**

a. **Significant Impact**

The Orange Drive at Nut Tree Road intersection (76) would degrade to LOS F in the PM peak hour.

b. **Facts in Support of Findings**

After the implementation of recommended mitigation measures on the northbound, southbound, and westbound portions of the Orange/Nut Tree intersection, potential impacts would be reduced to less than significant.

Mitigation Measures

The City of Vacaville shall implement the following measures:

♦ Northbound approach: Add a northbound right-turn lane and convert the through-right shared lane to a through lane to provide one left-turn lane, two through lanes, and a right-turn lane; provide lagging left-turn signal phasing.

♦ Southbound approach: Add a southbound right-turn lane and convert the through-right shared lane to a through lane to provide two left-turn lanes, two through lanes, and a right-turn lane; provide lagging left-turn signal phasing.

♦ Westbound approach: Convert a westbound through lane to a left-turn lane to provide three left-turn lanes, two through lanes, and one right-turn lane.

Less than Significant (After mitigation)

**TRAF-12:**

a. **Significant Impact**

The Peabody Road at CSF intersection (81) would degrade to LOS F in the AM peak hour.

b. **Facts in Support of Findings**

The mitigation measures of adding a southbound right-turn lane and convert the through-right shared lane to a through lane, along with adding a corresponding receiving lane on the south leg of the intersection will present the Peabody/CSF intersection from downgrading to LOS F in the AM peak hour.
Mitigation Measures

The City of Vacaville shall implement the following measures:

- Southbound approach: Add a southbound right-turn lane and con-vert the through-right shared lane to a through lane to provide a left-turn lane, a through-left shared lane, and a right-turn lane.

- South leg: Add a corresponding receiving lane on the south leg of the intersection.

**Less than Significant (After mitigation)**

TRAF-14:

a. **Significant Impact**

   The Peabody Road at Foxboro Parkway intersection (83) would degrade to below LOS mid-D during the PM peak hour.

b. **Facts in Support of Findings**

   After the implementation of the recommended mitigation measures on northbound portion of the Peabody/Foxboro intersection, potential impacts would be reduced to less than significant.

Mitigation Measures

The City of Vacaville shall implement the following measure:

- Northbound approach: Convert the northbound through-right shared lane to a through lane and add a right-turn lane to provide two through lanes and a right-turn lane.

**Less than Significant (After mitigation)**

TRAF-15:

a. **Significant Impact**

   The Peabody Road at Hume Way intersection (84) would degrade to LOS D during the PM peak hour.

b. **Facts in Support of Findings**

   After the implementation of recommended mitigation measures on the eastbound and northbound portion of the Peabody/Hume intersection, potential impacts would be reduced to less than significant.

Mitigation Measure

The City of Vacaville shall implement the following measures:

- Eastbound approach: Convert the westbound through lane to a left-through shared lane to provide a left-turn lane, a left-through shared lane, and a right-turn lane; and modify the traffic signal to provide overlap right-turn phasing.

- Northbound approach: Prohibit northbound U-turn movement.
Less than Significant (After mitigation)

**TRAF-16:**

a. **Significant Impact**

The Vaca Valley Road at Crescent Drive intersection (92) would degrade to LOS F during the AM peak hour and LOS E during the PM peak hour.

b. **Facts in Support of Findings**

After the implementation of recommended mitigation measures on the southbound portion of the Vaca Valley/Crescent intersection, potential impacts would be reduced to less than significant.

**Mitigation Measures**

The City of Vacaville shall implement the following measure:

♦ Southbound approach: Convert the through-right shared lane to a left-through-right shared lane to provide a left-turn lane and a left-through-right shared lane; modify the traffic signal to provide split phase operation on the north-south approaches.

Less than Significant (After mitigation)

**TRAF-17:**

a. **Significant Impact**

The Vaca Valley Road at East Akerly Drive intersection (93) would degrade to LOS F during both peak hours.

b. **Facts in Support of Findings**

After the implementation of recommended mitigation measures on the northbound and westbound portions of the Vaca Valley/East Akerly intersection, potential impacts would be reduced to less than significant.

**Mitigation Measures**

The City of Vacaville shall implement the following measures:

♦ Northbound approach: Convert the northbound through lane to a through-right shared lane to provide a left-turn lane, a through-right shared lane, and a right-turn lane; modify the traffic signal to provide split phase operations on the north-south approaches.

♦ Westbound approach: Convert the westbound through lane to a left-turn lane to provide two left-turn lanes and a through-right shared lane.

Less than Significant (After mitigation)

**TRAF-18:**

a. **Significant Impact**
The Vaca Valley Road at New Horizons Way intersection (98) would degrade to LOS F during the PM peak hour.

b. **Facts in Support of Findings**

After the implementation of recommended mitigation measures the eastbound and northbound portions of the Vaca Valley/New Horizons intersection, potential impacts would be reduced to less than significant.

**Mitigation Measures**

The City of Vacaville shall implement the following measures:

♦ Eastbound approach: Add an eastbound left-turn lane to provide two-left turn lanes, a through lane, and a through-right shared lane.

♦ Northbound approach: Convert the northbound through lane to a left-turn lane to provide two left-turn lanes and a through-right shared lane.

**Less than Significant (After mitigation)**

**TRAF-19:**

a. **Significant Impact**

The Leisure Town Road at Midway Road intersection (38) would degrade to LOS E during the PM peak hour.

b. **Facts in Support of Findings**

After the implementation of recommended mitigation measures, potential impacts would be reduced to less than significant.

**Mitigation Measure**

The City of Vacaville shall implement the following measure:

♦ Install a traffic signal at the intersection as the peak hour traffic signal warrant would be met.

**Less than Significant (After mitigation)**

**TRAF-20:**

a. **Significant Impact**

The unsignalized Monte Vista Avenue at Airport Road intersection (56) would degrade to LOS F in the PM peak hour.

b. **Facts in Support of Findings**

After the implementation of recommended mitigation measures, potential impacts would be reduced to less than significant.
Mitigation Measure

The City of Vacaville shall implement the following measure:

♦ Install a traffic signal at the intersection as the peak hour traffic signal warrant would be met in the PM peak hour

Less than Significant (After mitigation)

TRAF-24:

a. Significant Impact

The Leisure Town Road at Marshall Road intersection (37) would degrade to LOS F during both peak hours

b. Facts in Support of Findings

After the implementation of recommended mitigation measures, potential impacts would be reduced to less than significant.

Mitigation Measures

The City of Vacaville shall implement the following measure:

♦ Install a traffic signal at the intersection as the peak hour traffic signal warrant would be met.

Less than Significant (After mitigation)

TRAF-25:

a. Significant Impact

The unsignalized Leisure Town Road at North-South Arterial intersection (43) would degrade to LOS E with an average delay of 49 seconds on the worst minor street approach during the PM peak hour, while the overall intersection would operate at LOS A.

b. Facts in Support of Findings

After the implementation of the recommended mitigation measure, potential impacts would be reduced to less than significant

Mitigation Measures

The City of Vacaville shall implement the following measure:

♦ Provide a storage pocket on the south leg to allow a two-stage, east-bound, left-turning movement.

Less than Significant (After mitigation)
TRAF-28:

a. **Significant Impact**

The unsignalized Nut Tree Road at Burton Drive intersection (66) would degrade to LOS F during the PM peak hour.

b. **Facts in Support of Findings**

After the implementation of recommended mitigation measure, potential impacts would be reduced to less than significant.

**Mitigation Measures**

The City of Vacaville shall implement the following measure:

♦ Install a traffic signal at the intersection as the peak hour traffic signal warrant would be met.

Less than Significant (After mitigation)

TRAF-29:

a. **Significant Impact**

The unsignalized Vaca Valley Road at Allison Drive intersection (90) would degrade to LOS F on the worst minor street approach during the AM peak hour.

b. **Facts in Support of Findings**

After the implementation of recommended mitigation measure, potential impacts would be reduced to less than significant.

**Mitigation Measures:**

The City of Vacaville shall implement the following measure:

♦ Install stop signs on the eastbound and westbound approaches to provide all-way stop control at the intersection.

Less than Significant (After mitigation)

TRAF-30:

a. **Significant Impact**

The Monte Vista Avenue at Depot Road intersection (61) would degrade to LOS E during the PM peak hour. This intersection is located within the Downtown Urban High Density Residential Overlay District.

b. **Facts in Support of Findings**

After the implementation of the recommended mitigation measures on the northbound and westbound portions of the Monte Vista/Depot intersection, potential impacts would be reduced to less than significant.

**Mitigation Measures:**
The City of Vacaville shall implement the following measures:

♦ Northbound approach: Modify the traffic signal to allow an overlapping right-turn movement.

♦ Westbound approach: Prohibit westbound U-turn movements.

Less than Significant (After mitigation)

**TRAF-38**

a. **Significant Impact**

The proposed General Plan would allow for development to occur in areas not currently served by public transit at equal service levels to the rest of the Local Tax Base Area. This would be in conflict with the accessibility and geographic coverage goals of the Vacaville City Coach Short Range Transit Plan.

b. **Facts in Support of Findings**

After the implementation of recommended mitigation measures, potential impacts would be reduced to less than significant.

**Mitigation Measure**

Implementation of the policies and implementing actions in the proposed General Plan, in particular Policies TR-P7.3 and TR-P7.4 and Action TR-A7.3, would establish policies and procedures to evaluate transit demand generated by new development and means to provide for transit demand beyond what can be expected from other established funding sources. New or extended transit service must comply with the established 20 percent farebox recovery mandate.

Less than Significant (After mitigation)

**Utilities and Service Systems**

*Since there are no significant impacts related to utilities and service systems as a result of the proposed General Plan and ECAS, no mitigation measures are required.*
B. Significant Impacts that Cannot be Avoided

Finding: The City finds that, where feasible, the changes or alterations that have been required, or incorporated into, the proposed project to reduce the significant environmental impacts listed below as identified in the EIR. However, specific economic, legal, social, technological, or other considerations make infeasible the mitigation measures analyzed to reduce the following impacts to a less-than-significant level. This finding is supported by substantial evidence in the record of this proceeding. Unless otherwise noted, the City of Vacaville hereby finds the following mitigation measures infeasible or ineffective, and therefore finds the following impacts significant and unavoidable.

Aesthetics

AES-1:

a. Significant Impact

The visual character in undeveloped portions of Vacaville would be substantially altered.

b. Facts in Support of Finding

The development put forth in the proposed General Plan will alter the visual character of currently undeveloped lands, where development in proposed. The visual changes due to development are significant and unavoidable.

Mitigation Measure

There are no available mitigation measures, and the impact would be significant and unavoidable.

Significant and Unavoidable Impact (with mitigation)

Agriculture and Forest Resources

AG-1:

a. Significant Impact

Although the proposed General Plan includes policies and actions that would reduce and offset the conversion of farmland, it designates approximately 2,640 acres of farmlands of concern under CEQA for non-agricultural uses.

b. Facts in Support of Findings

Policies within the Land Use Element and the Conservation/Open Space Element have been incorporated into the General Plan to avoid or substantially lessen the significant environmental effect of converting agricultural land to non-agricultural uses. However, the effect of zoning agricultural lands for non-agricultural uses remains significant and unavoidable.

Mitigation Measure

Because these farmland areas are located near existing urbanized areas, they may not be viable for agricultural operations due to conflicts with nearby urbanized areas. The only way to mitigate this impact would be to prohibit any development on
farmland of concern, even within the UGB. The UGB identifies where future urban development is appropriate and was adopted as such by the City Council. CEQA does not require that the project be changed in order to avoid an impact, and no additional mitigation is available, resulting in a significant and unavoidable impact.

Significant and Unavoidable Impact (After mitigation)

AG-2:

a. Significant Impact

The proposed General Plan designates 206 acres of lands with active Williamson Act contracts for non-agricultural uses.

b. Facts in Support of Findings

Policies within the Land Use and Conservation/Open Space Element have been incorporated into the General Plan to avoid or substantially lessen the significant environmental effect. However, even with the policies included in the General Plan and potential mitigation measures discussed in the Draft EIR to mitigate this impact, the effect remains significant and unavoidable.

Mitigation Measure

Because these parcels with Williamson Act contracts are located near existing urbanized areas, they may not be viable for agricultural operations due to conflicts with nearby urbanized areas. As discussed under Section D.1.a, Project Impacts, above, no additional mitigation is available, resulting in a significant and unavoidable impact.

Significant and Unavoidable Impact (After mitigation)

AG-3:

a. Significant Impact

Although the policies and actions in the proposed General Plan would reduce and partially offset regional agricultural impacts, the proposed project would contribute to cumulatively significant agricultural impacts in the region.

b. Facts in Support of Findings

Policies within the Land Use Element and Conservation/Open Space Element have been incorporated into the General Plan to avoid or substantially lessen the significant environmental effect. However, even with the policies included in the General Plan and potential mitigation measures discussed in the Draft EIR to mitigate this impact, the effect remains significant and unavoidable.

Mitigation Measure

The amount of growth foreseen in the region and the decisions of surrounding counties regarding conversion of agricultural land are outside the control of Vacaville. Therefore, this impact is significant and unavoidable.
Significant and Unavoidable Impact (After mitigation)

Air Quality

AIR-1:
  a. Significant Impact

  Mobile-source air pollutant emissions associated with the proposed General Plan would exceed the significance criterion of 80 pounds per day of PM10. This would be a significant project-level and cumulative impact.

  b. Facts in Support of Findings

  Policies have been incorporated into the General Plan to avoid or substantially lessen the significant environmental effect. However, the effect of motor vehicle emissions remains a significant and unavoidable impact.

  Mitigation Measures

  Motor vehicle emissions are regulated by the California ARB and the federal EPA. Therefore, the proposed General Plan does not have the authority to reduce PM10 tailpipe emissions. When considering regional emissions, a change to the General Plan land use map to restrict housing growth would not necessarily lead to a reduction in VMT to a level sufficient to avoid this impact, because people would still travel to and from Vacaville to work or shop and existing land use patterns would not change. In addition, the proposed ECAS includes many measures to reduce VMT in Vacaville, which would contribute to a reduction in PM10 emissions. No additional mitigation is available to reduce this impact, resulting in a significant and unavoidable impact.

Significant and Unavoidable Impact (After mitigation)

Biological Resources

BIO-1:
  a. Significant Impact

  The proposed General Plan, in combination with the Northeast Fairfield Specific Plan, could preclude retention of an important wildlife corridor.

  b. Facts in Support of Finding

  Policies have been incorporated into the General Plan to avoid or substantially lessen the significant environmental effect of wildlife conservation. However, the effect of precluding retention of an important wildlife corridor remains significant and unavoidable.

  Mitigation Measures

  The area designated as Public/Institutional by the proposed General Plan in this wildlife corridor is owned by the Solano Irrigation District (SID), a public entity. While there are no formal plans in place, due to the nature of this agency, future land use would likely include facilities that support SID’s water service. Because SID would not be able to use
this land for other purposes that would be compatible with a wildlife corridor, no mitigation is available, and the impact is \textit{significant and unavoidable}.

\textbf{Significant and Unavoidable Impact (with mitigation)}

\textbf{Greenhouse Gas Emission}

\textbf{GHG-1:}
\begin{itemize}
\item a. \textit{Significant Impact}
\begin{itemize}
\item The proposed General Plan and ECAS would conflict with Executive Order S-03-05’s goal to reduce GHG emissions by 80 percent below 1990 levels by 2050.
\end{itemize}
\item b. \textit{Facts in Support of Finding}
\begin{itemize}
\item Policies have been incorporated into the Project to avoid or substantially lessen the significant environmental effect. However, even with the policies included in the Project and potential mitigation measures discussed in the Draft EIR to mitigate this impact, the effect remains significant and unavoidable.
\end{itemize}
\item Mitigation Measures
\begin{itemize}
\item The majority of the reductions needed to reach the 2050 target will likely come from State measures (e.g. additional vehicle emissions standards), but the City does not have authority over such measures. The State has not identified plans to reduce emissions beyond 2020. In addition, as part of the ECAS process, the City considered a wide range of GHG emission reduction measures, and all feasible measures are included in the proposed ECAS. No additional mitigation is available, and the impact is considered \textit{significant and unavoidable}.
\end{itemize}
\end{itemize}

\textbf{Significant and Unavoidable Impact (with mitigation)}

\textbf{Hydrology and Water Quality}

\textbf{HYDRO-1:}
\begin{itemize}
\item a. \textit{Significant Impact}
\begin{itemize}
\item Although the proposed General Plan’s policies and actions reduce risks associated with dam or levee failure, they do not eliminate risks to people and property.
\end{itemize}
\item b. \textit{Facts in Support of Finding}
\begin{itemize}
\item Policies have been incorporated into the Project to avoid or substantially lessen the significant environmental effect. However, even with the policies included in the Project and potential mitigation measures discussed in the Draft EIR to mitigate this impact, the effect remains significant and unavoidable.
\end{itemize}
\item Mitigation Measures
\begin{itemize}
\item As discussed above, it is not within Vacaville’s power to require or complete maintenance and improvements to dams or levees around Vacaville that are owned and
maintained by other agencies. Therefore, this impact is considered significant and unavoidable.

Significant and Unavoidable Impact (with mitigation)

HYDRO-2:

a. Significant Impact

The proposed General Plan would contribute to development in dam and levee inundation areas, resulting in a significant cumulative impact.

b. Facts in Support of Finding

Policies have been incorporated into the Project to avoid or substantially lessen the significant environmental effect. However, even with the policies included in the Project and potential mitigation measures discussed in the Draft EIR to mitigate this impact, the effect remains significant and unavoidable.

Mitigation Measures

It is not within Vacaville’s power to require or complete maintenance and improvements to dams or levees around the city owned and maintained by other agencies. Therefore, the impact is considered significant and unavoidable.

Significant and Unavoidable Impact (with mitigation)

Population and Housing

POP-1:

a. Significant Impact

The proposed General Plan would induce substantial population growth within the EIR Study Area.

b. Facts in Support of Finding

Population growth cannot be limited to what is deemed less than substantial and, subsequently, this impact is significant and unavoidable.

Mitigation Measures

In order to reduce the anticipated population growth by 2035 to an “in-substantial” level that would not exceed ABAG’s current projections, the City would have to limit housing development opportunities to less than half of what this EIR projects. This could drive up home prices in Vacaville, reducing housing options for Vacaville residents and changing the character of the city. In addition, much of the 2035 projection accounts for development that has already been approved by the City, including projects like the North Village Specific Plan and Lagoon Valley Specific Plan. In total, these approved projects account for approximately 4,900 new units in Vacaville, which alone would exceed ABAG’s projections. Since the City cannot take back development permits that have already been approved, it would be infeasible to reduce the development capacity
in the city to ABAG’s projections. Furthermore, the City projected development needs in 2035 based on a careful review of past development trends, as explained in Chapter 3, Project Description of the Draft EIR. The proposed General Plan land use map represents a land use plan that the City believes is most appropriate to accommodate growth projected for 2035 and beyond. It is not feasible to mitigate population growth to a level that is less than “substantial,” this impact is considered significant and unavoidable.

**Significant and Unavoidable Impact (with mitigation)**

**POP-2:**

a. **Significant Impact**

The proposed General Plan would induce substantial population growth within Vacaville and the region.

b. **Facts in Support of Finding**

Population growth cannot be limited to what is deemed less than substantial and, subsequently, this impact is significant and unavoidable.

**Mitigation Measures**

It is not feasible to mitigate population growth to a level that is less than “substantial,” and this impact is considered significant and unavoidable.

**Significant and Unavoidable Impact (with mitigation)**

**Traffic and Transportation**

**TRAF-1:**

a. **Significant Impact**

The Alamo Drive at the Marshall Road intersection (4) would degrade to LOS D during both peak hours.

b. **Facts in Support of Finding**

Policies within the Transportation Element have been incorporated into the General Plan to avoid or substantially lessen the significant transportation impact associated with the downgrades of intersection service levels. However, the effect of increased traffic at this particular intersection remains significant and unavoidable.

**Mitigation Measure**

The City of Vacaville shall implement the following measures:

- Southbound approach: Convert the southbound through-right shared lane in order to a through lane and add a southbound right-turn lane to provide an exclusive right-turn lane, a through lane, a left-turn lane.
Westbound approach: Add a left-turn lane on the westbound to provide dual left-turn lanes, two through lanes and a through-right shared lane.

Significant and Unavoidable Impact (with mitigation)

TRAF-3:

a. Significant Impact

The Allison Road at Nut Tree Parkway intersection (10) would degrade to LOS F during the PM peak hour.

b. Facts in Support of Finding

Policies within the Transportation Element have been incorporated into the General Plan to avoid or substantially lessen the significant transportation impact associated with the downgrades of intersection service levels. However, the effect of increased traffic at this particular intersection remains significant and unavoidable.

Mitigation Measure

The City of Vacaville shall implement the following measure:

♦ Northbound approach: Convert the northbound through-right shared lane to a through lane and add a right-turn lane to provide three through lanes and a right-turn lane.

♦ Southbound approach: Convert the southbound left-through lane to an exclusive left-turn lane to provide two left-turn lanes and two through lanes.

♦ Modify the traffic signal phasing to provide a protected left-turn phase on the southbound approach.

Significant and Unavoidable Impact (with mitigation)

TRAF-4:

a. Significant Impact

The Leisure Town Road at Alamo Drive intersection (32) would degrade to LOS E during the PM peak hour.

b. Facts in Support of Finding

Policies within the Transportation Element have been incorporated into the General Plan to avoid or substantially lessen the significant transportation impact associated with the downgrades of intersection service levels. However, the effect of increased traffic at this particular intersection remains significant and unavoidable.

Mitigation Measures

The City of Vacaville shall implement the following measure:

♦ Eastbound approach: Add an eastbound left-turn lane to provide dual left-turn lanes, a through lane, and a right-turn lane.
Significant and Unavoidable Impact (with mitigation)

TRAF-5

a. Significant Impact

The Leisure Town Road at Elmira Road intersection (33) would degrade to LOS F in during both peak hours.

b. Facts in Support of Finding

Policies within the Transportation Element have been incorporated into the General Plan to avoid or substantially lessen the significant transportation impact associated with the downgrades of intersection service levels. However, the effect of increased traffic at this particular intersection remains significant and unavoidable.

Mitigation Measures

The City of Vacaville shall implement the following measures:

♦ Northbound approach: Add one left-turn lane and one right-turn lane, and convert the through-right shared lane to a through lane to provide two left-turn lanes, two through lanes, and a right-turn lane.

♦ Southbound approach: Add one left-turn lane and one right-turn lane, and convert the through-right lane shared to a through lane to provide two left-turn lanes, two through lanes, and a right-turn lane.

♦ Eastbound approach: Add a left-turn lane and one through lane, and convert the through-left shared lane to a through lane to provide one left turn lane, two through lanes, and a right-turn lane.

♦ Westbound approach: Add a right-turn lane and convert the through-right shared lane to a through lane to provide one left-turn lane, two through lanes, and a right-turn lane

Significant and Unavoidable Impact (with mitigation)

TRAF-6:

a. Significant Impact

The Leisure Town Road at Interstate 80 Eastbound Ramps (35) would degrade to LOS D during both peak hours. This location is a freeway ramp intersection and is under Caltrans jurisdiction.
b. **Facts in Support of Finding**

Policies within the Transportation Element have been incorporated into the General Plan to avoid or substantially lessen the significant transportation impact associated with the downgrades of intersection service levels. However, the effect of increased traffic at this particular intersection remains significant and unavoidable.

**Mitigation Measure**

The City of Vacaville, in coordination with Caltrans, shall implement the following measure:

◆ **Eastbound approach:** Add a right-turn lane to the eastbound off-ramp approach to provide a left-turn lane, a left-through shared lane, and a right-turn lane.

**Significant and Unavoidable Impact (with mitigation)**

**TRAF-11:**

a. **Significant Impact**

The Peabody Road at Cliffside Drive intersection (80) would degrade to LOS E during the PM peak hour.

b. **Facts in Support of Finding.**

Policies within the Transportation Element have been incorporated into the General Plan to avoid or substantially lessen the significant transportation impact associated with the downgrades of intersection service levels. However, the effect of increased traffic at this particular intersection remains significant and unavoidable.

**Mitigation Measures**

The City of Vacaville shall implement the following measure:

◆ **Eastbound approach:** Add an eastbound left-turn lane to provide two-left turn lanes, a through-left shared lane, and a right-turn lane, and modify the lane alignment of the east-west movements.

**Significant and Unavoidable Impact (with mitigation)**

**TRAF-13:**

a. **Significant Impact**

The Peabody Road at Elmira Road intersection (82) would degrade to LOS E during the PM peak hour.

b. **Facts in Support of Finding**

Policies within the Transportation Element have been incorporated into the General Plan to avoid or substantially lessen the significant transportation impact associated with the
downgrades of intersection service levels. However, the effect of increased traffic at this particular intersection remains significant and unavoidable.

Mitigation Measures

The City of Vacaville shall implement the following measures:

♦ Eastbound approach: Add an eastbound left-turn lane to provide two left-turn lanes, Two through lanes, and one right-turn lane; modify the traffic signal to provide overlap eastbound right-turn phasing.

♦ Northbound approach: Prohibit northbound U-turn movement.

♦ Westbound approach: Convert a through lane to a left-turn lane to provide two left-turn lanes, one through lane, and a through-right shared lane.

Significant and Unavoidable Impact (with mitigation)

TRAF-21:

a. Significant Impact

The unsignalized Cherry Glen Road at Interstate 80 Eastbound Ramp intersection (19) would degrade to LOS F in the PM peak hour. This location is a freeway ramp intersection and is under Caltrans jurisdiction.

b. Facts in Support of Finding

Policies within the Transportation Element have been incorporated into the General Plan to avoid or substantially lessen the significant transportation impact associated with the downgrades of intersection service levels. However, this intersection is not solely within the jurisdiction of the City of Vacaville and the effect of increased traffic at this particular intersection remains significant and unavoidable.

Mitigation Measure

The City of Vacaville, in coordination with Caltrans, shall implement the following measure:

♦ Install a traffic signal at the intersection as the peak hour traffic signal warrant would be met.

Significant and Unavoidable Impact (with mitigation)

TRAF-22:

a. Significant Impact

The unsignalized Cherry Glen Road at Interstate 80 Westbound Ramp intersection (20) would degrade to LOS E in the AM peak hour and LOS F in the PM peak hour. This location is a freeway ramp intersection and is under Caltrans jurisdiction.
b. **Facts in Support of Finding**

Policies within the Transportation Element have been incorporated into the General Plan to avoid or substantially lessen the significant transportation impact associated with the downgrades of intersection service levels. However, this intersection is not solely within the jurisdiction of the City of Vacaville and the effect of increased traffic at this particular intersection remains significant and unavoidable.

**Mitigation Measures**

The City of Vacaville, in coordination with Caltrans, shall implement the following measure:

♦ Install stop signs on the northbound and southbound approaches to provide all-way stop control at the intersection.

**Significant and Unavoidable Impact (with mitigation)**

**TRAF-23:**

a. **Significant Impact**

The unsignalized Leisure Town Road at Gilley Way intersection (34) would degrade to LOS F on the worst minor street approach during both peak hours, while the overall intersection would deteriorate to LOS F in the PM peak hour.

b. **Facts in Support of Finding**

Policies within the Transportation Element have been incorporated into the General Plan to avoid or substantially lessen the significant transportation impact associated with the downgrades of intersection service levels. However, the effect of increased traffic at this particular intersection remains significant and unavoidable.

**Mitigation Measures**

The City of Vacaville shall implement the following measure:

♦ Install a traffic signal at the intersection as the peak hour traffic signal warrant would be met.

**Significant and Unavoidable Impact (with mitigation)**

**TRAF-26:**

a. **Significant Impact**

The unsignalized Midway Road at I-505 Northbound Ramp intersection (52) would degrade to LOS F on the worst minor street approach during both peak hours, while the overall intersection would operate at LOS A in the AM peak hour and LOS F in the PM peak hour. This location is a freeway ramp intersection and is under Caltrans jurisdiction.

b. **Facts in Support of Finding**
Policies within the Transportation Element have been incorporated into the General Plan to avoid or substantially lessen the significant transportation impact associated with the downgrades of intersection service levels. However, this intersection is not solely within the jurisdiction of the City of Vacaville and the effect of increased traffic at this particular intersection remains significant and unavoidable.

Mitigation Measures

The City of Vacaville, in coordination with Caltrans, shall implement the following measures:

♦ Install a traffic signal at the intersection as the peak hour traffic signal warrant would be met.

♦ Eastbound approach: Convert the eastbound through-left shared lane to a through lane, and add a left-turn lane to provide a left-turn lane and a through lane.

Significant and Unavoidable Impact (with mitigation)

TRAF-27:

a. Significant Impact

The unsignalized Midway Road at I-505 Southbound Ramp intersection (53) would degrade to LOS F during both peak hours. This location is a freeway ramp intersection and is under Caltrans jurisdiction.

b. Facts in Support of Finding

Policies within the Transportation Element have been incorporated into the General Plan to avoid or substantially lessen the significant transportation impact associated with the downgrades of intersection service levels. However, this intersection is not solely within the jurisdiction of the City of Vacaville and the effect of increased traffic at this particular intersection remains significant and unavoidable.

Mitigation Measures

The City of Vacaville, in coordination with Caltrans, shall implement the following measure:

♦ Install a traffic signal at the intersection as the peak hour traffic signal warrant would be met.

Significant and Unavoidable Impact (with mitigation)

TRAF-31:

a. Significant Impact

The Interstate 80 Eastbound Ramps at North Texas Street intersection (29) in Fairfield would degrade to LOS F during both peak hours. This location is a freeway ramp intersection and is under Caltrans jurisdiction.
b. Facts in Support of Finding:

Policies within the Transportation Element have been incorporated into the General Plan to avoid or substantially lessen the significant transportation impact associated with the downgrades of intersection service levels. However, this intersection is not solely within the jurisdiction of the City of Vacaville and the effect of increased traffic at this particular intersection remains significant and unavoidable.

Mitigation Measure

The City of Vacaville, in coordination with Caltrans and the City of Fairfield, shall implement the following measures:

♦ Eastbound approach: Convert the eastbound through-left shared lane to a left-through-right shared lane and add a right lane to provide one left-through-right shared lane, two exclusive right lanes.

♦ Southbound approach: Add one southbound through lane to provide one left-turn lane and two through lanes.

Significant and Unavoidable Impact (with mitigation)

**TRAF-32:***

a. Significant Impact

The Interstate 80 Westbound Ramps at North Texas Street intersection (30) in Fairfield would degrade to LOS F in the AM peak hour. This location is a freeway ramp intersection and is under Caltrans jurisdiction.

b. Facts in Support of Finding:

Policies within the Transportation Element have been incorporated into the General Plan to avoid or substantially lessen the significant transportation impact associated with the downgrades of intersection service levels. However, this intersection is not solely within the jurisdiction of the City of Vacaville and the effect of increased traffic at this particular intersection remains significant and unavoidable.

Mitigation Measure

The City of Vacaville, in coordination with Caltrans and the City of Fairfield, shall implement the following measure:

♦ Northbound approach: Restripe the northbound approach lanes on North Texas Street to provide two right-turn lanes, a through lane, and one left-turn lane.

Significant and Unavoidable Impact (with mitigation)

**TRAF-33:***

a. Significant Impact
The Peabody Road at Air Base Parkway intersection (78) in Fairfield would degrade to LOS E in the AM peak hour and LOS F in the PM peak hour.

b. Facts in Support of Finding:

Policies within the Transportation Element have been incorporated into the General Plan to avoid or substantially lessen the significant transportation impact associated with the downgrades of intersection service levels. However, this intersection is not solely within the jurisdiction of the City of Vacaville and the effect of increased traffic at this particular intersection remains significant and unavoidable.

Mitigation Measure:

The City of Vacaville, in coordination with the City of Fairfield, shall implement the following measures:

♦ Eastbound approach: Add an eastbound left-turn lane to provide three left-turn lanes and two through lanes.

♦ Westbound approach: Add a westbound right-turn lane to provide two right-turn lanes and two through lanes; modify traffic signal to allow right-turn overlap phasing.

♦ Southbound approach: Prohibit southbound U-turn movement.

TRAF-34:

a. Significant Impact

The Peabody Road at Jepson Parkway intersection (85) in Fairfield would degrade to LOS F during both peak hours.

b. Facts in Support of Finding:

Policies within the Transportation Element have been incorporated into the General Plan to avoid or substantially lessen the significant transportation impact associated with the downgrades of intersection service levels. However, this intersection is not solely within the jurisdiction of the City of Vacaville and the effect of increased traffic at this particular intersection remains significant and unavoidable.

Mitigation Measure

The City of Vacaville, in coordination with the City of Fairfield, shall implement the following measures:

♦ Northbound approach: Add one northbound left-turn lane, one through lane, and one right-turn lane to provide two left-turn lanes, three through lanes, and two right-turn lanes.

♦ Southbound approach: Add two southbound through lanes and one right-turn lane to provide one left-turn lane, three through lanes and two right-turn lanes.
Eastbound approach: Add one eastbound left-turn lane, one through lane, and one right-turn lane, and convert the through-right shared lane to an exclusive right-turn lane to provide two left-turn lanes, three through lanes, and two right-turn lanes.

Westbound approach: Add one westbound left-turn lane and one through lane to provide two left-turn lanes, two through lanes, and one through-right shared lane.

Significant and Unavoidable Impact (with mitigation)

TRAF-35:

a. Significant Impact

The eastbound segment of Interstate 80 west of Lagoon Valley Road would degrade to LOS F during the PM peak hour.

b. Facts in Support of Finding:

Policies within the Transportation Element have been incorporated into the General Plan to avoid or substantially lessen the significant transportation impact associated with the downgrades of intersection service levels. However, the effect of increased traffic at this particular intersection remains significant and unavoidable.

Mitigation Measure

Implementation of the policies and implementing actions in the proposed General Plan would potentially improve the freeway operation and reduce the project impact. However, the effectiveness of the policies and actions could not be clearly demonstrated to fully mitigate the project impact and improve the freeway operations to LOS E or better. Therefore, the project impact is significant and unavoidable.

Significant and Unavoidable Impact (with mitigation)

TRAF-36:

a. Significant Impact

The eastbound segment of Interstate 80 east of Leisure Town Road would degrade to LOS F during the PM peak hour.

b. Facts in Support of Finding:

Policies within the Transportation Element have been incorporated into the General Plan to avoid or substantially lessen the significant transportation impact associated with the downgrades of intersection service levels. However, the effect of increased traffic at this particular intersection remains significant and unavoidable.

Mitigation Measure

Implementation of the policies and implementing actions in the proposed General Plan would potentially improve the freeway operation and reduce the project impact. However, the effectiveness of the policies and actions could not be clearly demonstrated to fully mitigate the project impact and improve the freeway operations to LOS E or better. Therefore, the project impact is significant and unavoidable.
Significant and Unavoidable Impact (with mitigation)

TRAF-37:

a. **Significant Impact**

The project would result in deterioration of level of service at a number of intersections below acceptable standards that may not be able to be mitigated when the improvements are needed.

b. **Facts in Support of Finding:**

Policies within the Transportation Element have been incorporated into the General Plan to avoid or substantially lessen the significant transportation impact associated with the downgrades of intersections’ service levels. However, the effect of increased traffic at this some particular intersections will remain significant and unavoidable.

**Mitigation Measure**

Intersection level of service impacts would be addressed by Mitigation Measures TRAF-1 through TRAF-34. No additional mitigation measures are available to address this impact. Therefore, the project impact is significant and unavoidable.

Significant and Unavoidable Impact (with mitigation)

4.2 Air Quality and Greenhouse Gas Emissions

2. **Air Quality and Greenhouse Gas Emissions - Construction of the Proposed Project could generate emissions of ROG, NOx, PM10, and PM2.5.**

b. **Significant/Unavoidable Impact**

Proposed project emissions from operation would exceed the threshold for NO\textsubscript{x}, ROG, and PM\textsubscript{10}; therefore, the proposed project would have a significant effect on regional air quality. It should also be noted that individual projects that have a significant effect on regional air quality also have a significant cumulative effect on regional air quality. This is a significant impact.

c. **Facts in Support of Finding**

Even with implementation of Mitigation Measure 4.2-1a and 4.2-b, project emissions would exceed BAAQMD and YSAQMD thresholds for PM10. Therefore, PM10 emissions from construction are considered to be a significant and unavoidable impact.

**Mitigation Measures**

4.2-1a: The Applicant shall ensure through the enforcement of contractual obligations that construction contractors implement a fugitive dust abatement program during construction, which shall include the following elements:
- Cover all trucks hauling soil, sand, and other loose materials or require all trucks to maintain at least two feet of freeboard.
- Cover all exposed stockpiles.
- Water all exposed roadway and construction areas twice a day.
- Sweep streets daily (with water sweepers) if visible soil material is carried onto adjacent streets.
- Limit traffic speeds on unpaved roads to 15 miles per hour (mph).
- Suspend excavation and grading activity when winds (instantaneous gusts) exceed 25 mph.

4.2-1b: The applicant shall ensure through contractual obligations with construction contractors that the following Best Management Practices shall be implemented during all stages of construction:

- All heavy duty construction equipment shall be equipped with a diesel oxidation catalyst and use aqueous diesel fuel. Heavy duty construction equipment shall be the newest and cleanest equipment available. Biodiesel shall be used whenever available.
- Only low ROG VOC coatings that conform to the limits specified in YSAQMD Rule 2.14 shall be utilized. Low VOC paints are available through local paint retailers that supply Olympic Premium and Benjamin Moore Aura paints.
- Construction employees and subcontracts shall be informed that Emissions of reactive organic gases, nitrogen oxides, sulfur oxides, and carbon monoxide, and GHGs shall be controlled by requiring all diesel-powered equipment is to be properly maintained and that, in accordance with state law, minimizing idling time must be limited to 5 minutes when construction equipment is not in use, unless per engine manufacturer’s specifications or for safety reasons more time is required. Since these construction emissions would be generated primarily by construction equipment, machinery, and engines shall be kept in good mechanical condition to minimize exhaust emissions.
- All stationary equipment, other than internal combustion engines less than 50 horsepower, emitting air pollutants shall obtain an Authority to Construct and a Permit to Operate from the YSAPCD prior to the beginning of construction.
- The project proponent shall employ periodic and unscheduled inspections to accomplish the above mitigation.
- Any burning of cleared vegetation shall be conducted according to the rules and regulations of the BAAQMD’s Regulation 5 (BAAQMD, 2008) and YSAQMD Rule 2.8. Open Burning, General. Prior notification to BAAQMD shall be made by submitting an Open Burning Prior Notification Form to BAAQMD’s office in San Francisco.

3. Air Quality and Greenhouse Gas Emissions - Operation of the Proposed Project could generate emissions of ROG, NOx, PM10, and PM2.5.

b. Significant/Unavoidable Impact

Once the Proposed Project has been constructed and occupied, operational activities associated with various land uses of the Proposed Project would generate ROG, NOx,
PM10, and PM2.5 emissions. ROG, NOx, PM10, and PM2.5 are pollutants of concern due to their role in the formation of ozone and particulate matter.

c. Facts in Support of Finding:

Even with implementation of Mitigation Measure 4.2-4, project emissions project-related emissions during operation would be reduced, but would still exceed BAAQMD and YSAQMD thresholds for NOx, ROGs, and PM10. Therefore, this impact is considered to be significant and unavoidable.

Mitigation measures:

4.2-4: The City shall ensure through conditions of project approval or the specific plan requirements that the following mitigation measures are implemented to reduce project-related operational emissions:

- The number of parking spaces at the proposed school shall be consistent with the Leadership in Energy and Environmental Design standards.

- The following provision along with design standards shall be included within the Vanden Meadows Specific Plan: If the City expands City Coach’s Route 8 (or any other route) into Vanden Meadows area, the Applicant shall install bus turnouts and transit stops in location(s) designated by the City.

4. Air Quality and Greenhouse Gas Emissions - Operation of the Proposed Project could generate emissions of ROG, NOx, PM10, and PM2.5, which in combination with past, present, and future criteria emissions, has the potential to cause and exceedance of the NAAQS and/or the CAAQS.

b. Significant/Unavoidable Impact

Proposed project emissions from operation would exceed the threshold for NOx, ROG, and PM10; therefore, the proposed project would have a significant effect on regional air quality. It should also be noted that individual projects that have a significant effect on regional air quality also have a significant cumulative effect on regional air quality. This is a significant impact.

c. Facts in Support of Finding:

Past, present and future development projects contribute to a regions air quality conditions on a cumulative basis; therefore by its very nature, air pollution is largely a cumulative impact. No single project is sufficient in size to, by itself, result in nonattainment of the NAAQS or CAAQS. If a project’s individual emissions contribute toward exceedance of the NAAQS, then the project’s cumulative impact on air quality would be significant.

Mitigation Measure 4.2-7 is to Implement Mitigation Measure 4.2-4. Even with Mitigation Measure 4.2-4, the project will reduce project emissions; however, not to a less than significant level. This impact is Significant and Unavoidable.

See Mitigation Measure 4.2-4.

4.3 Agricultural Resources
5. Agricultural Resources – The Proposed Project could result in the conversion of Prime Farmland within the project site to non-agricultural uses.

c. Significant/Unavoidable Impact

The Proposed Project would convert approximately 56.81 acres of Prime Farmland, 12.02 acres of Farmland of Statewide Importance, and 195.65 acres of Grazing Lands to urban uses. Loss of prime and important agricultural land is a significant and unavoidable impact.

d. Facts in Support of Finding:

Even with Mitigation Measure 4.3-1, the loss of prime and important agricultural lands for the Proposed Project would remain a significant and unavoidable impact.

Mitigation Measure

4.3-1: The applicant shall preserve 68.83 acres of active farmland in Solano County with soils similar in productive value to on-site soils through agricultural easement, purchase of development rights, donation of mitigation fees to an agricultural land trust or conservancy, contribution to the State Department of Conservation fund for the preservation of farmland, or by some other feasible method, as determined by the City Council, that achieves the goal of preserving active farmland. Should donation of mitigation fees be the preferred method for mitigating impacts, the fees shall be based on fair market value of a conservation easement over similar quality active farmland as determined by the County Assessor’s Office at the time the fee is to be paid.

6. Agricultural Resources – The Proposed Project could contribute to adverse cumulative impacts associated with conversion of agricultural land uses.

c. Significant/Unavoidable Impact

The Proposed Project would significantly contribute towards the conversion of prime and important farmland within Solano County. This cumulative impact is considered significant and unavoidable.

d. Facts in Support of Finding:

Mitigation Measure 4.3-1 has been recommended to help off-set the project’s direct conversion of important farmland through the preservation of farmland with similar qualities in another location within the County. Nevertheless, the Proposed Project would significantly contribute towards the conversion of prime and important farmland within Solano County. This cumulative impact is considered significant and unavoidable.

Mitigation Measure

4.3-4: Implement Mitigation Measure 4.3-1.

Noise
7. Noise - Project-related construction has the potential to generate a substantial temporary or periodic noise level greater than existing ambient levels in the project vicinity.

c. Significant/Unavoidable Impact

Temporary substantial noise increases associated with project construction would be considered significant and unavoidable.

d. Facts in Support of Finding:

During the construction phases of the project, noise from construction activities would add to the noise environment in the immediate project vicinity. Activities involved in construction would generate maximum noise levels. Noise would also be generated during the construction phase by increased truck traffic on area roadways. Temporary substantial noise increases associated with project construction would be considered significant and unavoidable.

Mitigation Measure:

4.10-1: The Applicant shall ensure through contractual agreements that the following measures are implemented during construction:

- Construction activities shall be limited to occur between the hours of 7:00 a.m. to 7:00 p.m. Monday through Friday, and 8:00 a.m. to 5:00 p.m. on Saturdays, Sundays, and Federal Holidays. The intent of this measure is to prevent construction activities during the more sensitive nighttime period.
- Stationary equipment and staging areas shall be located as far as practical from noise-sensitive receptors.
- All construction vehicles or equipment, fixed or mobile, shall be equipped with properly operating and maintained mufflers and acoustical shields or shrouds, in accordance with manufacturers’ recommendations.
- To the extent feasible existing barrier features (structures) shall be used to block sound transmission between noise sources and noise sensitive land uses.
- Construction activities shall conform to the following standards: (a) there shall be no start-up of machines or equipment, no delivery of materials or equipment, no cleaning of machines or equipment and no servicing of equipment except during the permitted hours of construction; (b) radios played at high volume, loud talking and other forms of communication constituting a nuisance shall not be permitted; and (c) there shall be no construction on Sundays or legal holidays. Exceptions to these time restrictions may be granted by the Community Development Director for one of the following reasons: (1) inclement weather affecting work; (2) emergency work; or (3) other work, if work and equipment will not create noise that may be unreasonably offensive to neighbors so as to constitute a nuisance. The Community Development Director must be notified and must approve the work in advance.
- The general contractors for all construction and demolition activities shall provide a contact number for citizen complaints and a methodology for dealing with such complaints such as designating a noise disturbance coordinator. This noise disturbance coordinator shall receive all public complaints about construction related noise and vibration, shall be responsible for determining the cause of the complaint, and shall implement any feasible measures to be taken to alleviate the problem. All complaints and resolution of complaints shall be reported to the City weekly.
Public Services, Utilities and Recreation

8. Public Services, Utilities and Recreation – The Proposed Project could require expansion of the City’s water treatment, storage, and distribution facilities, the construction of which could result in environmental impacts.

c. Significant/Unavoidable Impact

The Proposed Project’s cumulative contribution to the triggering of the construction of the planned reservoirs is, therefore, considered a significant and unavoidable impact.

d. Facts in Support of Finding:

Build-out of the Proposed Project would contribute towards the need to construct planned water reservoirs. These reservoirs would be provided as needed by the City and financed through a combination of developer funds and existing impact fee reserves. Build-out of the Proposed Project would contribute towards the need to construct planned water reservoirs. These reservoirs would be provided as needed by the City and financed through a combination of developer funds and existing impact fee reserves. The potential locations for the additional reservoirs are generally in undeveloped and/or agricultural areas. Due to the general locations of the additional reservoirs, potentially significant and unavoidable environmental effects to agricultural and/or biological resources may occur as a result of construction. The Proposed Project’s cumulative contribution to the triggering of the construction of the planned reservoirs is, therefore, considered a significant and unavoidable impact.

Mitigation Measure

No feasible mitigation available.

9. Public Services, Utilities and Recreation – 4.12-4 The Proposed Project could exceed the capacity of the wastewater treatment and collection facilities serving the project site.

c. Significant/Unavoidable Impact

The Proposed Project’s cumulative contribution to the need to expand the EWWTP is, therefore, considered a significant and unavoidable impact.

d. Facts in Support of Finding:

Although the EWWTP currently has the capacity to accommodate the Proposed Project, the treatment plant would ultimately need one or more capacity expansions in order to serve the full amount of development allowed under to General Plan, in accordance with previous treatment planning documents (West-Yost, 2011). Expansion of the EWWTP would be constructed in accordance with the City’s standard specifications on the existing previously disturbed EWWTP site and would be subject to environmental review in compliance with CEQA. However, potentially significant and unavoidable short-term environmental effects from construction would likely occur as a result of construction emissions and noise, similar to the effects that were identified within the EIR for the previous expansion of the EWWTP (City of Vacaville, 1998). The Proposed Project’s cumulative contribution to the need to expand the EWWTP is, therefore, considered a significant and unavoidable impact.
Mitigation Measure

4.12-4. Prior to the construction of off-site sewer upgrades, the City shall implement Mitigation Measures 4.4-12a-c to conduct pre-construction surveys for rare plants and nesting birds and implement avoidance measures during construction.

Transportation and Circulation

10. Roadway Segments – Implementation of the Proposed Project with and without the Foxboro Parkway Extension has the potential to increase traffic on Vacaville and Solano County roadways beyond acceptable capacities under Existing plus Approved Projects Conditions.

a. Significant/Unavoidable Impact

Leisure Town Road north of Sequoia Drive, and Peabody Road south of the City limit would operate below LOS D during the PM Peak Hour.

b. Facts in Support of Finding:

The segment of Leisure Town Road north of Sequoia would operate at below LOS D with or without the addition of project traffic. This Leisure Town Road segment is a part of the approved Jepson Parkway project that would improve the roadway to a four-lane arterial. With the implementation of the Jepson Parkway improvements, the segment would operate at LOS C or better under Exiting plus Approved Projects conditions. However, because the Jepson Parkway project is not under the City’s jurisdiction, the timing and implementation is not under the City’s control and therefore the impact would be significant and unavoidable.

The Project would contribute to the already substandard operations at the segment of Peabody Road south of the Vacaville City Limit, which would operate below LOS D under Existing + Approved Project Conditions. This segment is located in Solano County and is also designated as a Route of Regional Significance. The CMP standard on this segment is LOS E. This segment is projected to operate beyond the capacity of a two lane arterial and the project trips would exacerbate the conditions. The Fairfield Train Station Specific Plan has included widening of this segment of Peabody Road to a four lane arterial. This improvement would provide capacity for Existing plus Approved Projects. However, the implementation of this improvement is uncertain. Therefore, this is a cumulative project impact. The cumulative project impact would remain significant and unavoidable.

Mitigation

No feasible mitigation available

11. Roadway Segments – Implementation of the Proposed Project with and without the Foxboro Parkway Extension has the potential to increase traffic on Vacaville and Solano County roadways beyond acceptable capacities under Cumulative Conditions.

a. Significant/Unavoidable Impact

Under Cumulative conditions, the segment of Peabody Road south of Vacaville City would operate at LOS F with and without the addition of project traffic.
b. **Facts in Support of Finding:**

The segment of Peabody Road south of Vacaville City would operate at LOS F with and without the addition of project traffic. This segment is located in Solano County and is also a designated Route of Regional Significance. The CMP standard on this segment is LOS E; therefore, the segment operations would exceed acceptable standards. The County allows the operations to fall below its LOS C standard as long as the existing LOS level is maintained. The segment is operating at LOS E under Existing No Project conditions and the LOS level would further deteriorate under Cumulative conditions. The project is projected to add less than one percent to PM peak hour directional volumes and therefore this impact is a result of Cumulative Condition. It is noted that widening of this segment of Peabody Road is being considered for inclusion in the nexus study used for Regional Transportation Impact Fee Program. Also the Proposed Fairfield Train Station Specific Plan addresses the widening of this segment of Peabody Road. Cumulative analysis for Fairfield Train Station Specific Plan did include Vanden Meadows Project.

**Mitigation Measure**

**4.13-9e.** The City shall continue to monitor the operation of Peabody Road south of City Limits and support regional efforts to provide additional capacity on this segment of Peabody Road through the proposed Regional Transportation Impact Fee Program. City shall continue to participate and support the Regional Transportation Impact Fee.

Should Regional Transportation Impact Fee be approved prior to issuance of building permits for the project, the Project shall participate in the Regional Transportation Impact Fee Program. With implementation of Regional Impact Fee Program that includes improvements to two lane section of Peabody Road south of Vacaville City Limits, impact would be less than significant. However, since the implementation and timing of the Fee Program is beyond the City's control, this impact remains significant and unavoidable.

---

**IV. EVALUATION OF ALTERNATIVES**

CEQA mandates that an EIR evaluate a reasonable range of alternatives to the project or the project location that generally reduce or avoid potentially significant impacts of the project. CEQA requires that every EIR evaluate a “No Project” alternative. Alternatives provide a basis of comparison to the project in terms of beneficial, significant, and unavoidable impacts. This comparative analysis is used to consider reasonable feasible options for minimizing environmental consequences of a project. The City of Vacaville General Plan and Energy and Conservation Action Strategy EIR analyzed three alternatives, including the No Project alternative, the Focused Growth Alternative, and the Town Grid Alternative. Table 5-1, *Comparison of Impact from Project Alternatives*, of the Draft EIR provides a side-by-side comparison table of the three land use alternatives and their impacts as they compare to the proposed General Plan and ECAS and its impacts.

1. **No Project Alternative**

As required by CEQA *Guidelines* Section 15126.6(e), a No Project Alternative has been evaluated. The evaluation of the No Project Alternative allows decision makers to compare the
impacts of the Proposed Project against no development of the project. According to the CEQA Guidelines Section 15126.6(e)(2), the No Project Alternative shall discuss what would reasonably be expected to occur in the foreseeable future if the project were not approved. Under the No Project Alternative the proposed General Plan and ECAS would not be adopted, and future development in Vacaville would continue to be subject to existing policies, regulations, and land use designations as per the existing General Plan.

Under this alternative, the proposed General Plan and ECAS would not be adopted. Future development in Vacaville would continue to be subject to existing policies, regulations, and land use designations as per the existing General Plan. This alternative would not achieve the greenhouse gas (GHG) reduction target of the proposed ECAS because it would continue existing, planned growth patterns without incorporating the GHG reduction measures in the proposed ECAS. As described in Chapter 3, Project Description, the horizon-year development projections are based on the “probable planning period development,” which represents the anticipated demand for new development in Vacaville, based primarily on past development trends. Because the existing inventory of vacant lands in the city has the capacity to accommodate a significant amount of development, the No Project Alternative can accommodate the probable planning period development. Therefore, it is projected that this alternative would result in the same amount of new development by 2035 (9,880 new housing units) as the proposed project, the only difference being the location of future development. Based on this amount of future development potential, the No Project Alternative would include the same level of growth as the proposed project, but with an altered land use map and distribution of growth that matches the existing General Plan. Said another way, although the existing General Plan and the proposed General Plan are based on somewhat different land use maps, these differences are not substantial enough that significantly more growth would be expected to occur under one than the other by 2035.

Ability to Meet Project Objectives

This land use alternative does not meet the City Council objective of providing General Plan land use designations for the development of properties located with the two new growth areas that were created with the 2008 adoption of the Urban Growth Boundary initiative.

Summary of Environmental Impacts

The No Project Alternative would result in several slightly greater impacts than the General Plan and ECAS. These slightly greater impacts are associated with Air Quality, Cultural Resources, Hydrology and Water Quality, Land Use Planning, and Transportation/Traffic. The No Project Alternative would have a substantially greater impact on Greenhouse Gas Emissions. Each of these impacts are described below.

a. Air Quality

The horizon-year development levels anticipated for the No Project Alternative are the same as for the proposed project. The proposed project would result in a significant and unavoidable impact to air quality due to PM10 emissions associated with vehicle miles traveled (VMT). This impact would occur at the project and cumulative levels. Because the No Project Alternative would involve the same horizon-year development and therefore the same amount of additional traffic, the significant and unavoidable project and cumulative impacts would still occur. However, the No Project Alternative would not include proposed ECAS measures to promote non-vehicular transport and reduce VMT. Therefore, overall this alternative would have slightly greater impacts than the proposed project.
b. Cultural Resources

The No Project Alternative would result in slightly greater impacts in comparison to the proposed project. Less development would occur in the growth areas under the No Project Alternative than under the proposed project, which could reduce the extent of potential cultural resource impacts on disturbed but undeveloped land. However, under the No Project Alternative, the policies in the proposed General Plan would not be adopted.

Under the proposed project, consistency with the policies of the proposed General Plan as new development occurs would ensure that impacts to cultural resources would be less than significant. The No Project Alternative would not include the proposed ECAS measures to promote green building design and energy efficiency. These measures support preservation and reuse of existing structures, which would reduce demolition activities and reduce impacts on historic resources.

The existing General Plan contains policies related to the protection of cultural resources, but these policies have been expanded and strengthened in the proposed General Plan by preserving and protecting identified cultural resources and evaluating unanticipated finds made during construction. Therefore, the No Project Alternative would result in slightly greater impacts in comparison to the proposed project.

c. Hydrology and Water Quality

As demonstrated below, the No Project Alternative would result in slightly greater impacts in comparison to the proposed project. Less development would occur in the growth areas under this alternative than under the proposed project, which would reduce impervious surfaces and thereby lessen water quality and groundwater impacts and reduce the exposure of people to flooding and failure of a dam or levee. The proposed project would not result in significant impacts associated with water quality, groundwater, drainage, or flooding. The proposed project would result in significant project Alternative, the same impact related to dam or levee failure would occur.

As under the proposed project, new development under the existing General Plan would need to comply with the National Pollution Discharge Elimination System (NPDES) General Permit, which requires the preparation of a Stormwater Pollution Prevention Plan (SWPPP) for projects that disturb 1 acre or more of land, and construction on smaller sites that are part of a larger project. Existing regulations and procedures, such as the Vacaville Grading Ordinance and FEMA’s flood zone mapping, would still apply.

Under the No Project Alternative, policies of the existing General Plan would remain in place. The existing General Plan includes policies related to water conservation, flooding, and storm drainage. However, under the proposed General Plan policies related to these topics would be expanded and strengthened. In addition, the No Project Alternative would lack the proposed ECAS measures that promote water conservation and increase infiltration. Therefore, overall the No Project Alternative would result in slightly greater impacts in comparison to the proposed project.

d. Land Use and Planning

As demonstrated below, the No Project Alternative would result in slightly greater impacts from land use conflicts in comparison to the proposed project.
As discussed in Section B.2.d, Biological Resources, it is assumed that under the No Project Alternative the City would still be required to comply with the Solano HCP. However, the No Project Alternative would lack the proposed ECAS measures that promote neighborhood connectivity. In addition, the No Project Alternative would lack the proposed General Plan policies and ECAS measures that support the regional Sustainable Communities Strategy (SCS), which could result in a significant impact. Therefore, overall the No Project Alternative would result in a *slightly greater impact* in comparison to the proposed project.

**e. Transportation and Traffic**

As demonstrated below, the No Project Alternative would result in slightly greater impacts in comparison to the proposed project. The horizon-year development levels anticipated for the No Project Alternative are the same as for the proposed project. As shown in Table 4.14-10 in Chapter 4.14, Transportation and Traffic, the proposed project would cause roadway intersections and freeway segments to degrade below acceptable level of service (LOS) standards, creating 17 significant and unavoidable impacts.

The No Project Alternative would not cause two of the significant and unavoidable impacts (Impacts TRAF-5 and TRAF-6) of the proposed project, but new impacts could occur under the No Project Alternative at different intersections due to different development patterns from the proposed project. Therefore, the impacts with respect to LOS standards are considered similar under horizon-year conditions.

The proposed project would not result in significant impacts related to air traffic, roadway hazards, or alternative transportation. Although the No Project Alternative would have similar impacts related to air traffic and roadway hazards, it would not include the proposed General Plan and ECAS policies and measures that support alternative transportation. Overall, because the No Project Alternative would have similar impacts related to roadway intersections and segments, but exclude the alternative transportation policies and measures found in the proposed project, this alternative would result in a *slightly greater impact* in comparison to the proposed project.

**f. Greenhouse Gas Emissions**

As demonstrated below, the No Project Alternative would result in substantially greater impacts in comparison to the proposed project. The proposed project would result in a significant and unavoidable GHG impact because the General Plan and ECAS would not ensure that the City will be on track to reach the goal of Executive Order S-03-05 to reduce GHG emissions by 80 percent below 1990 levels by 2050. As described in Chapter 4.7, Greenhouse Gas Emissions, transportation emissions from VMT are the largest contributor to Vacaville’s emissions. Under horizon-year conditions, the same level of development would occur as under the proposed project, and therefore VMT levels and GHG emissions would be similar.

However, the No Project Alternative would not include proposed ECAS measures to reduce GHG emissions, which would make the No Project Alternative inconsistent with the 2020 GHG emission reduction target established by AB 32 and Executive Order S-03-05, creating a new significant impact. Therefore, this alternative would result in a *substantially greater impact* in comparison to the proposed project.

**Similar Impacts**
The No Project Alternative would have similar impacts to Aesthetics; Geology, Soils, and Minderal Resources; Hazards and Hazardous Materials; Population and Housing; and Public Services and Recreation as the proposed General Plan and ECAS would have. These impacts are described below.

a. Aesthetics

Under the No Project Alternative, new development would occur under the existing General Plan in Vacaville and, following annexation, in the Sphere of Influence (SOI) and Urban Growth Boundary (UGB). The proposed project would not have an adverse effect on a scenic vista, substantially damage scenic resources, or create new sources of light or glare. The proposed project would substantially alter the visual character in undeveloped portions of Vacaville, which would be a significant and unavoidable impact. As with the proposed project, the No Project Alternative would allow new development in areas that are currently largely undeveloped or in agricultural use. These areas offer open, expansive views of the hillsides in and surrounding the city. These areas also offer scenic views of agricultural landscapes and countryside. Under the No Project Alternative, proposed land uses would be less intensive than under the proposed project in some of these areas, such as the East of Leisure Town Growth Area. In addition, the No Project Alternative would not include the proposed ECAS measures that promote alternative energy facilities, green building techniques, and reflective surfaces to reduce heat gain, all of which could affect visual resources and community character. Nevertheless, development allowed by the No Project Alternative would alter the existing rural and agricultural appearance of undeveloped areas. Therefore, the No Project Alternative would also result in a significant and unavoidable impact as under the proposed project and the alternative would be considered to have impacts that are similar to the proposed project.

b. Geology and Soils

As demonstrated below, the No Project Alternative would result in similar impacts as the proposed project. Under both the No Project Alternative and the proposed project, consistency with the policies of the proposed General Plan and compliance with the California Building Code (CBC) as new development occurs would ensure that impacts associated with geologic and seismic hazards would be less than significant. Although the No Project Alternative would not include the adoption of the policies in the proposed General Plan, the existing General Plan includes similar policies related to seismic and geologic hazards as those proposed in the General Plan. Therefore, overall the No Project Alternative would be similar to the proposed project.

c. Hazards and Hazardous Materials

As demonstrated below, the No Project Alternative would result in similar impacts as the proposed project. Under the proposed project, consistency with the policies of the proposed General Plan and compliance with the existing regulations and procedures as new development occurs would ensure that impacts associated with hazards and hazardous materials would be less than significant. The existing General Plan contains policies related to hazards, but these policies have been expanded and strengthened in the proposed General Plan by, for example, requiring industrial uses that rely on the use of hazardous materials to have a storage and emergency response program in place, directing the City to maintain designated hazardous materials carrier routes, and requiring separation between hazardous materials areas and sensitive uses. Although the No Project Alternative would not include these strengthened policies, development would be required to comply with existing regulations and procedures.
related to hazardous and hazardous materials. Therefore, overall the No Project Alternative would be similar to the proposed project.

d. Noise

Under the No Project Alternative, new development would occur under the existing General Plan, which calls for less intensive development east of Leisure Town Road, but calls for similar levels of development along Vaca Valley Parkway and Ulatis Drive, which are all areas where the proposed project would result in significant noise impacts due to increased traffic levels. In addition, the No Project Alternative would not include the proposed ECAS measures that promote alternative energy facilities, such as wind turbines, which would become stationary sources of noise. However, the No Project Alternative would also not include the proposed new policies to address vibration from the railroad; to reduce noise from stationary noise sources by requiring conditions of approval; and to control construction noise. Overall, the No Project Alternative would result in similar impacts in comparison to the proposed project.

e. Population and Housing

The No Project Alternative would result in similar impacts to population and housing as the proposed project. The proposed General Plan would induce substantial population growth in the EIR Study Area under horizon-year conditions, which would result in project-level and cumulative significant and unavoidable impacts. Since the No Project Alternative would include the same amount of horizon-year development as the proposed project, impacts associated with population growth would be similar to the proposed project.

f. Public Services and Recreation

The No Project Alternative would result in similar impacts to public services and recreation as the proposed project. The No Project Alternative would include the same amount of horizon-year development as the proposed General Plan. Therefore, the No Project Alternative would generate a similar demand for police, fire protection, school, library, and park and recreation services and facilities and public service impacts would be similar to the proposed project.

2. Focused Growth Alternative

Under the Focused Growth Alternative, the policies in the proposed General Plan and ECAS would be adopted, but the land use map in the proposed General Plan would not be adopted. Under this alternative, a revised land use map would be adopted. Development in growth and focus areas would occur under the Focused Growth Alternative as follows:

- Development in the growth areas would be focused in the central portion of the East of Leisure Town Road Growth Area and in the southwest corner of the Northeast Growth Area. The northeast corner of the Northeast Growth Area would maintain the land use designations specified by the existing General Plan.

- In the focus areas, which are vacant or underdeveloped parcels within the city, the existing character would be maintained as much as possible. Land use designations would be changed from what is in the existing General Plan only in order to be consistent with the existing land use.
It is estimated that this alternative would result in less residential development by the horizon year than would occur under the proposed General Plan, with approximately 9,240 new housing units expected under the Focused Growth Alternative by 2035. The amount of non-residential development projected by 2035 is slightly lower than that of the proposed General Plan. It is assumed that all residential development would occur during the horizon year, and therefore the full buildout anticipated under the Focused Growth Alternative would include significantly less residential development than would occur under the full buildout of the proposed General Plan. Non-residential development under full buildout would also be lower under this alternative than under the proposed General Plan. This alternative would achieve the GHG reduction target of the proposed ECAS.

**Ability to Meet Project Objectives**

The Focused Growth land use alternative does not meet the City Council’s objective of providing General Plan land use designations for the development of properties located with the two new growth areas that were created with the 2008 adoption of the Urban Growth Boundary initiative. In addition, this land use alternative designates the majority of the Northeast growth area as “agricultural,” which does not meet the City Council’s objective of providing large 100-acre parcels of land designated for job-generating technology campuses.

**Summary of Environmental Impacts**

CEQA requires the identification of an environmentally superior alternative in an EIR. The Focused Growth Alternative is the Environmentally Superior Alternative. By focusing growth into portions of the growth areas, leaving more land undeveloped and allowing less development overall, this alternative would be an improvement over the proposed project with respect to potential negative impacts associated with aesthetics, agriculture and forestry resources, air quality, biological resources, cultural resources, noise, population and housing, public services and recreation, transportation and traffic, and utilities and service systems.

Under the Focused Growth Alternative, portions of the East of Leisure Town Road Growth Area and Northeast Growth Area would remain in agricultural use rather than being converted to non-agricultural land uses, as would occur under the proposed General Plan. Focus areas would remain in their existing land use. The proposed project would not have an adverse effect on a scenic vista, substantially damage scenic resources, or create new sources of light or glare. The proposed project would substantially alter the visual character in undeveloped portions of Vacaville, which would be a significant and unavoidable impact. Like the proposed project, the Focused Growth Alternative would allow new development in some areas that are currently largely undeveloped or in agricultural use. These areas offer open, expansive views of the hillsides in and surrounding the city. However, in comparison to the proposed project, the Focused Growth Alternative would allow for the conversion of fewer of these properties. Because the Focused Growth Alternative would reduce the extent of the significant and unavoidable impact of the proposed project, the alternative would result in a *slightly reduced impact* in comparison to the proposed project.

The Focused Growth Alternative would be similar to the impacts to Geology, Soils, and Mineral Resources; Greenhouse Gas Emissions; Hazards and Hazardous Materials; Hydrology and Water Quality; and Land Use Planning as the proposed General Plan and ECAS would have. These impacts are described below.

a. Geology and Soils
Under horizon-year conditions, less development would occur under the Focused Growth Alternative than under the proposed General Plan, which could reduce the exposure of people and structures to geologic and seismic hazards. Under the proposed project, consistency with the policies of the proposed General Plan and compliance with the California Building Code (CBC) as new development occurs would ensure that impacts associated with geologic and seismic hazards would be less than significant. Under the Focused Growth Alternative, the same set of policies in the proposed General Plan would be adopted and the CBC would still apply to new development. Therefore, overall the Focused Growth Alternative would be similar to the proposed project.

b. Greenhouse Gas Emissions

Under horizon-year conditions, less development would occur under the Focused Growth Alternative than under the proposed General Plan. The proposed project would result in a significant and unavoidable impact because the General Plan and ECAS would not ensure that the City will be on track to reach the goal of Executive Order S-03-05 to reduce GHG emissions by 80 percent below 1990 levels by 2050. As described in Chapter 4.7, Greenhouse Gas Emissions, VMT is the largest contributor to Vacaville’s emissions. Because the Focused Growth Alternative would involve less development than the proposed project, VMT and GHG emissions would be slightly reduced. However, this reduction in VMT would likely not be substantial enough to reduce GHG emissions consistent with the 2050 goal of Executive Order S-03-05. Therefore, overall this alternative would be similar to the proposed project.

h. Hazards and Hazardous Materials

As demonstrated below, the Focused Growth Alternative would result in similar hazards and hazardous materials impacts as the proposed project. Under horizon-year conditions, less development would occur under the Focused Growth Alternative than under the proposed General Plan, which could reduce the exposure of people and structures to hazards and hazardous materials. Under the proposed project, consistency with the policies of the proposed General Plan and compliance with the existing regulations and procedures as new development occurs would ensure that impacts associated with hazards and hazardous materials would be less than significant. Development under both the Focused Growth Alternative and the proposed project would be required to comply with existing regulations and procedures related to hazardous and hazardous materials, reducing potential impacts to be less than significant. Therefore, the Focused Growth Alternative would be similar to the proposed project.

i. Hydrology and Water Quality

Under horizon-year conditions, less development would occur under this alternative than under the proposed General Plan, which could reduce the potential for water quality and groundwater impacts and reduce the exposure of people to flooding and failure of a dam or levee. The proposed project would not result in significant impacts associated with water quality, groundwater, drainage, or flooding. The proposed project would result in significant project-level and cumulative impacts associated with failure of a dam or levee. As under the proposed project, new development under the Focused Growth Alternative would be subject to existing regulations and procedures, including the NPDES and SWPPP requirements, the Vacaville Grading Ordinance, and FEMA’s flood zone mapping. Under the Focused Growth Alternative, the same impact related to dam or levee failure would occur. The Focused Growth Alternative would be subject to the same policies related to water conservation, flooding, and drainage in the proposed General Plan. Overall, the Focused Growth Alternative would be similar to the proposed project.
j. Land Use and Planning

The proposed General Plan would not result in any land use impacts. Neither the proposed project nor the Focused Growth Alternative would divide an established community, conflict with a habitat conservation plan, or create a land use conflict. Therefore, the Focused Growth Alternative would be similar to the proposed project.

3. **Town Grid Alternative**

Under the Town Grid Alternative, the policies in the proposed General Plan and ECAS would be adopted, but the land use map of the proposed General Plan would not be adopted. Development in growth and focus areas would occur under the Town Grid Alternative as follows:

- The highest density development in the growth areas would be focused around a central town square in the East of Leisure Town Road Growth Area. Both residential and nonresidential uses would be focused around the Meridian Road interchange in the Northeast Growth Area.

- In the focus areas, this alternative would establish or revitalize neighborhood centers throughout Vacaville. Many of the focus areas would be designated for mixed-use development, which would eventually serve as neighborhood-serving retail uses on the ground floor with residential on a second and possibly third floor. These mixed-use centers would enhance the character of Vacaville’s existing neighborhoods by allowing vacant or underutilized areas to be redeveloped in support of neighborhood revitalization, and provide a central neighborhood focal point for the community living in Vacaville’s neighborhoods.

It is projected that this alternative would result in the same amount of new residential development by 2035 (e.g. 9,680 new housing units) as the proposed project, and approximately the same amount of non-residential development by 2035. Under full buildout, the Town Grid Alternative would involve more residential development but less non-residential development than the proposed General Plan. This alternative would not achieve the GHG reduction target of the proposed ECAS.

**Ability to Meet Project Objectives**

The Town Square Alternative does not meet the City Council’s objective for the General Plan. The City Council was not supportive of the creating new “town squares” within the East of Leisure Town growth area due to the possibility that it would detract from the Downtown. In addition, this land use alternative designates the majority of the Northeast growth area as “agricultural,” which does not meet the City Council’s objective of providing large 100-acre parcels of land designated for job-generating technology campuses.

**Summary of Environmental Impacts**

Under the Town Grid Alternative, new development would be oriented around neighborhood centers. As under the proposed General Plan, new development would occur throughout the growth areas and in focus areas. Under horizon-year conditions, this alternative would include development of a similar extent of land as would occur under the proposed project. The proposed project would not have an adverse effect on a scenic vista, substantially damage
scenic resources, or create new sources of light or glare. The proposed project would substantially alter the visual character in undeveloped portions of Vacaville, which would be a significant and unavoidable impact. Like the proposed project, the Town Grid Alternative would allow new development in some areas that are currently largely undeveloped or in agricultural use. These areas offer open, expansive views of the hillsides in and surrounding the city. These areas also offer scenic views of agricultural landscapes and countryside. Therefore, the Town Grid Alternative would result in the same significant and unavoidable impact as under the proposed project, and the alternative would be similar to the proposed project.

Outside of the growth areas and focus areas, land uses under this alternative would be the same as the land uses planned in the proposed General Plan. It is estimated that this alternative would result in the same horizon-year residential development levels (9,680 new housing units) as the proposed project, and approximately the same amount of non-residential development by 2035. The Town Grid Alternative would include the same level of horizon-year growth as the proposed project, but with an altered land use map. Under full buildout, this alternative would involve more residential development, but less non-residential development as the proposed project. This alternative would not achieve the GHG reduction target of the proposed ECAS. The alternatives analysis in this section is based on estimated horizon-year development in 2035.

The Town Square Alternative would be similar to the impacts to Aesthetics; Agriculture and Forestry Resources; Biological Resources; Cultural Resources; Geology, Soils, and Mineral Resources; Greenhouse Gas Emissions; Hazards and Hazardous Materials; Hydrology and Water Quality; Land Use Planning; Population and Housing; Public Services and Recreation; and Utilities and Service Systems as the proposed General Plan and ECAS would have. These impacts are described below.

a. Aesthetics

Under the Town Grid Alternative, new development would be oriented around neighborhood centers. As under the proposed General Plan, new development would occur throughout the growth areas and in focus areas. Under horizon-year conditions, this alternative would include development of a similar extent of land as would occur under the proposed project. The proposed project would not have an adverse effect on a scenic vista, substantially damage scenic resources, or create new sources of light or glare. The proposed project would substantially alter the visual character in undeveloped portions of Vacaville, which would be a significant and unavoidable impact. Like the proposed project, the Town Grid Alternative would allow new development in some areas that are currently largely undeveloped or in agricultural use. These areas offer open, expansive views of the hillsides in and surrounding the city. These areas also offer scenic views of agricultural landscapes and countryside. Therefore, the Town Grid Alternative would result in the same significant and unavoidable impact as under the proposed project, and the alternative would be similar to the proposed project.

b. Agriculture and Forestry Resources

Under horizon-year conditions, the Town Grid Alternative would include development of a similar extent of land as would occur under the proposed General Plan. The proposed project would not result in impacts to forest lands. However, the proposed project would convert farmlands of concern under CEQA and Williamson Act lands to non-agricultural uses, and contribute to cumulative impacts to agricultural resources; these impacts would be significant and unavoidable. Like the proposed project, the Town Grid Alternative would allow new development in areas that are currently in agricultural use. As under the proposed project,
development under the Town Grid Alternative would result in the conversion of agricultural uses to non-agricultural uses, including farmlands of concern and lands under active Williamson Act contracts. Therefore, the Town Grid Alternative would be similar to the proposed project.

c. Biological Resources

Under horizon-year conditions, this alternative would include development of a similar extent of land as would occur under the proposed General Plan. Under the proposed project, potential impacts to special-status plant and animal species, riparian habitat, wetlands, and biological resource plans and policies would be less than significant as a result of proposed General Plan policies and consistency with the Solano HCP. Under cumulative conditions, the proposed project could substantially impact an important wildlife corridor, resulting in a significant and unavoidable impact. The Town Grid Alternative would include the same General Plan land use designations in that wildlife corridor area, and therefore result in the same significant and unavoidable impact. Therefore, the Town Grid Alternative would be similar to the proposed project.

d. Cultural Resources

Under horizon-year conditions, the Town Grid Alternative would include development of a similar extent of land as would occur under the proposed General Plan. Under the proposed project, consistency with the policies of the proposed General Plan as new development occurs would ensure that impacts to cultural resources would be less than significant. Therefore, the Town Grid Alternative would also avoid significant cultural resource impacts and the alternative would be similar to the proposed project.

e. Geology and Soils

Under the proposed project, consistency with the policies of the proposed General Plan and compliance with the CBC as new development occurs would ensure that impacts associated with geologic and seismic hazards would be less than significant. The Town Grid Alternative would be subject to the same proposed General Plan policies and the CBC, reducing impacts to a less than significant level. Therefore, the Town Grid Alternative would be similar to the proposed project.

f. Greenhouse Gas Emissions

The proposed project would result in a significant and unavoidable impact because the General Plan and ECAS would not ensure that the City will be on track to reach the goal of Executive Order S-03-05 to reduce GHG emissions by 80 percent below 1990 levels by 2050. As described in Chapter 4.7, Greenhouse Gas Emissions, VMT is the largest contributor to Vacaville’s emissions. Although the Town Grid Alternative is anticipated to generate the same amount of development in 2035 as the proposed project, the mix of uses in the growth areas would increase the likelihood that new residents in these areas could work and shop in the eastern portion of the city, rather than traveling further to other areas of the city, which could reduce VMT and GHG emissions. However, this reduction in VMT would likely not be substantial enough to reduce GHG emissions consistent with the 2050 goal of Executive Order S-03-05. Therefore, overall this alternative would be similar to the proposed project.

g. Hazards and Hazardous Materials
Under horizon-year conditions, the Town Grid Alternative would include development of a similar extent of land as would occur under the proposed General Plan. Under the proposed project, consistency with the policies of the proposed General Plan and compliance with the existing regulations and procedures as new development occurs would ensure that impacts associated with hazards and hazardous materials would be less than significant. In addition, development would be required to comply with the same regulations and procedures related to hazardous and hazardous materials as the proposed project. Therefore, the Town Grid Alternative would be similar to the proposed project.

h. Hydrology and Water Quality

The proposed project would not result in significant impacts associated with water quality, groundwater, drainage, or flooding. The proposed project would result in significant project-level and cumulative impacts associated with failure of a dam or levee. Under horizon-year conditions, the Town Grid Alternative would include development of a similar extent of land as would occur under the proposed project, which would result in a similar potential for water quality and groundwater impacts. As under the proposed project, new development under the Town Grid Alternative would be subject to existing regulations and procedures, including the NPDES and SWPPP requirements, the Vacaville Grading Ordinance, and FEMA’s flood zone mapping. Under the Town Grid Alternative, the same impact related to dam or levee failure would occur. Overall, the Town Grid Alternative would be similar to the proposed project.

i. Land Use and Planning

The proposed General Plan would not result in any land use impacts. Neither the proposed project nor the Town Grid Alternative would divide an established community, conflict with a habitat conservation plan, or create a land use conflict. Therefore, the Town Grid Alternative would be similar to the proposed project.

j. Population and Housing

The Town Grid Alternative would include approximately the same amount of horizon-year development as the proposed General Plan, but with an altered land use map. The proposed project would induce substantial population growth in the EIR Study Area, which would result in project-level and cumulative significant and unavoidable impacts. Because the Town Grid Alternative would involve the same amount of horizon-year development, the same impacts associated with population growth would occur under this alternative as would occur under the proposed project, and overall the Town Grid Alternative would be similar to the proposed project.

k. Public Services and Recreation

The Town Grid Alternative would include approximately the same amount of horizon-year development as the proposed General Plan, but with an altered land use map. Therefore, within the horizon of the General Plan, the Town Grid Alternative would generate a similar demand for police, fire protection, school, library, and park and recreation services and facilities, and public service impacts would be similar to the proposed project.

l. Utilities and Service Systems

The Town Grid Alternative would include approximately the same amount of horizon-year development as the proposed General Plan, but with an altered land use map. Therefore, within
the horizon of the General Plan, a similar demand for water supply, wastewater, stormwater, solid waste, and energy supplies, services, and facilities would be generated by the Town Grid Alternative. Therefore, impacts to utilities and services systems would be similar to the proposed project.
Table 5-1  
Comparison of Impacts from Project Alternatives

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Topic</th>
<th>No Project Alternative</th>
<th>Focused Growth Alternative</th>
<th>Town Grid Alternative</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Aesthetics</td>
<td>=</td>
<td>&lt;</td>
<td>=</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Agriculture and Forestry Resources</td>
<td>&lt;</td>
<td>&lt;</td>
<td>=</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Air Quality</td>
<td>&gt;</td>
<td>&lt;</td>
<td>&lt;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Biological Resources</td>
<td>&lt;</td>
<td>&lt;</td>
<td>=</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cultural Resources</td>
<td>&gt;</td>
<td>&lt;</td>
<td>=</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Geology, Soils, and Mineral Resources</td>
<td>=</td>
<td>=</td>
<td>=</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Greenhouse Gas Emissions</td>
<td>&gt;&gt;</td>
<td>=</td>
<td>=</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hazards and Hazardous Materials</td>
<td>=</td>
<td>=</td>
<td>=</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hydrology and Water Quality</td>
<td>&gt;</td>
<td>=</td>
<td>=</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Land Use and Planning</td>
<td>&gt;</td>
<td>=</td>
<td>=</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Noise</td>
<td>=</td>
<td>&lt;</td>
<td>&lt;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Population and Housing</td>
<td>=</td>
<td>&lt;</td>
<td>=</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Public Services and Recreation</td>
<td>=</td>
<td>&lt;</td>
<td>=</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Transportation/Traffic</td>
<td>&gt;</td>
<td>&lt;&lt;</td>
<td>&lt;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Utilities and Service Systems</td>
<td>&lt;</td>
<td>&lt;</td>
<td>=</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<< Substantially reduced impact in comparison to the proposed project
< Slightly reduced impact in comparison to the proposed project
= Similar impacts in comparison to the proposed project
> Slightly greater impact in comparison to the proposed project
>> Substantially greater impact in comparison to the proposed project