

CHAPTER 2 EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

2.1 PROJECT UNDER REVIEW

This Draft Environmental Impact Report (EIR) evaluates the environmental impacts of the proposed Roberts' Ranch Specific Plan Project (proposed project) in the City of Vacaville (City). The proposed project includes development of a 785-unit residential project along with parks on an approximately 248-acre site located in the City. A detailed description of the project and all its components is contained in Chapter 3, Project Description.

This document has been prepared to satisfy the California Environmental Quality Act (CEQA), Public Resources Code (Section 21000 et seq.) and the State CEQA Guidelines (14 CCR 15000 et seq.). CEQA requires that all state and local government agencies consider the environmental consequences of projects over which they have discretionary authority before acting on those projects. The environmental analysis in the Modified Initial Study (Appendix B) is based on Sections 15168 and 15183 of the CEQA Guidelines, which governs program EIRs and projects consistent with a general plan or community plan. Under these sections, the program EIR, in this case the City's General Plan EIR, serves as a basis for the Modified Initial Study to determine if project-specific impacts would occur that are not adequately covered in the previously certified EIR. The proposed project's land uses and development assumptions are consistent with the City's General Plan.

This Draft EIR evaluates the environmental impacts of the proposed project that are not addressed in the General Plan EIR. The Modified Initial Study prepared for the project indicated whether the proposed project would result in significant impact that: (1) is peculiar to the project or the project site; (2) was not identified as a significant effect in the General Plan EIR; or (3) are previously identified significant effects which as a result of substantial new information that was not known at the time that the General Plan EIR was certified, and are determined to have a more severe adverse impact than discussed in the General Plan EIR (see Appendix B). Such impacts are evaluated in this EIR (CEQA Guidelines Section 15183).

2.2 SUMMARY OF ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACTS AND MITIGATION

This summary chapter provides an overview of the technical analysis of the project's environmental effects contained in Sections 4.1 through 4.7 in Chapter 4, Environmental Analysis. This summary also includes an overview of: (a) effects found to be less than significant, (b) comments received in response to the Notice of Preparation (NOP), (c) potential areas of controversy, (d) potentially significant impacts and mitigation measures to avoid or reduce identified significant impacts, and (e) alternatives to the proposed project. Each of these issues is discussed in detail in this Draft EIR.

The California Environmental Quality Act (CEQA) Guidelines Section 15382 defines a significant effect as a substantial, or potentially substantial, adverse change in any physical conditions within the area affected by the project including land, air, water minerals, flora, fauna, ambient noise, and objects of historic or aesthetic significance. Implementation of the proposed project would result in significant impacts to the environment. As lead agency, the City determined that this Draft EIR will address the following technical issue areas:

- Air Quality
- Biological Resources
- Cultural Resources
- Hydrology, Water Quality, and Drainage
- Land Use and Planning
- Public Utilities
- Transportation and Circulation

The specific topics evaluated are described in each of the technical sections presented in Chapter 4. A brief summary of the findings in each of the technical sections in Chapter 4 is included below followed by a discussion of those issue areas determined to be less than significant and therefore not further evaluated in this Draft EIR.

Air Quality

This section describes the project's impacts on local and regional air quality and contribution to regional air quality conditions. The analysis evaluates construction and operational air emissions associated with the proposed project. Construction-related activities are considered short-term and include site clearing, grading, and the use of construction equipment that would generate air pollutants. Operational impacts associated with an increase in vehicle trips and use of consumer equipment was also evaluated. The analysis was prepared in compliance with the Yolo-Solano Air Quality Management District (YSAQMD) guidelines.

An increase in construction-related air emissions and dust would exceed the YSAQMD thresholds resulting in a potentially significant impact. Implementation of mitigation measures identified in Section 4.1, Air Quality and in Table 2-1, Summary of Impacts and Mitigation Measures would reduce impacts to less than significant. Emissions associated with project operation would result in a significant impact. Implementation of mitigation measures would not reduce the impact to less than significant; therefore, the impact would be significant and unavoidable. The proposed project would also result in a significant and unavoidable cumulative impact associated with operational emissions.

Biological Resources

This section evaluates the potential effects on biological resources associated with construction and operation of the proposed project. The biological resources present within the project site are described and special-status plant and wildlife species that could occur within the project site are identified. Potential impacts to biological resources associated with proposed off-site improvements are also evaluated. Numerous biological surveys were prepared for the project to determine the presence or absence of species and are reported and discussed in this section (see Appendix D).

There are no heritage trees or wildlife corridors present on the site; therefore, the project would not impact these resources. With implementation of the mitigation measures identified in Section 4.2, Biological Resources, and in Table 2-1, Summary of Impacts and Mitigation Measures, the project would have a less-than-significant impact on nesting birds and foraging habitat for protected raptors and loss of wetlands.

Cultural Resources

The cultural resources section describes the existing historic and archaeological resources within the project site and evaluates the potential for unknown resources to exist. A Cultural Resource Assessment for the project site was prepared (see Appendix E). No structures exist on the project site so there are no potential impacts to historic resources associated with the demolition of an existing building.

The proposed project would result in potentially significant impacts associated with the potential to unearth unknown historic or archaeological resources during site construction. Implementation of mitigation measures identified in Section 4.3, Cultural Resources, and in Table 2-1, Summary of Impacts and Mitigation Measures, would reduce project impacts on cultural resources to less than significant.

Hydrology, Water Quality, and Drainage

This section describes the existing hydrology, drainage and water quality of the project site and identifies infrastructure improvements associated with the proposed project. The increase in impervious surface area and the potential for an increase in localized flooding is evaluated along with hazards associated with a levee or dam failure.

Based on the Drainage Plan prepared for the project site (see Appendix F) and assuming compliance with existing federal, state, and local regulations and mitigation, impacts associated with construction-related surface water quality, water quality degradation associated with urban runoff, and increased peak stormwater flows would be less than significant.

Land Use and Planning

This section of the Draft EIR describes existing and planned land uses in and adjacent to the project site, current land uses, General Plan land use designations, and zoning, and analyzes the consistency of the proposed project with existing land use plans and policies as well as land use compatibility with adjacent lands. CEQA Guidelines Section 15125(d) provides that the environmental setting of an EIR must discuss “any inconsistencies between the proposed project and applicable general plans and regional plans.” Potential inconsistencies between the proposed project and the City of Vacaville General Plan, the City of Vacaville General Plan 2015–2023 Housing Element (adopted May 12, 2015), and the City of Vacaville Zoning Ordinance are discussed in this chapter.

The analysis concludes that the proposed project would be consistent with the intent of the City’s General Plan and would be compatible with the existing adjacent uses. Population generated by the project is anticipated in the City’s Housing Element and would not result in any plan inconsistencies.

Public Utilities

This section describes the utility systems and facilities within the project area and potential impacts resulting from implementation of the proposed project. Utilities and service systems considered in the analysis include wastewater treatment and collection, solid waste collection and disposal, and energy. This section describes the existing energy resources derived from petroleum products, electricity, and natural gas available within the project area and analyzes impacts related to energy resources resulting from implementation of the proposed project.

Implementation of the proposed project would contribute to an increased demand for public services and utilities in the City of Vacaville. However, the increase in demand would not exceed capacity or exceed City projections; therefore, impacts are less than significant.

Transportation and Circulation

This section describes potential impacts to the transportation system near the proposed project site. The impact analysis examines the roadway, transit, bicycle, pedestrian, and construction components of the overall transportation system under existing conditions, existing plus project, cumulative, and cumulative plus project conditions.

The proposed project would increase traffic on local roadways and intersections during project construction and operation. During project operation, under existing plus project conditions, the level of service (LOS) on area roadways and roadway segments, and intersections would be affected, but implementation of mitigation would reduce all of the impacts to less than significant

with the exception of one roadway segment that is not part of the Jepson Parkway Road Widening project. This impact would be significant and unavoidable. Impacts to transit, bicycle and pedestrian facilities under existing plus project conditions would also be impacted, but mitigation would reduce to less than significant. Under cumulative plus project conditions the project would result in impacts to seven intersections and six roadway segments. Implementation of required mitigation would reduce all impacts to less than significant with the exception of two roadway segments and two intersections that are not part of the Jepson Parkway Road Widening project and would remain significant and unavoidable.

2.3 EFFECTS FOUND TO BE ADEQUATELY ADDRESSED IN THE GENERAL PLAN EIR

As described in further detail in Chapter 1, Section 1.1 of this EIR, the Modified Initial Study (Appendix B) provides an analysis of whether the General Plan EIR adequately analyzes the environmental impacts of the proposed project. The Modified Initial Study indicates whether the proposed project would result in significant impacts that: (1) are peculiar to the project or the project site; (2) were not identified as a significant effect in the General Plan EIR; or (3) are previously identified significant effects which as a result of substantial new information that was not known at the time that the General Plan EIR was certified, and are determined to have a more severe adverse impact than discussed in the General Plan EIR. The Modified Initial Study concludes that the following impact topics were adequately addressed in the General Plan EIR and that, due to certain aspects of the project, project characteristics, or existing regulatory requirements, the project is not anticipated to have significant impacts on the following resources: aesthetics, agricultural and forestry resources, geology and soils, greenhouse gas emissions, hazards and hazardous materials, mineral resources, noise, population and housing, public services, and recreation. Under CEQA Sections 15168 and 15183, the City's General Plan EIR, serves as a basis for the Modified Initial Study to determine if project-specific impacts would occur that are not adequately covered in the previously certified General Plan EIR. The proposed project's land uses and development assumptions are consistent with the City's General Plan and are adequately evaluated in that program EIR. The following analysis provides an overview that explains why the project would not adversely affect these resources and therefore these resources are not further analyzed in this Draft EIR. The Modified Initial Study prepared for the project includes more information that addresses these issue areas and is included in Appendix B.

Aesthetics

The project site is bounded by Leisure Town Road to the west, Alamo Drive extension and Fry Road to the south, the Southern-Pacific Railroad right-of-way to the east, and the approved Brighton Landing project to the north. The City does not have any designated State Scenic Highways (City of Vacaville 2015). The City recognizes uninterrupted views of vistas within the

rural residential and agricultural area near the project site which are provided along Hawkins Road, Elmira Road, and Fry Road (City of Vacaville 2014). The City's 2035 General Plan includes policies that encourage preservation of scenic features and the character of the City. These policies include Policy LU-P1.2, which requires the protection of the City's natural environment by integrating hills, creeks, and other natural features into major development plans. Policies COS-P8.1 and P8.2, require preservation of scenic features including view corridors to the hills, and retaining major ridgelines and hillsides as open space.

Since there are no designated State Scenic highways within the City, the General Plan EIR concluded that buildout would have no impact on scenic resources within a State Scenic Highway. Future development in the east of Leisure Town area, which includes the project site, currently contains large open spaces and provides expansive views of the hillsides to the west. Much of the open space in the east of Leisure Town area is designated for development. Compliance with General Plan policies requires that development preserve natural areas and view corridors and integrate open spaces and buffer areas into proposed developments.

The City's Land Use Development Code includes policies that require compliance with Off-Street Parking and Loading Design Guidelines and other guidelines for limiting the amount of light and glare from a project site. The General Plan EIR concluded that with implementation of General Plan policies and compliance with other applicable codes, impacts from development on scenic vistas and increasing nighttime light and glare would be less than significant. Due to the substantial rural and agricultural lands in the planning area buildout of the General Plan would substantially change the character and appearance of these undeveloped areas. The General Plan EIR concluded the change could not be mitigated except by foregoing development and identified this as a significant and unavoidable impact. Development of the project site is anticipated under the General Plan; therefore, impacts to aesthetics have been adequately addressed in the General Plan EIR and the project would not have any additional impacts.

Agricultural and Forestry Resources

The majority of the project site is designated as Prime Farmland, with smaller portions designated as Farmland of Statewide Importance and Unique Farmland on the Department of Conservation Important Farmland Maps (DOC 2014). The project site is not under an active Williamson Act contract or a Farmland Security Zone contract (City of Vacaville 2013). The City's 2035 General Plan includes policies that encourage the preservation of existing local agricultural lands and operations in areas outside of the City and development that reduces conflict between existing agricultural areas and areas of new development. These policies include Policy LU-P5.2, which requires preservation of at least one acre of land outside the Urban Growth Boundary for every acre of agricultural land developed, and Policy COS-P4.1,

which requires new developments to maintain a 300- to 500-foot-wide buffer along the eastern boundary of all residential developments and existing agricultural lands.

The City's General Plan EIR identified approximately 199 acres of Prime Farmland and 1,079 acres of non-prime farmland under active Williamson Act contracts within the City. Although the City still contains agricultural land or land designated as Prime Farmland, Farmland of Statewide Importance and Unique Farmland, much of this land within the City has been designated and zoned for development, and in many instances, has been entitled for future development. It is the City's policy to limit the conversion of agricultural lands outside of the City limits. By keeping development within established growth areas, the City seeks to limit urban sprawl into other agricultural regions, thereby helping to minimize or reduce impacts on agricultural resources and operations in more agriculturally productive areas. Infrastructure already exists or is planned for undeveloped areas within the City, signaling the City's intention for urban growth to occur. The General Plan EIR concluded that impacts to agricultural resources, specifically conversion of farmland and land under Williamson Act contracts, that could occur with implementation of the 2035 General Plan would be significant and unavoidable. Development of the project site is anticipated under the General Plan; therefore, the impact has been adequately addressed in the General Plan EIR and the project would not have any additional impacts.

There are no trees within the project boundaries that would be considered timberland or forest land. Forestry resources or forest land is typically defined as land covered with forests or reserved for the growth of forests. The Solano County Zoning Code does not contain a zoning district for forest or timberland and the project site is not located in an area mapped by the California Department of Forestry and Fire Protection as forest or timberland (City of Vacaville 2013, p.4.2-14). Construction of the project would not result in the loss of protected forestry resources, and no impact would occur.

Geology and Soils

The project site is located in the City of Vacaville, which is considered a seismically active region and earthquakes have the potential to cause ground shaking or liquefaction. One fault system, the Vaca-Kirby Fault System, passes through the City, although the Vaca fault has not experienced displacement for the past 11,700 years and the Kirby Hills fault has no evidence of displacement in the last 700,000 years (KC Engineering Company 2016a). There are no regulated Earthquake Fault Zones or mapped seismic hazard zones in the City. All development in California is subject to the requirements of the California Building Code (CBC). The CBC contains more stringent building standards than the Uniform Building Code, specific to conditions in California.

The project site is generally flat and does not contain any slopes steep enough to present a landslide hazard during construction or operation of the project. During construction, measures would be incorporated to shore slopes and prevent potential ground movement. A Geotechnical Report was prepared for the project site in April 2016 by KC Engineering Company to assess the soils on the site to determine any potential constraints for construction. A total of 24 test borings were taken up to depths of 40 feet below existing grade level. Soils encountered within the upper 2 to 7 feet of the surface consist of soft to very stiff, highly expansive sandy and silty clays. Groundwater was encountered at depths between 10 to 17.5 feet below existing grade level (KC Engineering Company 2016a).

Grading activities associated with project construction would result in the disruption, displacement, compaction, and over covering of soils associated with site preparation (grading and trenching for utilities). There are no notable topographic features on the site. Any grading activities would be limited to the project site and all grading and improvement plans would be required to comply with the Vacaville Land Use and Development Code Chapters 14.20 (California Building Code), 14.19, (Grading and Erosion Sediment Control), and 14.26 (Urban Storm Water Quality Management and Discharge Control Ordinance) for consistency with the City's development standards. Grading activities would require a grading permit from the City, which requires including the provision of proper drainage and appropriate dust control and erosion control measures. Grading and erosion control measures would be incorporated into the required grading plans. Project construction is subject to the requirements of the National Pollutant Discharge Elimination System (NPDES) permit requirements. Compliance with the requirements of the City Code and the federal NPDES, and the limited exposure of soils anticipated the potential for substantial soil erosion or loss of topsoil is less than significant.

Additionally, the City's 2035 General Plan finds such impacts to be less than significant since new buildings and structures are required to comply with all applicable state and local building codes. The project would also be required to comply with the recommendations provided in the Geotechnical Engineering Report (KC Engineering Company 2016a). Development of the project site is anticipated under the General Plan; the impact has been adequately addressed in the General Plan EIR and the project would not have any additional impacts.

Greenhouse Gas Emissions

The 2006 California Assembly Bill (AB) 32 requires that California reduce its greenhouse gas (GHG) emissions to 1990 levels by 2020. The AB 32 Scoping Plan, approved December 12, 2008, includes a range of GHG reduction actions including a cap and trade program that covers 85% of the State's emissions. The Association of Bay Area Governments and the Metropolitan Transportation Commission are preparing a sustainable communities strategy for the Bay Area, Plan Bay Area, which includes the City of Vacaville. A 2008 GHG emissions inventory for the

City was prepared to use as a baseline against which to measure future GHG emissions reductions. The City's Energy Conservation Action Strategy (ECAS) includes the 2008 GHG emissions inventory, a 2020 Business as Usual (BAU) forecast model, targets for GHG emissions reduction and measures to meet those reduction targets.

The General Plan EIR concluded that the ECAS was a qualified GHG emissions reduction strategy because it contained the elements required by the BAAQMD. The General Plan includes policies to ensure that future development is consistent with the policies outlined in the ECAS aimed at reducing GHG emissions in the City. Since the City is required to conduct a GHG emissions inventory every five years, future development would be subject to relevant environmental design standards necessary to attain ECAS goals. The General Plan EIR concluded that future development, including the proposed project, would not conflict with the ECAS and would have a less-than-significant impact on the generation of GHG emissions.

Executive Order S-03-05 establishes a target for statewide GHG emissions reduction by 80% below 1990 levels by 2050. However, the timeframe for the General Plan and the ECAS do not go up to the year 2050. The General Plan EIR concluded that buildout of the General Plan, including application of measures in the ECAS, would conflict with the State's reduction goal and the impact would be significant. It is assumed that a majority of the reductions needed to reach the 2050 goals would come from State measures. All feasible GHG emission reduction measures considered during the ECAS process have already been included in the ECAS. Since no additional mitigation is available, the General Plan EIR determined this impact to be significant and unavoidable. GHG emissions are cumulative in nature and the project's contribution to GHG emissions was assumed by the land uses for the project site included in the City's General Plan GHG forecast. Since the project is consistent with the designated land use the project would not result in a significant impact not already identified in the General Plan EIR.

Hazards and Hazardous Materials

According to a Phase I Environmental Site Assessment (ESA) completed for the project there are no recognized environmental conditions present on the site and no hazardous substances, pollutants, contaminants, petroleum or petroleum products identified on the project site (KC Engineering Company 2016b). The proposed project would be expected to generate limited amounts of household hazardous waste and would not generate hazardous waste equal to the quantities regulated by the Solano County Hazardous Waste Management Plan. The project site is not included in the Cortese List for hazardous waste and substances (DTSC 2007). The project site is not mapped in an area of moderate or high wildland fire risk; however, open space agricultural lands in eastern Vacaville pose a threat related to grass fires. The City has adopted the Association of Bay Area Governments (ABAG's) regional hazard mitigation plan, *Taming Natural Disasters: Multi-Jurisdictional Local Hazard Mitigation Plan for the San Francisco Bay Area*, as the local hazard mitigation plan for natural disasters and emergency response (City of Vacaville 2015, p. SAF-24-25).

The General Plan EIR did not identify any significant impacts from future development associated with the release of hazardous materials through routine transport, use, disposal or reasonably foreseeable upset and accident conditions. Additionally, the General Plan EIR did not identify any significant impacts from future development on known hazardous materials sites. The General Plan EIR concluded for these impacts that implementation of General Plan policies and compliance with applicable federal and state laws would ensure that impacts would be less than significant. The project would be required to comply with all applicable federal and state regulations and General Plan policies and the impact would not change from what was evaluated in the General Plan EIR.

The project site is located within Compatibility Zone D for Travis Air Force Base. Compatibility Zone D does not limit residential development or other uses, but would require airspace review for objects greater than 200 feet tall and to ensure that no wildlife attractant hazards are created by the project (Solano County 2015). Since there would be no buildings or structures that would exceed 200 feet no airspace review is required and this impact would be less than significant.

The General Plan EIR concluded that General Plan policies requiring City of Vacaville Fire Department (VFD) review of all development applications would reduce risks related to inadequate emergency access or impairment of the local hazard mitigation plan. The project would be required to get review and approval from the VFD and this impact would not change from what was evaluated in the General Plan EIR. The General Plan EIR also concluded that General Plan policies and compliance with the Land Use and Development Code would be sufficient to reduce risks related to wildfires to a less-than-significant level. The project would include a 100-foot-wide defensible fire protection zone, an Emergency Access and Evacuation Plan would be prepared for each phase of development, and roads would be sized adequately to accommodate fire trucks in accordance with General Plan policies and the Land Use and Development Code. Therefore, this impact would not change from what was evaluated in the General Plan EIR.

Mineral Resources

The project site is not located near Cement Hill or the western hills, which are the only places within the City where mineral resources are known to exist. California Geologic Survey has not mapped the City as an area containing aggregate mines (CGS 2012, Map Sheet 52). Additionally, there are no mapped Mineral Resource Zone (MRZ)-2 zones in the City, which are the zones where adequate information indicates the presence or high likelihood of the presence of significant mineral resource deposits.

The General Plan EIR concluded that the lack of designated MRZ-2 zones within the City and delineated locally important resource recovery sites would result in a less-than-significant impact to mineral resources. The project site is not located in an area known to contain mineral

resources or have active or historic mineral resource recovery sites. Development of the project site is anticipated under the General Plan; the impact has been adequately addressed in the General Plan EIR and the project would not have any additional impacts.

Noise

The project site is surrounded by undeveloped agricultural land to the south and east and residential development to the west and to the north. Documented sources of audible noise include vehicle traffic, aircraft overflights, heavy equipment operations, construction activity, loading and unloading operations, commercial activities, dogs barking, birds chirping, wind blowing and people conversing. Noise monitoring conducted by LSA in 2010 for the General Plan EIR indicates that existing daytime noise levels throughout the City range from 54 to 70 dBA L_{eq} , which is typical of urban or suburban settings (City of Vacaville 2013, p. 4.11-18). According to measurements conducted in 2009 adjacent to Leisure Town Road between Elmira and Marshall Roads, the ambient noise level near the project site is 74.8 L_{dn} (City of Vacaville 2013, Table 4.11-7). The project site is not located within a noise contour for Travis Air Force Base or the Nut Tree Airport. The 2035 General Plan includes policies for noise and vibration reduction including Policy NOI-P2.5 which encourages the use of open space, parking, accessory buildings, and landscaping to buffer new and existing development, and Policy NOI-P2.7 which requires setbacks at least 100 feet from the centerline of railroad tracks. Policy NOI-P4.2 lists construction noise control measures including use of mufflers, location of stationary noise-generation equipment and limited hours of operation.

The General Plan EIR concluded that future development would have a less-than-significant impact related to exposure of sensitive receptors to noise impacts from stationary sources, rail sources, transportation sources and ground-borne vibration with implementation of General Plan policies. The General Plan EIR also concluded that with implementation of General Plan policies and compliance with the Noise Ordinance (Section 8.10.030 of the City's Municipal Code) impacts related to short-term construction noise would be less than significant. The project would be required to comply with all provisions of the Noise Ordinance and with General Plan policies; therefore, this impact would not change from what was identified in the General Plan EIR.

The project is consistent with the land uses assumed in the General Plan EIR and would implement all General Plan policies to reduce traffic related noise impacts. Therefore, the project would not result in a substantial permanent increase in ambient noise levels in the project vicinity above levels existing without the project, and the impact would not change from what was identified in the General Plan EIR.

No portion of the City falls within the 60 dBA community noise equivalent level (CNEL) noise contour for Travis Air Force Base. Some portions of the City fall within the 60 dBA CNEL noise contour for the Nut Tree Airport; however, all proposed land use designations within these areas

are compatible with the 60 dBA contour. The General Plan EIR concluded that compliance with land use designations and General Plan policies would ensure any potential aircraft noise impacts on sensitive receptors associated with future development would be less than significant. Since the project site is not within a noise contour for the Nut Tree Airport or Travis Air Force Base and is not within the vicinity of a private airstrip this impact would not change from what was identified in the General Plan EIR.

Population and Housing

The City's most recent Housing Element was adopted on May 12, 2015, and includes a housing needs assessment that identifies current and projected housing needs, as well as policies to accommodate affordable housing development for a range of income and household types. Future buildout of the City's General Plan includes 9,680 new dwelling units, 26,500 new residents, 9,720 new jobs, 1 million square feet of new commercial space, 1.1 million square feet of new office space, and 2.1 million square feet of new industrial space (City of Vacaville 2013, Table 4.12-3). ABAG projections for development by 2035 in the City includes 4,550 new households, 11,400 new residents and 13,730 new jobs between 2010 and 2035 (City of Vacaville 2013, p. 4.12-6). However, because ABAG projections did not accurately reflect past development trends, the City did not use the ABAG projections and instead based projections off of actual development trends within the City.

General Plan policies require that development in new urban areas should be planned and new growth should only occur in areas served by existing utilities and public services. The City's urban growth boundary (UGB) would continue to protect agricultural lands from conversion to non-agricultural uses. General Plan and ECAS policies would require orderly, planned growth within the UGB in areas already served, or planned to be served, by urban services. However, since buildout of the 2035 General Plan would significantly exceed development projected by the ABAG's existing and future 2035 projections, this would be a significant impact. The General Plan EIR determined that in order to meet ABAG projections for population growth, housing opportunities would have to be reduced to less than half of what is currently projected in the 2035 General Plan. The City has already approved projects accounting for 4,900 new units, which would exceed the ABAG's projections. The General Plan EIR concluded that this impact would be significant and unavoidable because it is not feasible to rescind existing development entitlements or to reduce development to meet ABAG projections. The project site is assumed for residential development under the 2035 General Plan and the projected population increase was evaluated as part of the General Plan EIR. Therefore, the project would not contribute to an additional significant impact beyond what was identified in the General Plan EIR.

Most of the future development within the City would be developed on agricultural, vacant or underutilized parcels. The General Plan EIR concluded that impacts related to displacing people or housing as a result of future development would be less than significant. The project site is

currently vacant and does not contain housing or people. Therefore, implementation of the proposed project would not change from what was identified in the General Plan EIR.

Public Services

Fire and emergency medical services are currently provided by Solano County, but will be provided to the project site by the Vacaville Fire Department (VFD) and law enforcement services will be provided by Vacaville Police Department (VPD) upon annexation of the site into the City limits. The closest VFD station is Station 75 located at Cogburn Circle and Vanden Road approximately 1 mile southwest of the project site. VFD's adopted standard response time and success rate is 7 minutes for 90% of calls, which refers to the time period between VFD notification and arrival on the scene of the incident within the City limits (City of Vacaville 2013, p. 4.13-12). The single main VPD police station is located at 660 Merchant Street, adjacent to Vacaville City Hall, and is approximately 3.40 miles northwest of the project site. VPD standards for average response time are 6 minutes and 1 second for Priority I calls and 16 minutes and 28 seconds for Priority II calls. Currently, the VPD has an average response time of exactly 6 minutes for Priority I calls and 15 minutes for Priority II calls (City of Vacaville 2013, p. 4.13-3).

New development would be required to create or annex into a Community Facilities District (CFD) and pay a fair and equitable impact fee to offset for the cost of fire and emergency medical services and law enforcement services under General Plan policies PUB-P1.2 and PUB-P2.3. The City's development and review process would ensure that adequate fire and law enforcement services are available to serve new developments. The General Plan EIR concluded that impacts to the provision of fire and emergency services as well as law enforcement services would be less than significant. The project would comply with all General Plan policies and the impact would not change from what was identified in the General Plan EIR.

The project site is located with the Vacaville Unified School District (VUSD) and students would attend Callison Elementary School, located approximately 0.52 mile to the west, Vaca Pena Middle School located approximately 1.11 miles northwest, and Will C. Wood High School located approximately 2.40 miles west.

Buildout of the General Plan could generate over 3,000 new students which would exceed the capacity of the VUSD. VUSD has plans for future school sites and the General Plan identifies three new schools in the area east of Leisure Town Road, including a 16-acre designated school site on the north portion of the project site. Development of these school sites would increase capacity by approximately 1,300 students, which would accommodate new students generated by future development under the General Plan. The General Plan EIR concluded that impacts to the VUSD would be less than significant since payment of development fees is deemed to fully mitigate the impacts of new development on school facilities under Section

65996 of the California Government Code. The project would pay the required development fees and this impact would not change from what was identified in the General Plan EIR.

The City is currently served by two libraries, the Town Square Branch Library, located at 1 Town Square Place and the Cultural Center Branch Library, located at 1020 Ulatis Drive (City of Vacaville 2013, p. 4.13-33). Buildout of the General Plan would increase the population and could increase demand for other public services such as libraries. It is anticipated that school library facilities would decrease the potential impact of new development on City and County library facilities. The General Plan EIR concluded that impacts to library facilities would be less than significant with compliance with General Plan policies. Since the project would comply with General Plan policies the impact would not change from what was identified in the General Plan EIR.

Recreation

The City's General Plan classifies park and recreational facilities into six categories: Neighborhood parks, community parks, regional parks, accessible open space, special purpose facilities, and bikeways, multi-use trails and nature trails (City of Vacaville 2015, p. PR-1-3). Development of parks, recreation and open space facilities in the City is guided by the City's *Comprehensive Parks, Recreation, and Open Space Master Plan* adopted in 1992. The City's standards for the provision of parks and open space is 1.8 acres per 1,000 people for neighborhood parks, 1.7 acres per 1,000 people for community parks, and 1.0 acre per 1,000 people for regional parks (City of Vacaville 2015, p. PR-13). The City is currently deficient in meeting the provision standards for neighborhood and community parkland, but exceeds the standard for regional and total parkland. The City is also currently deficient in meeting the service standard for eight of the eleven types of recreational facilities (City of Vacaville 2013, p. 4.13-53).

The nearest existing neighborhood park to the project site is Normandy Meadows Park located approximately 0.34 mile to the southwest and the nearest existing community park is Nelson Park, located approximately 1.0 mile to the northwest. The only regional park in the project area is Lagoon Valley Regional Park, located approximately 4.40 miles generally west of the project site. A new neighborhood park, East of Leisure Town Road Park, and a new community park, Elmira Park, are planned just north of the project site (City of Vacaville 2015, Figure PR-4).

The General Plan is projected to increase Vacaville's total population to 112,000 residents by 2035 including the project, which would exacerbate the deficiencies in neighborhood and community parks and recreational facilities. It is estimated that in order to meet these standards by 2035, an additional 91 acres of neighborhood parkland and 50 acres of community parkland would be needed (City of Vacaville 2013, p. 4.13-49). Parkland and recreational facility goals are met through General Plan policies requiring the construction of new park facilities or payment of an in-lieu park fee for land acquisition and development impact fees. The proposed

project would include over 23 acres of open space and five smaller 0.5-acre “stroller” parks throughout the development. The General Plan EIR concluded that with implementation of General Plan policies, impacts to parks and recreational facilities would be less than significant. In addition to providing open space, stroller parks, and a school site that includes a shared park facility, the project would comply with General Plan policies and pay any park fees related to the adequate provision of parkland and recreational facilities. Therefore, the project’s impacts on recreation facilities and parks would not result in a significant impact not already identified in the General Plan EIR.

2.4 COMMENTS RECEIVED IN RESPONSE TO THE NOTICE OF PREPARATION

The NOP for this Draft EIR was released on November 19, 2015, and the public comment period closed on December 18, 2015. The City received a total of seven letters; no comments were received from the public. Comment letters were received from seven public agencies including the California Department of Transportation (Caltrans), YSAQMD, Solano Local Agency Formation Commission, and the U.S. Army Corps of Engineers. A brief overview of the primary concerns raised in the NOP comment letters is included below. The purpose of the NOP process is to solicit input from public agencies and the public on the scope of the EIR analysis. Opinions on the merits of the project are noted, but are not considered relevant for the purposes of defining the scope of the analysis. The Introduction of each technical section in Chapter 4 provides a brief summary of comments relevant to that particular issue area. All of the NOP comment letters received are included in Appendix A.

Agricultural and Forestry Resources

Comments received expressed concerns regarding the project’s impact on agriculture on the project site, potential impacts to adjacent agricultural property, and a request to include a discussion of the consistency of any mitigation measures or buffers with the Solano County General Plan. Additional comments suggested including a discussion regarding the potential impacts to preserving prime agriculture and open space from extension of the City’s urban growth boundary.

Air Quality

Comments received from the YSAQMD provided information regarding the YSAQMD Handbook for assessing and mitigation air quality impacts as well as the preferred emissions modeling software. Other comments received on this subject expressed concerns associated with siting a residential project adjacent to the Southern Pacific railroad tracks where air quality has the potential to contain high-levels of toxins or particulate matter that can lead to negative health effects on future residents. Another comment expressed concern for the

potential of odors from the nearby City of Vacaville detention basin and Easterly Wastewater Treatment Plant on future residents.

Biological Resources

Comments included a suggestion that a wetland delineation be performed to determine the extent of jurisdictional waters on the project site and that the range of alternatives considered includes alternatives that avoid impacts to wetlands or other waters of the United States. An additional comment states if no practical alternatives to filling waters of the United States are available the mitigation plans should be developed to compensate for the loss.

Cultural Resources

Comments received identified the project site as being within the aboriginal territories of the Yocha Dehe Wintun Nation and the Wintun Nation requested a copy of the Cultural Resources Report be provided. The City provided a copy of the Cultural Resources Report to the Wintun Nation for their review and there was no request for additional follow up. A copy of the response from the Wintun Nation is also provided in Appendix A.

Hydrology, Water Quality, and Drainage

Comments received included information on the regulations protecting water quality and permit requirements that could be necessary for the proposed project. The comments state that the project's potential impacts to both surface and groundwater quality should be analyzed in the Draft EIR. Other concerns were related to the filling of waters of the United States and recommended completing a wetland delineation, if necessary. An additional comment was received regarding stormwater and requesting a discussion of the detention basin northeast of the project site since the basin is important to stormwater services in the City.

Land Use and Planning

Comments received from the Solano Local Agency Formation Commission (LAFCO) suggest that LAFCO be identified as one of the responsible agencies under CEQA and the Cortese-Knox-Hertzberg Local Government Reorganization Act of 2000 be identified in the regulatory setting. Another comment requests that the portion of the site that would remain in Solano County be evaluated for consistency with the County's General Plan and zoning ordinance. Additional comments suggested a discussion regarding the potential to annex the adjacent storm water detention pond into the City limits.

Transportation and Circulation

Comments received from Caltrans requested identification of the traffic impact fees and suggested that the City participate in a contribution program to plan for impacts of future growth on the regional transportation system. Comments also expressed concern that traffic from the proposed project would contribute to a cumulative impact to the already congested state highway system, specifically Interstate 80. Caltrans noted what information should be included in the Traffic Impact Study and suggested that the Caltran's *Guide for the Preparation of Traffic Impact Studies* be used to determine which scenarios and methodologies are evaluated. A comment from Solano County requested that the Draft EIR analyze project specific and cumulative traffic impacts to County roads. Other comments suggested the analysis examine the project's incorporation of features to reduce vehicle miles traveled, such as electric vehicle charging stations, street bicycle facilities, pedestrian facilities, and policies to encourage use of the nearby public transportation. An additional comment requested that barriers to non-motorized transportation to and from the future school site be minimized in order to allow for students to travel safely and conveniently.

Public Utilities

One comment was received requesting a discussion of the detention basin northeast of the project site since the basin is important to stormwater services in the City.

2.5 POTENTIAL ISSUES OF CONCERN

The primary issues of concern raised were the potential increase in traffic on City and County roads, as well as the already congested state highway system; and the protection of water quality and the project's potential impacts on stormwater. Additional concerns were raised regarding the preservation of agriculture, and the maintenance of appropriate agricultural buffers as well as the project's consistency with the Solano County General Plan and zoning code.

Other concerns were raised regarding potential impacts to future residents related to toxins from operation of the Southern Pacific Railroad and related to odors from the adjacent Easterly Wastewater Treatment Plant. These effects are beyond the scope of analysis in this EIR because they are concerned with the existing environment's impact on the project and do not fall into one of the exceptions to CEQA's general rule, articulated in *CBIA v. BAAQMD* (2015 62 Cal.4th 369 and *CBIA v. BAAQMD* (2016) 2 Cal.App.5th 485), that an EIR must only evaluate the projects' impact on the environment. However, this EIR discloses these effects for information purposes and these topics may be addressed by the decision-makers as part of the land use planning review for this project.

2.6 SUMMARY OF PROJECT ALTERNATIVES

CEQA requires that the lead agency adopt mitigation measures or alternatives, where feasible, to substantially lessen or avoid significant environmental impacts that would otherwise occur. Project modification or alternatives are not required, however, where significant environmental impacts will not occur.

As is evident from the text of the EIR, all significant effects of the project would be mitigated to less than significant levels by the adoption of feasible mitigation measures. There are no impacts that remain as significant and unavoidable and which cannot be substantially lessened. The EIR evaluates the following alternatives to the proposed project:

Alternative 1: No Project/No Build Alternative. This alternative assumes no development would occur, and the site would remain in its current undeveloped condition.

Alternative 2: Active Park Alternative. This alternative assumes development of the same residential project but includes an active-use facility within a portion of the large open space area identified on the eastern side of the project site. Such facilities would include recreational features typically found within a Community Park site and would be placed outside of agricultural buffer areas designated on the site. The same circulation and site access would be provided as the proposed project and some on-site parking would be placed within the active use areas.

Alternative 3: No School Alternative. This alternative assumes that the future middle school site, approximately 16.5 acres in size, would not be developed for school uses and that the same number of residential units (785) would be constructed on the project site, including use of the school site for residential development. The same circulation and site access, parks, utilities, and open space would be provided as the proposed project.

Alternative 4: Open Space Alternative. Under this alternative the approximately 16.5 acre future middle school site would not be developed with a school but would be designated as Open Space. This alternative would provide over 30 acres of open space with the remainder of the site developed consistent with the proposed project.

Information in Table 2-1, Summary of Impacts and Mitigation Measures, has been organized to correspond with environmental issues discussed in Chapter 4. The summary table is arranged in four columns and organized as follows:

2.7 SUMMARY OF IMPACTS AND MITIGATION MEASURES

1. Environmental impacts;
2. Level of significance prior to mitigation;

3. Applicable mitigation; and
4. The level of significance after implementation of mitigation.

This Draft EIR assumes that all applicable plans, policies, and regulations would be implemented, including state laws and regulations, the City of Vacaville General Plan policies, and requirements or recommendations of the City of Vacaville and applicable building codes. Applicable plans, policies, and regulations are identified and described in the Regulatory Setting of each issue area in Chapter 4 and within the relevant impact analysis. A description of the organization of the environmental analysis, as well as key foundational assumptions regarding the approach to the analysis, is provided in Chapter 4, Introduction to the Analysis.

Table 2-1
Summary of Impacts and Mitigation Measures

Environmental Impact	Level of Significance Prior to Mitigation	Mitigation Measure(s)	Level of Significance After Mitigation
<i>4.1 Air Quality</i>			
4.1-1: Construction of the proposed project could result in emissions of ROG, NOx, or PM _{10/2.5} at levels that could substantially contribute to a potential violation of applicable air quality standards or to nonattainment conditions.	Potentially Significant	AQ-1 The applicant shall implement Best Management Practices and shall submit a construction dust control plan for the project that includes the following conditions: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Water all active construction sites at least twice daily. Frequency should be based on the type of operation, soil, and wind exposure. • Ensure haul trucks maintain at least 2 feet of freeboard. • Cover all trucks hauling dirt, sand, or loose materials. • Apply non-toxic binders (e.g., latex acrylic copolymer) to exposed areas after cut and fill operations and hydroseed area. • Apply chemical soil stabilizers on inactive construction areas (disturbed lands within construction projects that are unused for at least four consecutive days). • Plant vegetative ground cover in disturbed areas as soon as possible. • Cover inactive storage piles. • Sweep streets if visible soil material is carried out from the construction site. 	Less than Significant
4.1-2: Operation of the proposed project would result in emissions of	Significant	AQ-2 Operational Emission Reduction Measures. The applicant shall incorporate the following measures to reduce emissions associated with	Significant and Unavoidable

**Table 2-1
Summary of Impacts and Mitigation Measures**

Environmental Impact	Level of Significance Prior to Mitigation	Mitigation Measure(s)	Level of Significance After Mitigation
<p>ROG, NOx, or PM_{10/2.5} at levels that could substantially contribute to a potential violation of applicable air quality standards or to nonattainment conditions.</p>		<p>vehicle trip generation and area sources from the proposed project:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Equip all residential garages, as well as parking lots at parks, with infrastructure to install electric vehicle charging outlets and equipment. • Provide transit facilities (e.g., bus bulbs/turnouts, benches, shelters). • Provide bicycle lanes and/or paths, connected to the existing community-wide network. • Where feasible, provide sidewalks and/or paths, connected to adjacent land uses, transit stops, and the existing community-wide trail network. • Traffic calming devices such as bulb-outs and pedestrian refuges shall be implemented on residential streets in areas of high pedestrian activity and adjacent to neighborhoods. • The Roberts' Ranch Specific Plan shall be modified to include bicycle parking standards as follows: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ For residential development, one, sheltered, secure bicycle parking space per dwelling unit shall be required. Garages, storage sheds, utility rooms, or similar areas that can be secured from unauthorized access and are sheltered from sun and rain would satisfy this requirement without the addition of special improvements or racks. <p>Additional convenience bicycle parking may</p>	

**Table 2-1
Summary of Impacts and Mitigation Measures**

Environmental Impact	Level of Significance Prior to Mitigation	Mitigation Measure(s)	Level of Significance After Mitigation
		<p>be provided with exterior racks but does not count toward the sheltered bicycle parking requirement.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ New parking areas created to serve nonresidential uses should provide one bicycle parking space for every 20 vehicle parking spaces, with a minimum of four bicycle spaces. ○ For all school developments, secured bicycle parking shall be provided at a minimum rate of 10% of the student capacity plus 3% of the maximum number of employees. • All wood burning devices shall be prohibited in residential units. Only natural gas fueled hearths shall be permitted. • During the Design Review process for each home design application, the City shall confirm compliance with measures incorporated into the City’s Energy & Conservation Action Strategy (ECAS), through use of a checklist identifying the residential design measures feasible for residential structures. 	
4.1-3: The proposed project would not result in CO concentrations that exceed the 1-hour state ambient air quality	Less than Significant	None Required	Less than Significant

Table 2-1
Summary of Impacts and Mitigation Measures

Environmental Impact	Level of Significance Prior to Mitigation	Mitigation Measure(s)	Level of Significance After Mitigation
standard (i.e., 20.0 ppm) or the 8-hour state ambient standard (i.e., 9.0 ppm).			
4.1-4: The proposed project would not result in the exposure of sensitive receptors to substantial pollutant concentrations.	Less than Significant	None Required	Less than Significant
4.1-5 The proposed project would result in a cumulatively considerable net increase of any criteria pollutant for which the project area is in non-attainment under an applicable federal or state ambient air quality standard (including the release of emissions that exceed quantitative thresholds for ozone precursors).	Significant	AQ-3 Implement Mitigation Measure AQ-2.	Significant and Unavoidable
<i>4.2 Biological Resources</i>			
4.2-1: Implementation of the proposed project may result in substantial	Potentially Significant	Short-Eared Owl BIO-1 Impacts from construction-related noise may occur to avian wildlife if construction occurs	Less than Significant

**Table 2-1
Summary of Impacts and Mitigation Measures**

Environmental Impact	Level of Significance Prior to Mitigation	Mitigation Measure(s)	Level of Significance After Mitigation
<p>adverse effect, either directly or through habitat modifications, on species identified as a candidate, sensitive, or special-status species in local or regional plans, policies, or regulations, or by the CDFW or USFWS.</p>		<p>during the breeding season (i.e., February 1–August 31 for most bird species; and January 1–August 31 for raptors). Protection of general bird species shall be accomplished by either scheduling construction between July 15 and February 1 or if construction must occur during the nesting season (February 1–July 15), a one-time biological survey for nesting bird species shall be conducted. The biological survey shall be conducted by a qualified biologist to identify the presence of nesting birds no more than 72 hours prior to the commencement of work. If any active nests are detected, the area shall be flagged and mapped on construction plans along with a minimum 25-foot buffer with up to a 300-foot maximum buffer for raptors, as determined by the qualified biologist. These areas shall be avoided until the nesting cycle is complete or it is determined that the nest has failed.</p> <p>Burrowing Owl BIO-2 Burrowing owls could be significantly impacted by both the loss of suitable nesting and foraging habitat, as well as direct destruction of burrows, eggs, nestlings, and nesting owls. Mitigation Measures BIO-2 through BIO-3 correspond to Avoidance and Minimization Measures BO 1 through BO 4 in the Solano HCP (Solano County Water Agency 2012) and</p>	

**Table 2-1
Summary of Impacts and Mitigation Measures**

Environmental Impact	Level of Significance Prior to Mitigation	Mitigation Measure(s)	Level of Significance After Mitigation
		<p>recommendations detailed in the <i>Staff Report on Burrowing Owl Mitigation</i> (CDFW 2012).</p> <p>a. Within 14 days prior to the anticipated start of construction, a qualified biologist approved by the CDFW shall conduct preconstruction surveys within the project site to identify burrowing owls or their nesting areas for burrowing owl. This survey shall follow survey protocols outlined in the most current draft of the Solano HCP and as developed by the Burrowing Owl Consortium (Solano County Water Agency 2012; CDFW 2012). If no active burrows or burrowing owls are observed, no further mitigation is required. If a lapse in construction of 15 days or longer occurs during the nesting season, additional preconstruction surveys shall be repeated before work may resume.</p> <p>b. If burrowing owls or active burrows are identified within the project site during the preconstruction surveys, the following measures shall be implemented:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. During the non-breeding season for burrowing owls (September 1 through January 31), exclusion zones shall be established around any active burrows identified during the preconstruction survey. The exclusion zone shall be no less than 160 feet in radius centered on 	

**Table 2-1
Summary of Impacts and Mitigation Measures**

Environmental Impact	Level of Significance Prior to Mitigation	Mitigation Measure(s)	Level of Significance After Mitigation
		<p>the active burrow. With approval from CDFW, burrowing owls shall be passively evicted and relocated from the burrows using one-way doors. The one-way doors shall be left in place for a minimum of 48 hours and shall be monitored daily to ensure proper function. Upon the end of the 48-hour period, the burrows shall be excavated with the use of hand tools and refilled to discourage reoccupation.</p> <p>2. During the breeding season (February 1 through August 31), a qualified biologist familiar with the biology and behavior of this species shall establish exclusion zones of at least 250 feet in radius centered on any active burrow identified during the preconstruction survey. No construction activities shall occur within the exclusion zone as long as the burrow is active and young are present. Once the breeding season is over and young have fledged, passive relocation of active burrows may proceed as described in measure b.1, above.</p> <p>3. The buffer widths may be reduced in consultation with CDFW and with the following measures:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • A site specific plan shall be prepared that documents and described how the 	

**Table 2-1
Summary of Impacts and Mitigation Measures**

Environmental Impact	Level of Significance Prior to Mitigation	Mitigation Measure(s)	Level of Significance After Mitigation
		<p>nesting or wintering owls would not be adversely affected by construction activities;</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Monitoring shall occur by a qualified biologist approved by CDFW. All monitoring shall be conducted for a sufficient time, for a minimum of 10 consecutive days following initiation of construction and it is shown the owls do not exhibit adverse reactions to construction activities; • Burrows are not in danger of collapse due to equipment traffic; and • Monitoring is continued at least once a week through the nesting/wintering cycle at the site and no change in behavior by owls is observed; biological monitoring reports shall be submitted to CDFW. <p>BIO-3 Mitigation for the permanent loss of burrowing owl foraging habitat for urban development or other permanent facilities shall be provided at a 1:1 land/area ratio. The final acreage for mitigation calculations shall be determined based on final design of the open space areas within the project site. This measure may be accomplished in conjunction with Swainson’s hawk Mitigation BIO-4, below, provided the following additional measures are implemented.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • At least 5 acres of mitigation area shall be 	

**Table 2-1
Summary of Impacts and Mitigation Measures**

Environmental Impact	Level of Significance Prior to Mitigation	Mitigation Measure(s)	Level of Significance After Mitigation
		<p>permanently taken out of agricultural production, either on the project site or in another suitable location, to provide suitable nesting habitat and cover for burrowing owls.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • At least four artificial burrow complexes (three multi-entrance burrows per complex) shall be installed within the habitat set aside for burrowing owls. • Vegetation within the owl habitat shall maintain an average effective vegetation height less than or equal to 6 inches from February 1 to April 15, when owls typically select mates and nest burrows. In addition, tree and shrub canopy cover shall be limited to the edges of the set aside area and shall not be within 200 feet of the artificial burrows. • Burrowing owl habitat mitigation areas shall be subject to deed restrictions that would limit future urban development. • An Open Space Maintenance Plan shall be prepared and implemented to insure open space lands within the project site and mitigation lands are maintained, to the extent feasible, to be compatible for use by burrowing owl. • Adequate funding shall be provided to manage the owl mitigation area, including maintenance of the artificial burrows and 	

**Table 2-1
Summary of Impacts and Mitigation Measures**

Environmental Impact	Level of Significance Prior to Mitigation	Mitigation Measure(s)	Level of Significance After Mitigation
		<p align="center">grass height, in perpetuity.</p> <p>Swainson’s Hawk BIO-4 This Mitigation Measure is consistent with Avoidance and Minimization Measures SH-1 through SH-5 in the Solano HCP (Solano County Water Agency 2012).</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> a. If construction occurs during the nesting season for Swainson’s hawk (March 1 through August 31), a qualified biologist approved by the CDFW shall conduct preconstruction surveys no more than 15 days prior to construction to identify nesting Swainson’s hawk within 0.25 mile of the project site. If a lapse in project-related construction activities of 15 days or longer occurs, additional preconstruction surveys shall be conducted prior to reinitiating work. b. If an active Swainson’s hawk nest is identified within 0.25 mile of the project site, an exclusion buffer shall be established in consultation with the biologist and CDFW. No construction work such as grading, earthmoving, or any operation of construction equipment shall occur within the buffer zone except as provided below in mitigation measure BIO-5 and in consultation with CDFW. Construction may commence normally in the buffer zone if the nest becomes inactive 	

**Table 2-1
Summary of Impacts and Mitigation Measures**

Environmental Impact	Level of Significance Prior to Mitigation	Mitigation Measure(s)	Level of Significance After Mitigation
		<p>(e.g., the young have fully fledged), as determined by the qualified biologist.</p> <p>BIO-5 The project applicant shall mitigate for the loss of Swainson’s hawk irrigated foraging habitat by preserving a minimum of 1:1 land/area ratio of similar habitat. The final acreage for mitigation calculations shall be determined based on final design of the open space areas within the project site. The preservation of the mitigation area shall be accomplished through purchase of credits from a bank approved by the CDFW to provide such credits, such as the Elsie Gridley Mitigation Bank or the Burke Ranch Conservation Bank (CDFW 2016) or through preservation of irrigated agricultural lands protected in perpetuity by a conservation easement. Such an easement shall include provisions that provide for agricultural uses that are compatible with Swainson’s hawk foraging needs. Agricultural foraging habitats shall consist of alfalfa, tomatoes, other annual vegetable row crops, and grain. The mitigation area shall not include crop types and land uses incompatible with Swainson’s hawk foraging. The following additional restrictions and prohibited uses, at a minimum, shall also be noted as forbidden within the conservation easement:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Commercial feedlots, which are defined as any open or enclosed area where domestic livestock are grouped together for intensive 	

**Table 2-1
Summary of Impacts and Mitigation Measures**

Environmental Impact	Level of Significance Prior to Mitigation	Mitigation Measure(s)	Level of Significance After Mitigation
		<p>feeding purposes.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Horticultural specialties, including sod, nursery stock, ornamental shrubs, ornamental trees, Christmas trees, or flowers. • Commercial greenhouses or plant nurseries. • Commercial aquaculture of aquatic plants, animals, and their byproducts. • Planting orchards or vineyards for the production of fruits, nuts, or berries except in designated farmstead areas. • Cultivation of perennial vegetable crops such as artichokes and asparagus, as well as annual crops such as cotton or rice. • Construction, reconstruction, or placement of any building, billboard or sign, antennas, towers, and facilities for generation of electrical power, or any other structure or improvement of any kind, except as may be specifically permitted in site-specific management plan. Acreage occupied by any such existing facilities may not be counted toward mitigation requirements. <p>The City shall consult with CDFW prior to approving the site, conservation easement, and conservation easement holder.</p> <p>Northern Harrier, White-Tailed Kite, Loggerhead Shrike, and Mountain Plover</p> <p>BIO-6 Impacts from construction-related noise may</p>	

**Table 2-1
Summary of Impacts and Mitigation Measures**

Environmental Impact	Level of Significance Prior to Mitigation	Mitigation Measure(s)	Level of Significance After Mitigation
		<p>occur to avian wildlife if construction occurs during the breeding season (i.e., February 1–August 31 for most bird species; and January 1–August 31 for raptors). Protection of general bird species shall be accomplished by either scheduling construction between July 15 and February 1, or if construction must occur during the nesting season (February 1–July 15). A one-time biological survey for nesting bird species shall be conducted by a qualified biologist in all suitable habitat for the presence of nesting birds 72 hours prior to the commencement of work. If any active nests are detected, the area shall be flagged and mapped on construction plans along with a minimum 25-foot buffer up to a 300-foot maximum for raptors, as determined by the qualified biologist. These areas shall be avoided until the nesting cycle is complete, or it is determined that the nest has failed.</p>	
<p>4.2-2: Implementation of the proposed project could result in a substantial adverse effect on any riparian habitat or other sensitive natural community identified in local or regional plans, policies,</p>	<p>No Impact</p>	<p>None Required</p>	<p>Less than Significant</p>

**Table 2-1
Summary of Impacts and Mitigation Measures**

Environmental Impact	Level of Significance Prior to Mitigation	Mitigation Measure(s)	Level of Significance After Mitigation
or regulations, or by the CDFW or USFWS.			
4.2-3: Implementation of the proposed project may result in placement of fill into potential jurisdictional waters of the U.S and State.	Potentially Significant	BIO-7 To mitigate for the loss of potentially jurisdictional waters of the United States and/or waters of the State, the project applicant shall create, preserve, or restore an equivalent amount of jurisdictional waters not exempt from Sections 404 or 401 of the Clean Water Act. Actual mitigation acreage requirements shall be adjusted in conjunction with the U.S. Army Corps of Engineers and the Regional Water Quality Control Board. Mitigation may be accomplished by either of the following: a. Creation of similar habitat either on- or off-site at an appropriate mitigation site; or b. Purchase of the appropriate number of credits at an agency-approved off-site wetland mitigation bank. The Elsie Gridley Mitigation Bank services in Solano County has been approved by the USFWS to provide wetland mitigation credits (ACOE 2016).	Less than Significant
4.2-4: Implementation of the proposed project may interfere with the movement of any native resident or migratory fish or wildlife species or with established native	Less than Significant	None Required	Less than Significant

Table 2-1
Summary of Impacts and Mitigation Measures

Environmental Impact	Level of Significance Prior to Mitigation	Mitigation Measure(s)	Level of Significance After Mitigation
resident or migratory wildlife corridors, or impede the use of native wildlife nursery sites.			
4.2-5: Implementation of the proposed project could conflict with applicable land use plans, policies, regulations, or ordinances, of an agency with jurisdiction over the project, including the Solano County Water Agency's draft HCP adopted for the purpose of protecting biological resources or avoiding and mitigating impacts to biological resources.	Significant	BIO-8 Implement Mitigation Measures BIO-4 and BIO-5.	Less than Significant
4.2-6: The proposed project could contribute to cumulative impacts to special-status species in the region due to removal of foraging and breeding habitat.	Potentially Significant	BIO-9 Implement Mitigation Measures BIO-4, BIO-5, and BIO-7.	Less than significant

**Table 2-1
Summary of Impacts and Mitigation Measures**

Environmental Impact	Level of Significance Prior to Mitigation	Mitigation Measure(s)	Level of Significance After Mitigation
<i>4.3 Cultural Resources</i>			
<p>4.3-1: Implementation of the proposed project may cause a substantial adverse change in the significance of an archaeological resource.</p>	<p>Potentially Significant</p>	<p>CUL-1 If deposits of prehistoric or historical archaeological materials are encountered during construction activities, all work within 25 feet of the discovery shall be redirected until an archaeologist is contracted to assess the finds, consult with agencies and descendant communities (as appropriate), and make recommendations for the treatment of the discovery. If preservation in place is not feasible, the archaeologist shall evaluate the deposit for its eligibility for listing in the California Register of Historical Resources. If the deposit is not eligible, mitigation is not necessary. If the deposit is eligible, mitigation shall include excavation of the archaeological deposit in accordance with a data recovery plan (see <i>CEQA Guidelines</i> Section 15126.4(b)(3)(C)). The City of Vacaville shall ensure that descendant communities are consulted for their input and concerns during the development and implementation of any mitigation plan.</p> <p>Upon completion of the evaluation and/or mitigation, the report shall be submitted to the City of Vacaville, the applicant, the Northwest Information Center at Sonoma State University, and descendant communities.</p>	<p>Less than Significant</p>

**Table 2-1
Summary of Impacts and Mitigation Measures**

Environmental Impact	Level of Significance Prior to Mitigation	Mitigation Measure(s)	Level of Significance After Mitigation
<p>4.3-2: Implementation of the proposed project may disturb human remains, including those interred outside of formal cemeteries.</p>	<p>Potentially Significant</p>	<p>CUL-2 In the event that human remains are encountered, the on-site construction foreman shall stop all work within 25 feet of the discovery and shall immediately contact the City’s Community Development Department and the County Coroner. At the same time, a qualified archaeologist shall be contacted to assess the situation and consult with agencies as appropriate. On-site construction workers shall not collect or move any human remains and associated materials. If the human remains are of Native American origin, the coroner must notify the Native American Heritage Commission within 24 hours of this identification. The Native American Heritage Commission shall identify a Most Likely Descendant to inspect the site and provide recommendations for the proper treatment of the remains and associated grave goods. Upon completion of the assessment, the archaeologist shall prepare a report documenting the methods and results, and provide recommendations for the treatment of the human remains and any associated cultural materials, as appropriate, and in coordination with the recommendations of the Most Likely Descendant. The report shall be submitted to the City of Vacaville Community Development Department and the Northwest Information Center, and descendant communities.</p>	<p>Less than Significant</p>

Table 2-1
Summary of Impacts and Mitigation Measures

Environmental Impact	Level of Significance Prior to Mitigation	Mitigation Measure(s)	Level of Significance After Mitigation
4.3-3: The proposed project could contribute to cumulative impacts to historical, archaeological and paleontological resources in the area.	Less than Significant	None Required	Less than Significant
<i>4.4 Hydrology, Water Quality and Drainage</i>			
4.4-1: Implementation of the proposed project may violate water quality standards or waste discharge requirements, or otherwise substantially degrade water quality.	Less than Significant	None Required	Less than Significant
4.4-2: Implementation of the proposed project may alter the existing drainage pattern of the site or area in a manner which would result in substantial erosion or siltation on- or off-site.	Potentially Significant	HYDRO-1 Consistent with General Plan policies SAF P3.1, P3.3, P3.4, and P4.4, and with City standard conditions of approval for storm drain improvements, numbers 8 and 9, the final design of the project shall be required to adequately direct all flows to the existing detention basin and prohibited from increasing the area subject to flooding downstream. In order to demonstrate compliance with these requirements, the project applicant will be required to prepare a Storm Drain Master Plan (SDMP) prior to issuance of	Less than Significant

**Table 2-1
Summary of Impacts and Mitigation Measures**

Environmental Impact	Level of Significance Prior to Mitigation	Mitigation Measure(s)	Level of Significance After Mitigation
		<p>improvement plans for the development which would reduce this impact to less than significant. The SDMP shall provide the necessary calculations to adequately demonstrate that the proposed drainage facilities adequately convey the design runoff from the project and adequately mitigate the impacts of increased runoff. In accordance with the City's Storm Drain Design Standards, the SDMP shall be prepared prior to the approval of the final map/improvement plans and shall include, but is not limited to, the following items:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • A topographic map of the drainage shed and adjacent areas as necessary to define the study boundary. The map shall show existing and proposed ground elevations (including preliminary building pads), with drainage sub-shed areas in acres, and the layout of the proposed drainage improvements. • A map showing analysis points, proposed street grades, storm drainage facilities, and overland release paths with required easement locations for overland flow across private property. • Preliminary pipe sizes with hydraulic grade lines, design flows, inverts, and 	

**Table 2-1
Summary of Impacts and Mitigation Measures**

Environmental Impact	Level of Significance Prior to Mitigation	Mitigation Measure(s)	Level of Significance After Mitigation
		<p>proposed ground elevations at analysis points. This information shall be provided on the map showing the layout of the proposed drainage facilities.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Summary of the detention basin and pump station including: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ Additional pumping capacity added with this project. ○ Summary of detention storage capacity. ○ Proposed operations plan. ○ Downstream improvements or maintenance. ○ Proposed alterations required to avoid any increase in peak flows or areas subject to flooding. Such alterations may include, among other measures: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Adjustments to grading plans; ▪ Adjustments to storm water system design; ▪ Adjustments to pump station operations. 	
<p>4.4-3: Implementation of the proposed project may substantially alter the existing drainage pattern of the site or area or substantially</p>	<p>Potentially Significant</p>	<p>HYDRO-2</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> a. Implement Mitigation Measure HYDRO-1. b. The applicant shall conduct additional study of off-site drainage and flood conditions to demonstrate to the satisfaction of the City Engineer and 	<p>Less than Significant</p>

**Table 2-1
Summary of Impacts and Mitigation Measures**

Environmental Impact	Level of Significance Prior to Mitigation	Mitigation Measure(s)	Level of Significance After Mitigation
increase the rate or amount of surface runoff in a manner which would result in flooding on- or off-site.		Director of Public Works that the project shall not result in an increase in the depth or extent of flooding off-site, consistent with City Standard Conditions of Approval numbers 8 and 9. As part of the Storm Drain Master Plan, the applicant shall conduct a hydraulic analysis of the conveyance facilities downstream of the detention basin to determine the capacity of the downstream conveyance, the extent of the area subject to flooding under pre- and post-development conditions, and to identify the necessary mitigation measures that would reduce flooding to predevelopment levels. If mitigation measures are determined to be necessary based on detailed hydraulic analysis, such measures shall be incorporated into final project improvement plans.	
4.4-4: Implementation of the proposed project may create or contribute to runoff water which would exceed the capacity of the existing or planned stormwater drainage systems or	Potentially Significant	HYDRO-3 Implement Mitigation Measures HYDRO-1 and HYDRO-2.	Less than Significant

Table 2-1
Summary of Impacts and Mitigation Measures

Environmental Impact	Level of Significance Prior to Mitigation	Mitigation Measure(s)	Level of Significance After Mitigation
provide substantial additional sources of polluted runoff.			
4.4-5: The proposed project, in addition to other projects in the watershed, could result in the generation of polluted runoff that could violate water quality standards or waste discharge requirements for receiving waters.	Less than Significant	None Required	Less than Significant
<i>4.5 Land Use and Planning</i>			
4.5-1: Implementation of the proposed project may conflict with a regional land use plan, policy or regulation.	Less than Significant	None Required	Less than Significant
<i>4.6 Public Utilities</i>			
4.6-1: The proposed project could exceed the treatment requirements of the applicable Regional Water Quality Control Board.	Less than Significant	None Required	Less than Significant

**Table 2-1
Summary of Impacts and Mitigation Measures**

Environmental Impact	Level of Significance Prior to Mitigation	Mitigation Measure(s)	Level of Significance After Mitigation
4.6-2: The proposed project could require or result in the construction of new wastewater facilities or the expansion of existing facilities, the construction of which could cause significant environmental effects.	Less than Significant	None Required	Less than Significant
4.6-3: The proposed project could result in a determination by the wastewater treatment provider that it has inadequate capacity to serve the project's projected demand in addition to the provider's existing commitments.	Significant	<p>WW-1 The project applicant shall pay connection fees as determined by the City's Department of Utilities and specified in the City's DIF program.</p> <p>WW-2 The project applicant shall fund construction of any trunk sewer improvements needed upstream of the point where the Alamo/Fry trunk sewer and the CSP-S trunk sewer are combined under the DIF 54A project, beginning at the proposed project's point of connection.</p>	Less than Significant
4.6-4: The proposed project could be served by a landfill without sufficient permitted capacity to accommodate the project's solid waste disposal needs.	Less than Significant	None Required	Less than Significant

Table 2-1
Summary of Impacts and Mitigation Measures

Environmental Impact	Level of Significance Prior to Mitigation	Mitigation Measure(s)	Level of Significance After Mitigation
4.6-5: The proposed project could require or result in the construction of new energy production and/or transmission facilities or expansion of existing facilities.	Less than Significant	None Required	Less than Significant
4.6-6: The proposed project could contribute to a cumulative increase in the demand for wastewater treatment, which could result in inadequate capacity and require the construction of new or expansion of existing wastewater treatment facilities.	Less than Significant	None Required	Less than Significant
4.6-7: The proposed project could contribute to a cumulative increase in solid waste, which could result in either the construction of new solid waste facilities or the expansion of existing facilities, the construction of which	Less than Significant	None Required	Less than Significant

**Table 2-1
Summary of Impacts and Mitigation Measures**

Environmental Impact	Level of Significance Prior to Mitigation	Mitigation Measure(s)	Level of Significance After Mitigation
could cause significant environmental effects.			
4.6-8: The proposed project could contribute to a cumulative increase in energy demand, which could result in the need for construction of new energy production and/or transmission facilities or expansion of existing facilities.	Less than Significant	None Required	Less than Significant
<i>4.7 Transportation and Circulation</i>			
4.7-1: Implementation of the proposed project would degrade operations at one study intersection.	Significant	<p>TRAFF-1 At the Leisure Town Road (Jepson Parkway) / Elmira Road intersection (#6), the Project shall install the following improvements or pay in-lieu traffic fees to the City:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Widen the north leg to provide one additional through lane; this includes widening the north leg of the intersection to accommodate the second northbound through receiving lane. <p>The City shall implement these improvements or shall apply the in-lieu fee towards implementation of the Jepson Parkway Improvement Project. At this intersection, the Jepson Parkway Improvement Project will provide:</p>	Less than Significant

Table 2-1
Summary of Impacts and Mitigation Measures

Environmental Impact	Level of Significance Prior to Mitigation	Mitigation Measure(s)	Level of Significance After Mitigation
		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Northbound approach - two left-turn lanes, one through lane and one shared through-right turn lane • Southbound approach - one left turn lane, two through lanes and one right-turn lane • Eastbound approach - two left-turn lanes, one through lane and one right-turn lane • Westbound approach - one left-turn lane, one through lane and one right-turn lane 	
4.7-2: Implementation of the proposed project would increase traffic volumes above the LOS C threshold on two study road segments.	Significant	TRAFF-2a The project shall install the following improvements or pay in-lieu traffic fees to the City: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Widen Leisure Town Road (Jepson Parkway) to two lanes in each direction between Marshall Road and Elmira Road and between Elmira Road and Ulatis Road. 	Less than Significant
		TRAFF-2b Widen Leisure Town Road (Jepson Parkway) to provide two lanes in the southbound direction between Ulatis Road and Elmira Road.	Significant and Unavoidable
4.7-3: Implementation of the proposed project would increase traffic volumes along study freeway segments in the CMP system but would not exceed LOS	Less than Significant	None Required	Less than Significant

**Table 2-1
Summary of Impacts and Mitigation Measures**

Environmental Impact	Level of Significance Prior to Mitigation	Mitigation Measure(s)	Level of Significance After Mitigation
thresholds of significance.			
4.7-4: Implementation of the proposed project, including installation of traffic circles and other traffic calming devices, may delay emergency response or impede movement of emergency vehicles.	Potentially Significant	TRAFF-3 Roundabouts and traffic circles shall be designed to accommodate fire trucks and other large vehicles to travel through the intersection at an appropriate speed for emergency response. On-street parking shall be prohibited near the traffic circles to ensure clear passage. All traffic calming devices shall be designed in accordance with City standards and be approved by the City.	Less than Significant
4.7-5: Implementation of the proposed project could conflict with adopted policies, plans, or programs regarding public transit, bicycle, or pedestrian facilities, or otherwise decrease the performance or safety of such facilities.	Potentially Significant	TRAFF-4 The project-level site plan shall be submitted for each phase of the project development for review and approval by the City to ensure safe and direct facilities for pedestrians, bicyclists, and transit riders are provided and the design does not conflict with adopted plans, policies, and programs related to such facilities.	Less than Significant
4.7-6: Under Existing plus Approved plus Project conditions, traffic volumes would exceed intersection LOS operations at six	Significant	TRAFF-5 The City of Vacaville shall implement the following improvements to mitigate operations at the six impacted intersections. The project shall pay in-lieu traffic fees to the City.	Less than Significant

**Table 2-1
Summary of Impacts and Mitigation Measures**

Environmental Impact	Level of Significance Prior to Mitigation	Mitigation Measure(s)	Level of Significance After Mitigation
intersections.		<p>TRAFF- 5a At the Leisure Town Road (Jepson Parkway) / Sequoia-White Pine Street (#4) intersection, the City shall implement the following improvements:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Add a through lane on southbound Leisure Town Road to provide one left-turn lane, one through lane and one shared through-right lane on the southbound approach. • Widen the south leg of the intersection to provide a corresponding receiving lane. <p>This mitigation is consistent with the ultimate configuration of Jepson Parkway, but is not part of the Jepson Parkway Road Widening Project which the City is currently implementing. This is a temporary impact until the ultimate Jepson Parkway is constructed. With the mitigation the intersection would operate at LOS B or better during both peak hours.</p>	Significant and Unavoidable
		<p>TRAFF-5b At the Leisure Town Road (Jepson Parkway) / Ulatis Road (#5) intersection, the City shall implement the following improvements:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Install a traffic signal. <p>This mitigation is consistent with the ultimate configuration of Leisure Town Road (Jepson Parkway) which the City is currently implementing. The Jepson Parkway Improvement Project will provide a traffic signal</p>	Less than Significant

**Table 2-1
Summary of Impacts and Mitigation Measures**

Environmental Impact	Level of Significance Prior to Mitigation	Mitigation Measure(s)	Level of Significance After Mitigation
		at this location with two through lanes in the northbound and southbound directions. Implementation of the mitigation would improve the intersection operations to LOS B or better in both peak hours.	
		<p>TRAFF-5c At the Leisure Town Road (Jepson Parkway) / Elmira Road (#6) intersection, the City shall implement the following improvements:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> o Northbound – add a second left-turn lane and a second through lane. • Southbound – add a second through lane to provide one left-turn, two through and one right-turn lane. • Eastbound – add two left-turn lanes in addition to the existing through lane and right-turn lane. • Westbound – add a left-turn lane and a right-turn lane to the existing through lane. 	Less than Significant
		<p>TRAFF-5d At the Leisure Town Road (Jepson Parkway) / Marshall Road (#7) intersection, the project shall install a traffic signal and the City shall implement the following improvements:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Northbound – add a second through lane. • Southbound – add a second through lane. <p>This mitigation is consistent with the ultimate configuration of Leisure Town Road (Jepson Parkway) which the City is currently implementing.</p>	Less than Significant

**Table 2-1
Summary of Impacts and Mitigation Measures**

Environmental Impact	Level of Significance Prior to Mitigation	Mitigation Measure(s)	Level of Significance After Mitigation
		<p>Implementation of the mitigation would improve the intersection operations to LOS D or better during both peak hours.</p> <p>TRAFF-5e At the Leisure Town Road (Jepson Parkway) / Alamo Drive (#8) intersection, the City shall implement the following improvements:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Northbound – add a second through lane. • Southbound – add a second through lane. <p>This mitigation is consistent with the ultimate configuration of Leisure Town Road (Jepson Parkway) which the City is currently implementing. Implementation of the mitigation would improve the intersection operations to LOS D or better during both peak hours.</p> <p>The Jepson Parkway Improvement Project would also add a southbound right-turn lane and a westbound right-turn lane to provide one left-turn, one through lane and one right-turn lane on the eastbound and westbound approaches.</p> <p>TRAFF-5f At the Elmira Road / Nut Tree Road (#17) intersection, the City shall implement the following improvements: Southbound – restripe the inside southbound through lane to an exclusive left-turn lane, providing two left-turn lanes, one through lane and one shared through-right lane.</p> <p>Implementation of the changes in lane striping would</p>	<p></p> <p>Less than Significant</p> <p>Significant and Unavoidable</p>

**Table 2-1
Summary of Impacts and Mitigation Measures**

Environmental Impact	Level of Significance Prior to Mitigation	Mitigation Measure(s)	Level of Significance After Mitigation
		improve the intersection operations to LOS D or better during both peak hours. However, the proposed geometrics may not be feasible for operational reasons. This intersection was identified as operating unacceptably in the General Plan EIR.	
4.7-7: Under Cumulative plus Project conditions, intersection operations would exceed LOS at one intersection.	Significant	<p>TRAFF-6 The City of Vacaville shall implement the following improvements to mitigate operations at the impacted intersection. The project shall pay in-lieu traffic fees to the City.</p> <p>Implementation of the mitigation would improve the intersection operations to LOS D or better during both peak hours. However, the proposed geometrics may not be feasible for operational and safety reasons. Additional right-of-way would not be available to provide additional lanes in a different configuration.</p>	Significant and Unavoidable
4.7-8: Traffic volumes under Existing plus Approved plus Project conditions would be above the LOS C threshold on five study road segments. The project would cause traffic volumes to exceed the LOS C threshold on one of the five segments.	Significant	<p>TRAFF-7a Widen Leisure Town Road (Jepson Parkway) to two through lanes in each direction between south of the Vanden Road and Elmira Road.</p> <p>This mitigation is consistent with the ultimate configuration of Leisure Town Road (Jepson Parkway) currently being implemented by the City. The mitigation would increase the road capacity and allow the traffic volumes to be at LOS C or better during the AM and PM peak hours.</p>	Less than Significant
		<p>TRAFF-7b Widen Leisure Town Road (Jepson Parkway) to provide two lanes in each</p>	Significant and Unavoidable

**Table 2-1
Summary of Impacts and Mitigation Measures**

Environmental Impact	Level of Significance Prior to Mitigation	Mitigation Measure(s)	Level of Significance After Mitigation
		<p align="center">direction between Ulatis Road and Orange Drive.</p> <p>This mitigation is consistent with the ultimate configuration of the Jepson Parkway Concept Plan but is not part of the Jepson Parkway Road Widening Project which the City is currently implementing. The mitigation would increase the road capacity and allow the traffic volumes to be at LOS C or better during the AM and PM peak hours.</p>	
<p>4.7-9: Traffic volumes under Cumulative plus Project conditions would be above the LOS C threshold on one study road segment.</p>	<p>Significant</p>	<p>TRAFF-8 The City shall implement the following improvements and the project shall pay in-lieu fees to the City for the acquisition of necessary right-of-way and installation of the improvements:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Widen Leisure Town Road (Jepson Parkway) to two through lanes in each direction south of the Vanden Road/Leisure Town Road intersection. <p>This mitigation is consistent with the ultimate configuration of Leisure Town Road (Jepson Parkway) currently being implemented by the City.</p>	<p>Less than Significant</p>
<p>4.7-10: Implementation of the proposed project under Existing plus Approved plus Project conditions would increase traffic volumes along study freeway</p>	<p>Less than Significant</p>	<p>None Required</p>	<p>Less than Significant</p>

**Table 2-1
Summary of Impacts and Mitigation Measures**

Environmental Impact	Level of Significance Prior to Mitigation	Mitigation Measure(s)	Level of Significance After Mitigation
segments in the CMP system but would not exceed LOS thresholds of significance.			
4.7-11: Implementation of the proposed project under Cumulative plus Project conditions would increase traffic volumes along study freeway segments in the CMP system but would not exceed LOS thresholds of significance.	Less than Significant	None Required	Less than Significant

2.8 REFERENCES

- CGS (California Geologic Survey). 2012. "Aggregate Sustainability in California – Fifty Year Aggregate Demand Compared to Permitted Aggregate Reserves Map Sheet 52." Updated 2012. Accessed March 29, 2016. http://www.conservation.ca.gov/cgs/information/publications/ms/Documents/MS_52_2012.pdf.
- City of Vacaville. 2013. *City of Vacaville General Plan and Energy Conservation Action Strategy Environmental Impact Report*. Draft. SCH no. 2011022043. October 25, 2013.
- City of Vacaville. 2014. *City of Vacaville General Plan and Energy Conservation Action Strategy Final EIR*. Prepared for the City of Vacaville by Placeworks. June 12, 2014.
- City of Vacaville. 2015. *City of Vacaville General Plan*. Adopted August 11, 2015. Resolution 2015-074.
- DOC (California Department of Conservation). 2014. "Solano County Important Farmland Maps." Farmland Mapping and Monitoring Program. Accessed March 22, 2016. Available at <ftp://ftp.consrv.ca.gov/pub/dlrp/FMMP/pdf/2014/sol14.pdf>.
- DTSC (Department of Toxic Substances Control). 2007. "Hazardous Waste and Substances Site List." 2007. Accessed March 25, 2016. http://www.envirostor.dtsc.ca.gov/public/search.asp?cmd=search&reporttype=CORTESE&site_type=CSITES,OPEN,FUDS,CLOSE&status=ACT,BKLG,COM&reporttitle=HAZARDOUS+WASTE+AND+SUBSTANCES+SITE+LIST
- KC Engineering Company. 2016a. *Geotechnical Exploration Report on Roberts' Ranch Subdivision at Leisure Town Road & Fry Road Vacaville, California*. April 15, 2016.
- KC Engineering Company. 2016b. *Phase I Environmental Site Assessment on Roberts' Ranch Subdivision at Leisure Town Road & Fry Road Vacaville, California*. March 15, 2016.
- Solano County. 2015. "Solano County Code Chapter 28 Zoning Regulations." October 6, 2015. Accessed April 7, 2016. <https://admin.solanocounty.com:4433/civicax/filebank/blobdload.aspx?blobid=12826>.

INTENTIONALLY LEFT BLANK