

2.0 EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

2.1 PURPOSE

The City of Fairfield (“City”) has prepared this Draft Environmental Impact Report (“Draft EIR”) to provide an assessment of the potentially significant environmental effects of the proposed Green Valley II Mixed-use project (“proposed project”), located on the southwestern corner of Business Center Drive and Suisun Valley Road. This Executive Summary is intended to provide the decision makers, responsible agencies, and the public with a clear, simple, and concise description of the proposed project and its potential significant environmental impacts.

The *California Environmental Quality Act (CEQA) Guidelines* (Section 15123) requires that a summary be included in an EIR that identifies all major conclusions, identifies each significant effect, recommended mitigation measure(s), and alternatives that would minimize or avoid potential significant impacts. The summary is also required to identify areas of controversy known to the lead agency, including issues raised by agencies and the public and issues to be resolved. These issues include the choice among alternatives and whether or how to mitigate significant effects. All of these requirements of an EIR summary are addressed in the sections below. This summary focuses on the major areas of importance in the environmental analysis for implementation of the proposed project and utilizes non-technical language to promote understanding. The City of Fairfield is the CEQA lead agency for the proposed project.

2.2 PROJECT LOCATION

The City of Fairfield is located in southwestern Solano County. The project site is located approximately 600 feet northwest of Interstate 80 (I-80), approximately 32 miles northeast of the City of San Francisco and 42 miles southwest of the City of Sacramento. Benicia Bay is located approximately nine miles to the south.

The approximately 13.32-acre project site is located on the southwestern corner of Business Center Drive and Suisun Valley Road. Specifically, the site is bound by Business Center Drive to the north and west, Suisun Valley and Neitzel Roads to the east, and an undeveloped parcel to the south. The project site is presently undeveloped.

The area surrounding the project site is partially developed and consists of business park/office use. An office complex consisting of two buildings is located to the north of the project site, across Business Center Drive and Mangels Boulevard, while a residential neighborhood is located to the northwest of the project site, across the intersection of Business Center Drive and Suisun Valley Road. A vacant parcel is

located to the east of the project site across Suisun Valley Road while another vacant parcel adjoins the project site to the south. Finally, an office complex consisting of two buildings is located to the west of the project site, across Business Center Drive.

2.3 PROJECT DESCRIPTION

The proposed project would develop a multifamily residential and commercial project on the approximately 13.32-acre site. The commercial component would occupy 2.77 acres in the northern portion of the site along Business Center Drive while the residential component would occupy the remaining 10.55 acres of the site.

The proposed project includes 270 rental apartment units and would have an overall density of approximately 26 dwelling units per acre. The apartment units would be located in four residential buildings. Each apartment building would be 4-stories tall and would range in height from approximately 47 to 53 feet. The apartment units would range from 635 square feet to 1,248 square feet in size, with a mix of 34 studio units, 134 one-bedroom units and 102 two-bedroom units.

The commercial component of the proposed project would include four structures that would provide approximately 22,600 square feet of commercial space and an overall floor-to-area (FAR) of about 0.2. The structures would range in height from 23 to 31 feet. Each building would range in size from 5,675 square feet to 5,839 square feet.

2.4 PROJECT APPROVALS

The project site is currently designated IBP (Industrial Business Park) by the General Plan and Zoning Ordinance. As the proposed project would include residential and commercial uses, which are not permitted under the existing general plan and zoning designations, the Spanos Corporation has applied to the City for the following two entitlements for the proposed project:

- 1) General Plan Amendment (GPA) to re-designate the residential component of the site to Very High Density Residential and to re-designate the commercial component of the site to Community Commercial;
- 2) Rezone to re-designate the residential component of the site to RVH (Very High Density) and to re-designate the commercial component of the site to CC (Community Commercial);

Additional approvals required include development review (residential), development review (commercial), a conditional use permit to allow additional building height for residential, and a lot line adjustment.

2.5 OBJECTIVES OF THE PROPOSED PROJECT

The objectives of the project are to develop a well-designed, economically feasible residential community that consists of a variety of residential unit types and incorporates smart growth elements. The applicant's key objectives for the proposed project are to:

- Create a development of a scale and character that complements and is supportive of the surrounding uses; and
- Develop a well-designed, economically feasible residential community that consists of a variety of residential products and unit types.

2.6 TOPICS OF KNOWN CONCERN

To determine which environmental topics should be addressed in the Draft EIR for the proposed project, the City circulated a Notice of Preparation (NOP) in August 2018 in order to receive input from interested public agencies and private parties. A copy of that NOP are included in **Appendix 1.0, Notice of Preparation, and Scoping Comments** of this Draft EIR. Based on the comments received in response to the NOP, this Draft EIR addresses the following environmental topics in depth:

- Air Quality
- Biological Resources
- Cultural Resources and Tribal Cultural Resources
- Greenhouse Gas Emissions
- Hazards and Hazardous Materials
- Land Use and Planning
- Noise
- Public Services and Recreation
- Transportation and Traffic
- Utilities and Service Systems
- Energy

2.7 ISSUES TO BE RESOLVED/AREAS OF CONTROVERSY

This Draft EIR addresses environmental issues associated with implementation of the proposed project that are known to the lead agency or were raised by other public agencies or interested parties during the EIR scoping process. Key issues brought to the City's attention during the scoping process centered on traffic congestion in the area and nearby freeway off-ramps, and pedestrian safety issues resulting from the congestion. Other issues brought to the City's attention include air quality, noise, land use compatibility and the scale and density of the proposed project, impacts to public services (i.e., fire, police, schools, and parks), water supply and sewer service, and cumulative impacts. Finally, scoping comments received suggested that the City consider a full commercial/retail project, mixed-use project

with fewer residential apartments, and an alternative that would have a public benefit component (i.e., a fire station) on the project site. All of these issues are addressed in **Chapter 4.0, Environmental Impact Analysis**, and **Chapter 5.0, Alternatives**, of this Draft EIR.

2.8 ALTERNATIVES

Consistent with CEQA requirements, a reasonable range of alternatives was evaluated that could feasibly avoid or lessen any significant environmental impacts while substantially attaining the basic objectives of the proposed project. The alternatives analyzed in detail in this Draft EIR are presented below.

Alternative 1: No Project/ No Development Alternative

Section 15126.6(e)(1) of the *State CEQA Guidelines* state that “the purpose of describing and analyzing a no project alternative is to allow decision makers to compare the impacts of approving the proposed project with the impacts of not approving the proposed project.” Under the No Project/No Development alternative, no grading or new construction would occur on the project site and the site would remain vacant.

Alternative 2: No Project/Existing Zoning

The *State CEQA Guidelines* state that “the ‘no project’ analysis shall discuss the existing conditions, as well as what would be reasonably expected to occur in the foreseeable future if the project is not approved, based on current plans and consistency with available infrastructure and community services.” Should the proposed project not be approved by the City, it would be reasonable to expect that the project site would be developed by another entity consistent with the site’s existing specific plan land use and zoning designations, and available infrastructure.

The project site is designated Business and Industrial Park in the City’s General Plan and is zoned IBP-NC (Industrial Business Park-North Cordelia Overlay). The Business and Industrial Park designation is intended for light industrial and office uses and allows a floor-to-area ratio (FAR) of 0.25 to 0.60. Existing development adjacent to the project site consists of office use, and this alternative assumes that similar uses would be developed on the site under this scenario. Based on a typical FAR of 0.35 for this designation, a maximum of about 203,075 square feet of offices space¹ could be constructed on the project site.

¹ The project site is 13.32 acres or approximately 580,220 square feet in size.

Alternative 3: Reduced Residential

The Reduced Residential alternative would reduce the number of residential units on the project site by approximately 50 percent. Under this alternative, a total of 135 residential units would be provided in four 2-story buildings on the residential portion of project site as opposed to a total of 270 residential units provided in four 4-story buildings under the proposed project. The mix of apartment units under this alternative would consist of 17 studio units, 67 1-bedroom units, and 51 2-bedroom units. The commercial component of the proposed project would remain the same and provide approximately 22,600 square feet of commercial space.

Alternative 4: Fire Station/Residential

The Fire Station alternative would replace the commercial component with a fire station. As shown on **Figure 5.0-1, Fire Station/Residential Alternative Site Plan**, the fire station would be located on a 1.5-acre parcel along Business Center Drive on the southwest corner of the project site. The residential component would be located on the remainder of the site and would consist of four 4-story buildings containing 365 units.

It should be noted that the City reviewed two fire station alternatives. The alternative laid out in this DEIR as Alternative 4 was considered by the City. Using the narrative and plans provided by the Spanos team, City staff was able to thoroughly review the proposed site in terms of logistics, station operations, and traffic. Although staff agreed that the general site location north of I-80, with access to Business Center Drive is ideal for a new fire station; the proposed site location at the southeast corner of the overall Green Valley II Mixed Use project poses several concerns and challenges. The following key items were raised:

- The Neitzel Rd/I-80 STA interchange alignment and timeline is too uncertain for the City to make such a large commitment to the proposed fire station location. The proposed interchange, should it come to fruition, will greatly affect the ingress and egress of the fire station. Depending on the final design, the interchange could negatively impact the fire station's access significantly.
- The City is actively scheduling a new signalized intersection at Neitzel and Suisun Valley Road. The proposed fire station access onto Neitzel is too close to the upcoming signalized intersection to permit right and left egress; the station would be limited to a right-out only. Furthermore, should access be granted to the proposed station, the intersection signal operations will face consistent impacts. The site's proximity to the interchange also poses challenges in terms of access and safe travel for vehicles at high speeds. As proposed, the fire station's unsuitable proximity to the signalized intersection and interchange significantly affect the signal's operations and compromises safe vehicle access and travel.

- Another concern raised regarding traffic conflicts, was the level of high traffic volumes on and from Suisun Valley Rd. The number of vehicles traveling Suisun Valley Rd. further complicate and contribute to traffic impacts that are not observed at alternative locations (i.e. Fire Station 35 at Lopes Rd.)
- The interface of the propose fire station site with the residential component of Green Valley II project and any future industrial uses to the west raise apprehensions. Although it is recognized that residents and industrial uses would yield to an emergency vehicle coming to-or-from the fire station, the shared access and intermingle traffic still inhibit emergency vehicle access to Business Center Drive.
- Placing the fire station behind four-story apartment buildings impedes the Fire Department's goals to be visible, accessible, and in-partnership with the community. Programs such as, infant safe-surrender, rely on location visibility and access.

When determining whether or not the proposed fire station location would be feasible, staff considered the site's access to Business Center Drive and Neitzel, how surrounding traffic patterns would be impacted, how the logistics and operations of the station would realistically function with the adjacent uses, and if the City's objectives and goals are being met. Staff has concluded that the proposed site does not meet the needs and standards of the City and cannot be supported. Therefore, a second location for the fire station was identified. The site plan is similar to the site plan for the original Alternative 4, with the key difference being the removal of one apartment building on the southwest corner of the site and a different on-site location of the proposed fire station. This revision to Alternative 4 would also have fewer units, the unit total would be 281 units.

2.9 IMPACT SUMMARY

A detailed discussion regarding potential impacts of implementation of the proposed project is provided in **Chapter 4.0, Environmental Impact Analysis**. A summary of the impacts of the proposed project is provided in **Table 2.0-1, Summary of Impacts and Mitigation Measures**. Also provided in **Table 2.0-1** are mitigation measures that are proposed to avoid or reduce significant project impacts. The table indicates whether implementation of the recommended mitigation measures would reduce the impact to a less than significant level. **Table 2.0-2, Comparison of Alternatives to the Proposed Project**, presents the environmental impacts of each alternative to allow the decision makers, agencies, and the public to compare and contrast these alternatives with the proposed project and weigh their relative merits and demerits.

**Table 2.0-1
Summary of Impacts and Mitigation Measures**

Environmental Topic and Impact	Level of Significance before Mitigation	Mitigation Measures	Level of Significance after Mitigation
4.1 Air Quality			
Impact AIR-1			
Construction of the proposed project would generate construction emissions that would not result in a cumulatively considerable net increase of any criterial pollutant for which the project region is non-attainment under an applicable federal or state ambient air quality standard.	Potentially significant	<p>Mitigation Measure AIR-1</p> <p>The following BMPs shall be included in the construction documents, and the construction contractor(s) shall implement them during project construction, which shall be monitored by the City of Fairfield:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• All exposed surfaces (e.g., parking areas, staging areas, soil piles, graded areas, and unpaved access roads) shall be watered two times per day. <li>• All haul trucks transporting soil, sand, or other loose material off-site shall be covered. <li>• All visible mud or dirt track-out onto adjacent public roads shall be removed using wet power vacuum street sweepers at least once per day. The use of dry power sweeping is prohibited. <li>• All vehicle speeds on unpaved roads shall be limited to 15 mph. <li>• All roadways, driveways, and sidewalks to be paved shall be completed as soon as possible and feasible. Building pads shall be laid as soon as possible and feasible after grading, unless seeding or soil binders are used. <li>• Idling times shall be minimized either by shutting equipment off when not in use or reducing the maximum idling time to five minutes (as required by the California airborne toxics control measure Title 13, Section 2485 of California Code of Regulations [CCR]). Clear signage shall 	Less than significant

Environmental Topic and Impact	Level of Significance before Mitigation	Mitigation Measures	Level of Significance after Mitigation
		<p>be provided for construction workers at all access points.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> All construction equipment shall be maintained and properly tuned in accordance with manufacturer's specifications. All equipment shall be checked by a certified mechanic and determined to be running in proper condition prior to operation. A publicly visible sign with the telephone number and person to contact at the Lead Agency regarding dust complaints shall be posted at the project site. This person shall respond and take corrective action within 48 hours. The Air District's phone number shall also be visible to ensure compliance with applicable regulations. 	
Impact AIR-2			
Operation of the proposed project would not result in a cumulatively considerable net increase of any critical pollutant for which the project region is non-attainment under an applicable federal or state ambient air quality standard.	Less than significant	No mitigation measures are required.	Not applicable
Impact AIR-3			
Implementation of the proposed project would expose sensitive receptors to substantial pollutant concentrations.	Potentially significant	<p>Mitigation Measure AIR-3</p> <p>The construction contractor(s) shall implement the following mitigation measures during project construction, which shall be verified by the City of Fairfield:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> All diesel-powered off-road equipment larger than 50 horsepower and operating on the site for more than two days continuously shall, at a minimum, meet U.S. EPA particulate matter emissions standards for Tier 4 engines or equivalent. All diesel-powered portable equipment (i.e., air compressors, concrete saws, and forklifts) operating on the 	Less than significant

Environmental Topic and Impact	Level of Significance before Mitigation	Mitigation Measures	Level of Significance after Mitigation
Impact AIR-4		site for more than two days shall meet U.S. EPA particulate matter emissions standards for Tier 4 engines or equivalent.	
Implementation of the proposed project would not result in other emissions (such as those leading to odors) adversely affecting a substantial number of people.	Potentially significant	<p>Mitigation Measure AIR-4</p> <p>The project applicant shall require the implementation of the following BAAQMD-recommended management practices and odor technology during project operation, should a restaurant occupy one of the commercial spaces available at the proposed project. The BAAQMD recommends that mitigation for restaurant odors be selected on a case-by-case basis in consultation with the BAAQMD. The BAAQMD, the City of Fairfield and the Solano County Environmental Health Services Division, shall verify that potential restaurant odor sources are properly mitigated using the measures listed below. The following practices and technology are recommended by the BAAQMD:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Integral grease filtration system or grease removal system • Baffle filters • Electrostatic precipitator • Water cooling/cleaning unit • Disposable pleated or bag filters • Activated carbon filters • Oxidizing pellet beds • Incineration • Catalytic conversion • Proper packaging and frequency of food waste disposal • Exhaust stack and vent location with respect to receptors 	Less than significant
Impact AIR-5		No mitigation measures are required.	Not applicable
Implementation of the proposed project would not conflict with or	Less than significant	No mitigation measures are required.	Not applicable

Environmental Topic and Impact	Level of Significance before Mitigation	Mitigation Measures	Level of Significance after Mitigation
obstruct implementation of the applicable air quality plan.			
Cumulative Impact C-AIR-1			
Implementation of the proposed project would not result in a cumulatively considerable net increase of a criteria pollutant for which the project region is in nonattainment under an applicable federal or State ambient air quality standard.	Less than significant	No mitigation measures are required.	Not applicable
Cumulative Impact C-AIR-2			
The proposed project, in conjunction with other past, present and reasonably foreseeable future development, would not result in significant cumulative community health risk.	Less than significant	No mitigation measures are required.	Not applicable
4.2 Biological Resources			
Impact BIO-1		Mitigation Measure BIO-1	
The proposed project could adversely affect candidate, sensitive, or special-status plant species or their habitat.	Potentially significant	<p>A pre-construction special-status plant survey shall be conducted by a qualified biologist during the blooming period of the pappose tarplant, ideally during the summer months. If no plants are found, then no further action is required.</p> <p>If this species is observed on the project site, then appropriate avoidance and minimization and/or mitigation measures shall be implemented, dependent upon the results of the survey, which could include one or more of the following:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1) Avoiding areas where the plants occur. The avoidance area will consist of the locations of the plants and a 15-foot buffer around each plant. During project implementation, the avoidance area may be delineated by the use of orange 	Less than significant

Environmental Topic and Impact	Level of Significance before Mitigation	Mitigation Measures	Level of Significance after Mitigation
		<p>construction fencing and/or silt fencing. Following completion of the project, the avoidance area will be delineated by permanent fencing.</p> <p>2) Preserving land where the species is known to exist.</p> <p>3) Collecting mature seeds of the species on-site and establishing a similar sized population at a different suitable location. The new, CDFW-approved location will be monitored for five (5) years to ensure that pappose tarplant has established. Specific monitoring conditions will be followed according to regulatory permits.</p>	
Impact BIO-2		Mitigation Measure BIO-2	
<p>The proposed project could have a substantial effect, either directly or through habitat modifications, on raptors, nesting birds, or other birds protected under the California Fish and Game Code and MBTA.</p>	<p>Potentially significant</p>	<p>The removal of trees and shrubbery on-site, as well as initial ground disturbance, shall be conducted between August 16 and January 31 (outside of the February 1 to August 15 nesting season) to the extent feasible, which would avoid impacts to nesting birds.</p> <p>If such activities must be conducted during the nesting season, a pre-disturbance nesting-bird survey shall be conducted by a qualified biologist approved by CDFW no more than 14 days prior to vegetation removal or initial ground disturbance. The CDFW protocol survey shall include the disturbance area and surrounding 250 feet to identify the location and status of any nests that could potentially be affected either directly or indirectly by project activities.</p> <p>If active nests of protected species are found within the survey area, a work exclusion zone shall be established around each nest by the qualified biologist. Established exclusion zones shall remain in place until all young in the nest have fledged or the nest otherwise becomes inactive (e.g., due to predation). Appropriate exclusion zone sizes shall be determined by a qualified biologist and vary dependent upon the species, nest location, existing visual buffers, noise levels, and other factors. An exclusion zone radius may be as small as 50 feet for</p>	<p>Less than significant</p>

Environmental Topic and Impact	Level of Significance before Mitigation	Mitigation Measures	Level of Significance after Mitigation
		common, disturbance-adapted species or as large as 250 feet or more for raptors. Exclusion zone size may be reduced from established levels if nest monitoring by a qualified biologist indicates that work activities outside the reduced radius are not adversely impacting the nest and that a reduced exclusion zone would not adversely affect the subject nest upon consultation with, and to the satisfaction of the CDFW.	
Impact BIO-3			
The proposed project would not directly or indirectly affect any riparian habitat or sensitive natural community.	No impact	No mitigation measures are required.	Not applicable
Impact BIO-4			
The proposed project would not have a substantial adverse effect on state or federally protected wetlands.	No impact	No mitigation measures are required.	Not applicable
Impact BIO-5			
The proposed project would not interfere substantially with the movement of any native resident or migratory fish or wildlife species or with established native resident or migratory wildlife corridors or impede the use of native wildlife nursery sites.	No impact	No mitigation measures are required.	Not applicable
Impact BIO-6		Mitigation Measure BIO-6	
The proposed project could conflict with any local policies or ordinances protecting biological resources, such as a tree preservation policy or ordinance.	Potentially significant	The following tree protection measures shall be implemented during construction in the vicinity of the valley oak tree: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> All construction activity (grading, filling, paving, landscaping etc.) shall respect the root protection zone (RPZ) around the protected tree. The RPZ shall be a 	Less than significant

Environmental Topic and Impact	Level of Significance before Mitigation	Mitigation Measures	Level of Significance after Mitigation
		<p>distance of 1.0 times the dripline radius measured from the trunk of the tree.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Temporary protective fencing shall be installed around the dripline of the tree prior to commencement of any construction activity conducted within 25 feet of the tree canopy. The fence shall be clearly marked to prevent inadvertent encroachment by heavy machinery. • Drainage shall not be allowed to pond around the base of the tree. • An ISA-Certified Arborist or tree specialist shall be retained to perform any necessary pruning of the tree during construction activity. • Roots exposed as a result of construction activities shall be covered with wet burlap to avoid desiccation and shall be buried as soon as practicable. • Construction materials or heavy equipment shall not be stored within the RPZ. • Only an ISA-Certified Arborist or tree specialist should make specific recommendations as to where the tree can safely tolerate some level of fill within the drip line. • Trenches which are required within the RPZ of the protected tree shall be bored (tunneled) under the root(s) using an auger or drill, rather than trenched, to avoid root disturbance. • Construction materials shall be properly stored away from the tree to avoid spillage or damage to the tree. 	

Impact BIO-7

The proposed project would not conflict with the provisions of an adopted habitat conservation plan, natural community conservation plan, or other approved local, regional, or	Less than significant	No mitigation measures are required.	Not applicable
---	-----------------------	--------------------------------------	----------------

Environmental Topic and Impact	Level of Significance before Mitigation	Mitigation Measures	Level of Significance after Mitigation
state habitat conservation plan.			
Cumulative Impact BIO-1			
Past, present, and reasonably foreseeable future development in the region could result in significant cumulative impacts to biological resources. However, with mitigation the contribution of the proposed project to impacts on biological resources would not be cumulatively considerable.	Less than significant	No mitigation measures are required.	Not applicable
4.3 Cultural Resources			
Impact CUL-1			
The proposed project would not cause a substantial adverse change in the significance of a historical resource pursuant to Section 15064.5.	No impact	No mitigation measures are required.	Not applicable
Impact CUL-2		Mitigation Measure CUL-2	
The proposed project could cause a substantial change in the significance of an archaeological resource pursuant to Section 15064.5.	Potentially significant	Due to the high likelihood of archeological resources on the project site, the City of Fairfield shall require a note on any plans that require ground disturbing excavation that there is a potential for exposing buried cultural resources, including prehistoric Native American burials. Construction personnel associated with earth moving equipment, drilling, grading, and excavating, shall be provided with basic training conducted by a qualified archaeologist. Issues that shall be included in the basic training will be geared toward training the applicable construction crews in the identification of archaeological deposits, further described in MM CUL-3 . Training will include written notification of the restrictions regarding disturbance and/or removal of any portion of archaeological deposits and the procedures to follow should a resource be identified. The	Less than significant

Environmental Topic and Impact	Level of Significance before Mitigation	Mitigation Measures	Level of Significance after Mitigation
		<p>construction contractor, or its designee, shall be responsible for implementation of this measure. A tribal monitor will be provided an opportunity to attend the pre-construction briefing if requested.</p> <p>A tribal monitor shall be present, and a qualified archeologist shall be available on an “on-call” basis during ground disturbing construction in native soil to review, identify and evaluate cultural resources that may be inadvertently exposed during construction.</p>	
	Potentially significant	Mitigation Measure CUL-3	Less than significant
		<p>If archaeological remains are uncovered, all construction activities within a 100-foot radius shall be halted immediately until a qualified archaeologist, in consultation with the tribal monitor, can evaluate whether the resource requires further study. The City shall require that the applicant include a standard inadvertent discovery clause in every construction contract to inform contractors of this requirement. If any previously undiscovered resources are found during construction the City of Fairfield Community Development Department and the Yocha Dehe Wintun Nation shall be contacted, and the resource shall be evaluated for significance in terms of California Environmental Quality Act criteria by a qualified archaeologist and the Yocha Dehe Wintun Nation. Prehistoric archaeological site indicators include but are not limited to: obsidian and chert flakes and chipped stone tools; grinding and mashing implements (e.g., slabs and handstones, and mortars and pestles); bedrock outcrops and boulders with mortar cups; and locally darkened midden soils. Midden soils may contain a combination of any of the previously listed items with the possible addition of bone and shell remains, and fire-affected stones. Historic period site indicators generally include but are not limited to: fragments of glass, ceramic, and metal objects; milled and split lumber; and structure and feature remains such as building foundations and discrete trash</p>	

Environmental Topic and Impact	Level of Significance before Mitigation	Mitigation Measures	Level of Significance after Mitigation
		<p>deposits (e.g., wells, privy pits, dumps). If City and the qualified archaeologist determine the resource to be significant under CEQA, they shall determine whether preservation in place is feasible. Such preservation in place is the preferred mitigation. Contingency funding and a time allotment sufficient for recovering an archeological sample or to employ an avoidance measure may be required. If such preservation is infeasible, the qualified archaeologist shall prepare and implement a formal Archaeological Monitoring Plan (AMP) which will include a research design and archaeological data recovery plan for the resource. Development and implementation of the AMP will be determined by the City of Fairfield and treatment of any significant cultural resources shall be undertaken with the approval of the project applicant, the City, and the Yocha Dehe Wintun Nation. The archaeologist shall also conduct appropriate technical analyses, prepare a comprehensive written report and file it with the appropriate information center (California Historical Resources Information System [CHRIS]), and provide for the permanent curation of the recovered materials. A Monitoring Closure Report shall be filed with the City of Fairfield at the conclusion of ground disturbing construction if archaeological resources were encountered and/or recovered.</p>	
Impact CUL-3		Mitigation Measure CUL-4	
The proposed project could disturb human remains, including those interred outside of formal cemeteries.	Potentially significant	<p>The treatment of human remains and any associated or unassociated funerary objects discovered during any soil-disturbing activity within the project site shall comply with applicable State laws. This shall include immediate notification of the Solano County Coroner and the City of Fairfield of the discovery of any human remains.</p> <p>In the event of the Coroner's determination that the human remains are Native American, the coroner must contact the NAHC within 24 hours. The NAHC shall identify a Most Likely Descendant (MLD) of the deceased Native American (PRC</p>	Less than significant

Environmental Topic and Impact	Level of Significance before Mitigation	Mitigation Measures	Level of Significance after Mitigation
		<p>Section 5097.98). The MLD may then make recommendations to the landowner or the person responsible for the excavation work, for the means of treating or disposing of, with appropriate dignity, the human remains and any associated grave goods as provided in PRC Section 5097.98. Development activity on the impacted site will halt until the landowner has conferred with the MLD about their recommendations for treatment of the remains, and the coroner has determined that the remains are not subject to investigation under California Government Code Section 27491.</p> <p>The project applicant, archaeological consultant, and MLD shall make all reasonable efforts to develop an agreement for the treatment, with appropriate dignity, of human remains and associated or unassociated funerary objects (CEQA Guidelines Section 15064.5(d)). The agreement should take into consideration the appropriate excavation, removal, recordation, analysis, custodianship, curation, and final disposition of the human remains and associated or unassociated funerary objects. The California PRC allows 48 hours to reach agreement on these matters. If the MLD and the other parties do not agree on the reburial method, the project will follow PRC Section 5097.98(b) which states that ". . . the landowner or his or her authorized representative shall reinter the human remains and items associated with Native American burials with appropriate dignity on the property in a location not subject to further subsurface disturbance."</p>	
Impact CUL-5			
The proposed project could cause a substantial adverse change in the significance of a tribal cultural resource.	Potentially significant	Implement Mitigation Measures CUL-2, CUL-3, and CUL-4.	Less than significant
Cumulative Impact CUL-1			
Cumulative development could cause	Potentially significant	Implement Mitigation Measures CUL-2, CUL-3, and CUL-4.	Less than significant

Environmental Topic and Impact	Level of Significance before Mitigation	Mitigation Measures	Level of Significance after Mitigation
a substantial change in the significance of a historical resource or unique archaeological resource pursuant to Section 15064.5 or impact tribal cultural resources, but with the incorporation of mitigation measures, the proposed project would not contribute substantially to the cumulative impacts.			
4.4 Greenhouse Gas Emissions			
Impact GHG-1			
Project construction and operation would generate greenhouse gas emissions, either directly or indirectly, that would potentially have a significant impact on the environment.	Less than significant	No mitigation is required.	Less than significant
Impact GHG-2			
The proposed project would not conflict with an applicable plan, policy, or regulation adopted for the purpose of reducing GHG emissions.	Less than significant	No mitigation is required.	Less than significant
4.5 Hazards and Hazardous Materials			
Impact HAZ-1			
The proposed project would not create a significant hazard to the public or the environment through the routine transport, use, or disposal of hazardous materials.	Less than significant	No mitigation is required.	Less than significant
Impact HAZ-2			
The proposed project could create a	Less than significant	No mitigation is required.	Less than significant

Environmental Topic and Impact	Level of Significance before Mitigation	Mitigation Measures	Level of Significance after Mitigation
significant hazard to the public or the environment through reasonably foreseeable upset and accident conditions involving the release of hazardous materials into the environment.			
Impact HAZ-3			
The proposed project would not expose future project site residents to substantial risk associated with hazardous materials storage and use on nearby properties.	Less than significant	No mitigation is required.	Less than significant
Impact HAZ-4			
The proposed project would not emit hazardous emissions or handle hazardous or acutely hazardous materials, substances, or waste within one-quarter mile of an existing or proposed school.	No Impact	No mitigation is required.	Less than significant
Impact HAZ-5			
The project site is not located on a list of hazardous material sites subject to corrective action compiled pursuant to Government Code Section 65962.5 (Cortese List).	No Impact	No mitigation is required.	Less than significant
Impact HAZ-6			
The proposed project would not result in a safety hazard to aircraft due to building construction or excessive noise for people living or working on the site.	No Impact	No mitigation is required.	Less than significant

Environmental Topic and Impact	Level of Significance before Mitigation	Mitigation Measures	Level of Significance after Mitigation
Impact HAZ-7			
The proposed project would not impair implementation of or physically interfere with an adopted emergency response plan or emergency evacuation plan nor would the proposed project expose people or structures to a significant risk of loss, injury, or death involving wildland fires.	No Impact	No mitigation is required.	Less than significant
Impact GEO-7		Mitigation Measure GEO-7	
The proposed project would not be located on expansive soil, as defined in Table 18-1-B of the Uniform Building Code (1994), creating substantial direct or indirect risks to life and property.	Potentially significant	During construction, approximately 12 to 18 inches of imported, compactable, very low-expansive (Expansion Index ≤ 20) granular soils shall be placed beneath interior and exterior concrete slabs-on-grade, including PT slabs, sidewalks, and pool deck slabs. Alternatively, chemical amendment of on-site or approved imported clay soils (i.e., lime-treatment) may also be considered to reduce the shrinking and swelling potential of on-site or imported clays.	Less than significant
Cumulative Impact HAZ-1			
The proposed project, in conjunction with other past, present and reasonably foreseeable future development, would not result in significant cumulative impacts related to hazardous materials.	Less than significant	No mitigation is required.	Not applicable
Cumulative Impact GEO-1			
The proposed project would not be located on expansive soil, as defined in Table 18-1-B of the Uniform Building Code (1994), creating substantial direct or indirect risks to	Less than significant	No mitigation is required.	Not applicable

Environmental Topic and Impact	Level of Significance before Mitigation	Mitigation Measures	Level of Significance after Mitigation
life and property.			
4.6 Land Use and Planning			
Impact LU-1			
The proposed project would not physically divide an established community.	No Impact	No mitigation is required.	Not applicable
Impact LU-2			
The proposed project would not cause a significant environmental impact due to conflict with any land use plan, policy, or regulation adopted for the purpose of avoiding or mitigating an environmental effect.	Less than significant	No mitigation is required.	Not applicable
Cumulative Impact LU-1			
The proposed project, in conjunction with other past, present and reasonably foreseeable future development, would not result in significant cumulative impacts related to land use and planning.	Less than significant	No mitigation is required.	Not applicable
4.7 Noise			
Impact NOI-1			
The proposed project would generate increased traffic in the project vicinity but the increase in traffic would not generate a substantial permanent increase in ambient noise levels at off-site sensitive receptors in the project vicinity in excess of standards established in the local general plan or noise ordinance.	Less than significant	No mitigation is required.	Not applicable

Environmental Topic and Impact	Level of Significance before Mitigation	Mitigation Measures	Level of Significance after Mitigation
Impact NOI-2			
The proposed project would add new stationary and area noise sources to the project site but noise from these new noise sources would not generate a substantial permanent increase in ambient noise levels at off-site sensitive receptors in the project vicinity in excess of standards established in the local general plan or noise ordinance.	Less than significant	No mitigation is required.	Not applicable
Impact NOI-3		Mitigation Measure NOI-1	
Implementation of the proposed project would generate a substantial temporary increase in ambient noise levels at off-site sensitive receptors in the project vicinity in excess of standards established in the local general plan or noise ordinance.	Potentially significant	The construction contractor shall ensure that noise and groundborne vibration construction activities whose specific location on the site may be flexible (e.g., operation of compressors and generators, cement mixing, general truck idling) shall be conducted as far as possible from the nearest noise- and vibration-sensitive land uses, and natural and/or manmade barriers (e.g., intervening construction trailers) shall be used to screen propagation of noise from such activities towards these land uses . These activities shall be located in the southeast quadrant of the project site, as feasible.	Less than significant
	Potentially significant	Mitigation Measure NOI-2	
		The construction contractor shall ensure that barriers such as plywood structures or flexible sound control curtains shall be erected between the proposed project and adjacent sensitive receptors to minimize the amount of noise during construction. These temporary sound barriers shall be capable of achieving a sound attenuation of at least 12 dBA and block the line-of-sight between the project site and these adjacent land uses. This specification shall be included on all project plans.	
	Potentially significant	Mitigation Measure NOI-3	
			Less than significant

Environmental Topic and Impact	Level of Significance before Mitigation	Mitigation Measures	Level of Significance after Mitigation
		The construction contractor shall ensure the use of power construction equipment with state-of-the-art noise shielding and muffling devices capable of attenuating sound by 3 dBA or more. This specification shall be included on all project plans.	
	Potentially significant	Mitigation Measure NOI-4	Less than significant
		The construction staging area shall be as far from sensitive receptors as possible. Staging shall occur in the southeast quadrant of the project site, as feasible.	
	Potentially significant	Mitigation Measure NOI-5	Less than significant
		The construction contractor shall ensure that no less than two weeks prior to commencement of construction, notification shall be provided to the off-site residential, school, and church uses within 500 feet of the project site that discloses the construction schedule, including the types of activities and equipment that would be used throughout the duration of the construction period. Contact information shall also be posted where readily visible to the public.	
Impact NOI-4			
Implementation of the proposed project would not generate excessive groundborne vibration or groundborne noise levels.	Less than significant	No mitigation is required.	Not applicable
Cumulative Impact NOI-1			
Cumulative development would generate increased traffic, these increases in traffic would not cause a substantial permanent increase in noise levels at off-site locations.	Less than significant	No mitigation is required.	Not applicable
Cumulative Impact NOI-2			
Construction activities associated with the proposed project, along with other	No impact	No mitigation is required.	Not applicable

Environmental Topic and Impact	Level of Significance before Mitigation	Mitigation Measures	Level of Significance after Mitigation
construction projects in El Dorado County, would not result in a substantial temporary or periodic cumulative increase in ambient noise levels.			
4.8 Public Services			
Impact PS-1			
The proposed project would not require the construction of a new fire station in order to maintain adequate response times.	Less than significant	No mitigation is required.	Not applicable
Impact PS-2			
The proposed project would not require the construction of new or physically altered police facilities.	Less than significant	No mitigation is required.	Not applicable
Impact PS-3			
The proposed project would require the construction of new or physically altered school facilities. However, the construction of new school facilities would not cause significant environmental impacts.	Less than significant	No mitigation is required.	Not applicable
Impact PS-4			
The proposed project would not require the construction of new or physically altered library facilities.	Less than significant	No mitigation is required.	Not applicable
Impact PS-5			
Development of the proposed project would increase the use of existing neighborhood parks or other recreational facilities but not result in	Less than significant	No mitigation is required.	Not applicable

Environmental Topic and Impact	Level of Significance before Mitigation	Mitigation Measures	Level of Significance after Mitigation
substantial physical deterioration of the facilities. In addition, the demand created by the proposed project would not require the construction of new or physically altered parks and recreation facilities.			
Cumulative Impact C-PS-1			
The proposed project, in conjunction with other closely related past, present and reasonably foreseeable future development, would result in a need for a new fire station; however, the environmental effects of that fire station would not be significant.	Less than significant	No mitigation is required.	Not applicable
4.9 Transportation and Traffic			
Impact TRANS-1		Mitigation Measure TRANS-1a	
Development of the proposed project would not conflict with a program, plan, ordinance or policy addressing the circulation system, including transit, roadway, bicycle, and pedestrian facilities.	Significant	<p>The project applicant shall pay a fair share contribution to be included as part of the Development Review Conditions of Approval to fund construction of the following improvements at the intersection of Lopes Road/Bridgeport Avenue:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Signalize the Lopes Road/Bridgeport Avenue/Cordelia Road intersection complex, including: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ Split phases for all approaches at Lopes Road/Cordelia Road ○ Split phases for all approaches at Lopes Road/Bridgeport Avenue ○ Clustered intersection phasing with overlaps provided for movements crossing the railroad tracks. • Modify southbound approach at Lopes Road/Bridgeport Avenue to include one through lane and one southbound left turn lane 	Significant and unavoidable

Environmental Topic and Impact	Level of Significance before Mitigation	Mitigation Measures	Level of Significance after Mitigation
		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Modify northbound approach at Lopes road/Bridgeport Avenue to include one through lane and one through-right turn shared lane • Install four-quadrant railroad crossing gates to prevent motorists from entering the conflict area when a train preemption event occurs <p>Alternatively, improvements listed above may be funded through payment into the City’s Development Impact Fee (DIF) program if the improvements are part of an identified project in the DIF.</p>	
Mitigation Measure TRANS-1b			
	Potentially Significant	The project shall install a crosswalk connecting the existing curb ramp at the southwest corner of Business Center Drive/Westamerica Drive-Center Driveway to the proposed curb ramp at the southeast corner of Business Center Drive/Westamerica Drive-Center Driveway. The project shall install pedestrian signal heads for this crossing and retime the signal at this location to account for the pedestrian signal phase at this location.	Less than significant
Mitigation Measure TRANS-1c			
	Potentially Significant	<p>I-80 westbound ramps-Neitzel Road/Suisun Valley Road is an all-way stop-controlled intersection that operates unacceptably in the PM peak hour under both EPAP Conditions and EPAP with Project conditions. The intersection meets the Peak Hour Signal Warrant under EPAP Conditions for the PM peak hour. The project applicant shall pay a fair share contribution to be included as part of the Development Review Conditions of Approval to fund construction of the following improvements at the intersection of I-80 westbound ramps-Neitzel Road/Suisun Valley Road:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Signalize the intersection, including: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ Northbound and southbound protected left turn 	Less than significant

Environmental Topic and Impact	Level of Significance before Mitigation	Mitigation Measures	Level of Significance after Mitigation
		<p>phases</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ Eastbound and westbound split phases • Modify southbound right turn movement to remove the high-speed channelizer island and install a standard right turn pocket <p>Alternatively, improvements listed above may be funded through payment into the City’s Development Impact Fee (DIF) program if the improvements are part of an identified project in the DIF.</p>	
Impact TRANS-2			
The proposed project would not conflict or be inconsistent with <i>CEQA Guidelines</i> § 15064.3, subdivision (b).	Less than significant	No mitigation is required.	Not applicable
Impact TRANS-3			
Development of the proposed project would not substantially increase hazards due to a geometric design feature (e.g., sharp curves or dangerous intersections) or incompatible use (e.g., farm equipment).	Less than significant	No mitigation is required.	Not applicable
Impact TRANS-4			
Development of the proposed project would not result in inadequate emergency access.	Less than significant	No mitigation is required.	Not applicable
Cumulative Impact C-TRANS-1			
Development of the proposed project would conflict with plan, ordinance or policy addressing the circulation system, including transit, roadway, bicycle and pedestrian facilities under	Potentially Significant	Implementation of MM C-TRANS-1a and MM C-TRANS-1b	Significant and unavoidable

Environmental Topic and Impact	Level of Significance before Mitigation	Mitigation Measures	Level of Significance after Mitigation
Long-Term Cumulative (2035) Plus Project Conditions.			
Mitigation Measure C-TRANS-1			
	Potentially Significant	<p>The project applicant shall pay a fair share contribution to be included as part of the Development Review Conditions of Approval to fund construction of the following improvements at the intersection of Business Center Drive/Suisun Valley Road:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Restripe the eastbound approach to include two left turn lanes, two through lanes, and one right-turn only lane. • Add a right turn overlap phase for the eastbound right turn movement 	Less than significant
Mitigation Measure C-TRANS-2			
	Potentially Significant	<p>The project applicant shall pay a fair share contribution to be included as part of the Development Review Conditions of Approval to fund construction of the following improvements at the intersection of I-80 eastbound ramps/Pittman Road:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Restripe the eastbound approach to include one left turn lane and one left turn-through-right turn shared lane • Improve the northbound Pittman Road intersection exit to accommodate two receiving lanes to serve the two lanes turning left on the restriped eastbound approach (improvement may conform to existing infrastructure prior to the I-80/Suisun Valley Road-Pittman Road overcrossing). 	Less than significant
Cumulative Impact C-TRANS-2			
Development of the proposed project, in combination with reasonably foreseeable future developments, would not conflict or be inconsistent with CEQA Guidelines § 15064.3, subdivision (b).	Less than significant	No mitigation is required.	Not applicable

Environmental Topic and Impact	Level of Significance before Mitigation	Mitigation Measures	Level of Significance after Mitigation
Cumulative Impact C-TRANS-3			
Development of the proposed project, in combination with reasonably foreseeable future developments, would not substantially increase hazards due to a geometric design feature (e.g., sharp curves or dangerous intersections) or incompatible uses (e.g., farm equipment).	Less than significant	No mitigation is required.	Not applicable
Cumulative Impact C-TRANS-4			
Development of the proposed project, in combination with reasonably foreseeable future developments, would not result in inadequate emergency access.	Less than significant	No mitigation is required.	Not applicable
4.10 Utilities and Service Systems			
Impact UTL-1			
The project could require or result in the relocation or construction of new or expanded water, wastewater treatment, stormwater drainage, electric power, natural gas, or telecommunications facilities, but the construction or relocation would not cause significant environmental effects.	Less than significant	No mitigation is required.	Not applicable
Impact UTL-2			
FMU would have sufficient water supplies available to serve the project and reasonably foreseeable future development during normal, dry, and	Less than significant	No mitigation is required.	Not applicable

Environmental Topic and Impact	Level of Significance before Mitigation	Mitigation Measures	Level of Significance after Mitigation
multiple dry years.			
Impact UTL-3			
FMU would have adequate capacity to serve the project's projected wastewater treatment demand in addition to existing commitments.	Less than significant	No mitigation is required.	Not applicable
Impact UTL-4			
The proposed project would not generate solid waste in excess of the capacity of local infrastructure, or otherwise impair the attainment of solid waste reduction goals.	Less than significant	No mitigation is required.	Not applicable
Impact UTL-5			
The proposed project would comply with federal, state, and local management and reduction statutes and regulations related to solid waste.	Less than significant	No mitigation is required.	Not applicable
Cumulative C-UTL-1			
The proposed project, in conjunction with other past, present and reasonably foreseeable future development, would not result in a significant cumulative impact on utilities.	Less than significant	No mitigation is required.	Not applicable
4.11 Energy			
Impact EN-1			
Construction and operation of the proposed project would increase the consumption of energy but would not result in wasteful, inefficient or	Less than significant	No mitigation is required.	Not applicable

Environmental Topic and Impact	Level of Significance before Mitigation	Mitigation Measures	Level of Significance after Mitigation
unnecessary consumption of energy.			
Impact EN-2			
The proposed project would not conflict with or obstruct state or local plans for renewable energy or energy efficiency.	Less than significant	No mitigation is required.	Not applicable
<i>KEY</i>			
<i>SU</i>		<i>PS</i>	
<i>S</i>		<i>LTS</i>	

**Table 2.0-2
Summary Comparison of Project Alternatives¹**

Project Impact	Proposed Project (Before/After Mitigation)	Alternative 1: No Project/ No Development	Alternative 2: No Project/ Existing Zoning	Alternative 3: Reduced Residential	Alternative 4: Fire Station/Residential
AIR-1 Construction activities associated with the proposed project would result in a violation of an air quality standard, contribute substantially to an existing or projected air quality violation, or result in a cumulatively considerable net increase of a criteria pollutant for which the project region is non-attainment under an applicable national or State ambient air quality standard (including releasing emissions which exceed quantitative thresholds for ozone precursors)	S/LTS	Avoided	Reduced	Reduced	Similar
AIR-2 Operation of the proposed project would result in a violation of an air quality standard, contribute substantially to an existing or projected air quality violation, or result in a cumulatively considerable net increase of a criteria pollutant for which the project region is non-attainment under an applicable national or State ambient air quality standard (including releasing emissions which exceed quantitative thresholds for ozone precursors).	S/LTS	Avoided	Reduced	Reduced	Similar

Project Impact		Proposed Project (Before/After Mitigation)	Alternative 1: No Project/ No Development	Alternative 2: No Project/ Existing Zoning	Alternative 3: Reduced Residential	Alternative 4: Fire Station/Residential
AIR-5	Project construction would expose sensitive receptors to substantial pollutant concentrations.	PS/LTS	Avoided	Similar	Reduced	Similar
BIO-2	The proposed project would not directly or indirectly affect any riparian habitat, sensitive natural community, or wetlands nor interfere with the movement of any wildlife species, but project construction noise could affect nesting birds.	PS/LTS	Avoided	Similar	Similar	Similar
CUL-2	The proposed project could cause a substantial change in the significance of an archaeological resource pursuant to Section 15064.5.	PS/LTS	Avoided	Similar	Similar	Similar
CUL-4	The proposed project could disturb human remains, including those interred outside of formal cemeteries.	PS/LTS	Avoided	Similar	Similar	Similar
CUL-5	The proposed project could cause a substantial adverse change in the significance of a tribal cultural resource.	PS/LTS	Avoided	Similar	Similar	Similar
C-CUL-1	Cumulative development could cause a substantial change in the significance of a historical resource or unique archaeological resource pursuant to Section 15064.5 or impact tribal cultural resources, but the proposed project would not contribute substantially to the cumulative impacts.	PS/LTS	Avoided	Similar	Similar	Similar

Project Impact	Proposed Project (Before/After Mitigation)	Alternative 1: No Project/ No Development	Alternative 2: No Project/ Existing Zoning	Alternative 3: Reduced Residential	Alternative 4: Fire Station/Residential
TRANS-1 Development of the proposed project would conflict with a program, plan, ordinance or policy addressing the circulation system, including transit, roadway, bicycle, and pedestrian facilities.	S/SU	Avoided	Similar	Reduced	Similar
C-TRANS-1 Development of the proposed project would conflict with an applicable plan, ordinance or policy establishing measures of effectiveness for the performance of the traffic circulation system under Near-Term (2027) plus Project Conditions.	S/SU	Avoided	Similar	Reduced	Similar
UTL-4 Development of the proposed project would require the construction of new or expanded wastewater conveyance systems.	PS/LTS	Avoided	Greater (S)	Reduced	Similar

KEY

SU *Significant and unavoidable*S *Significant*PS *Potentially significant impact*LTS *Less than significant impact*Avoided *Proposed project's impact avoided*Similar *Impact similar to proposed project*Reduced *Impact less than proposed project*Greater *Impact greater than proposed project*1 *This table lists only the significant or potentially significant environmental impacts of the proposed project.*