

CITY OF FAIRFIELD

Initial Study Questionnaire

PROJECT DESCRIPTION AND BACKGROUND

Project title: Gold Hill Village 3
Contact Person: Amy Kreimeier, Associate Planner (707) 428-7450
akreimeier@fairfield.ca.gov
Project Sponsor's Name and Address: Kris Kamerzell, Discovery Builders
4061 Port Chicago Hwy, Suite H, Concord, CA 94520
General Plan Designation: Mixed Use
Zoning: CC (Community Commercial)
Project Location: Northeast corner of Gold Hill and Lopes Road
Fairfield, CA 94534

Longitude/Latitude: 38.183281"N -122.136765"W

Assessor's Parcel Numbers: 0180-080-290, 0180-080-320, and 0180-080-330



- | | | |
|--|--|---|
| <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Biological Resources | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Cultural Resources | <input type="checkbox"/> Energy |
| <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Geology / Soils | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Greenhouse Gas Emissions | <input type="checkbox"/> Hazards & Hazardous Materials |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Hydrology / Water Quality | <input type="checkbox"/> Land Use / Planning | <input type="checkbox"/> Mineral Resources |
| <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Noise | <input type="checkbox"/> Population / Housing | <input type="checkbox"/> Public Services |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Recreation | <input type="checkbox"/> Transportation | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Tribal Cultural Resources |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Utilities / Service Systems | <input type="checkbox"/> Wildfire | <input type="checkbox"/> Mandatory Findings of Significance |

DETERMINATION

On the basis of this initial evaluation:

- ☐ I find that the proposed project COULD NOT have a significant effect on the environment, and a NEGATIVE DECLARATION will be prepared.
- ☒ I find that although the proposed project could have a significant effect on the environment, there will not be a significant effect in this case because revisions in the project have been made by or agreed to by the project proponent. A MITIGATED NEGATIVE DECLARATION will be prepared.
- ☐ I find that the proposed project MAY have a significant effect on the environment, and an ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACT REPORT is required.
- ☐ I find that the proposed project MAY have a "potentially significant impact" or "potentially significant unless mitigated" impact on the environment, but at least one effect 1) has been adequately analyzed in an earlier document pursuant to applicable legal standards, and 2) has been addressed by mitigation measures based on the earlier analysis as described on attached sheets. An ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACT REPORT is required, but it must analyze only the effects that remain to be addressed.
- ☐ I find that although the proposed project could have a significant effect on the environment, because all potentially significant effects (a) have been analyzed adequately in an earlier EIR or NEGATIVE DECLARATION pursuant to applicable standards, and (b) have been avoided or mitigated pursuant to that earlier EIR or NEGATIVE DECLARATION, including revisions or mitigation measures that are imposed upon the proposed project, nothing further is required.


AMY KREIMEIER, Associate Planner

8/1/19
Date

- 8) This is only a suggested form, and lead agencies are free to use different formats; however, lead agencies should normally address the questions from this checklist that are relevant to a project's environmental effects in whatever format is selected.
- 9) The explanation of each issue should identify:
 - a) the criteria or threshold, if any, used to evaluate each question; and
 - b) the mitigation measure identified, if any, to reduce the impact to less than significance.

ISSUES

I. AESTHETICS – Except as provided in Public Resources Code Section 21099, would the project:	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant With Mitigation	Less than Significant Impact	No Impact
a) Have a substantial adverse effect on a scenic vista?			X	
b) Substantially damage scenic resources, including, but not limited to, trees, rock outcroppings, and historic buildings within a state scenic highway?				X
c) In non-urbanized areas, substantially degrade the existing visual character or quality of public views of the site and its surroundings? (Public views are those that are experienced from publicly accessible vantage point). If the project is in an urbanized area, would the project conflict with applicable zoning and other regulations governing scenic quality?			X	
d) Create a new source of substantial light or glare which would adversely affect day or nighttime views in the area?			X	

Discussion: The project is not located along a state designated scenic highway. The project is located adjacent to Interstate 680, a designated City of Fairfield Scenic Roadway and the Suisun Marsh, a designated City of Fairfield Scenic Vista Area. The project will not affect views of the scenic vista area from Interstate 680. The design of the proposed development is compatible with the existing residential development in the vicinity of the site. The project would not create any new sources of substantial light or glare in the area.

(Source: 8, 9, 10, 22)

and is not presently used for agricultural purposes. The site is vacant and is not considered forest land.

(Source: 4, 6, 8, 18, 19)

III. AIR QUALITY – Where available, the significance criteria established by the applicable air quality management district or air pollution control district may be relied upon to make the following determinations. Would the project:

	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant With Mitigation	Less than Significant Impact	No Impact
a) Conflict with or obstruct implementation of the applicable air quality plan?				X
b) Result in a cumulatively considerable net increase of any criteria pollutant for which the project region is non-attainment under an applicable federal or state ambient air quality standard?		X		
c) Expose sensitive receptors to substantial pollutant concentrations?			X	
d) Result in other emissions (such as those leading to odors) adversely affecting a substantial number of people?				X

Discussion: An Air Quality Analysis was prepared for the project by Yorke Engineering. The report determined that the proposed project will not exceed significance thresholds established by the Bay Area Air Quality Management District Guidelines (BAAQMD) for criteria air pollutants at the site both during construction and occupancy of the project.

The project would not result in substantial emissions of Toxic Air Contaminants (TACs) during construction. The primary air quality impacts during the construction phase would be associated with the combustions of diesel fuels which produce exhaust related particulate matter that is considered a TAC based on chronic exposure to these emissions. However, construction activities are short term in nature and would not produce chronic, long term exposure to diesel particulate matter. PM10 and PM2.5 diesel exhaust emissions would not exceed BAAQMD thresholds of significance. Additionally, the project will be required to utilize BAAQMD Best Management Practices (BMP) to further reduce fugitive dust emissions (PM-10 and PM-2.5) during the construction phase.

Impact AQ-1: Construction

Construction activities would generate exhaust emissions from vehicles/equipment and fugitive particulate matter emissions that would affect local air quality. Construction dust

11. All construction equipment, diesel trucks, and generators shall be equipped with Best Available Control Technology for emission reductions of NOx and PM.
12. All contractors shall use equipment that meets CARB's most recent certification standard for off-road heavy duty diesel engines. Idling time of diesel powered construction equipment shall be limited to two minutes.
13. 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 2 engines or equivalent.
14. All diesel-powered portable equipment (i.e., air compressors, concrete saws, forklifts, and generators) operating on the site for more than two days shall meet U.S. EPA particulate matter emissions standards for Tier 4 engines or equivalent.
15. Suspend excavation and grading activity when winds (instantaneous gusts) exceed 25 mph.
16. Limit the area subject to excavation, grading, and other construction activity at any one time.

(Source: 2, 4, 6, 7, 8, 27)

IV. <u>BIOLOGICAL RESOURCE</u> – Would the project:	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant With Mitigation	Less than Significant Impact	No Impact
a) Have a substantial adverse effect, either directly or through habitat modifications, on any species identified as a candidate, sensitive, or special status species in local or regional plans, policies, or regulations, or by the California Department of Fish and Wildlife or U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service?		X		
b) Have substantial adverse effect on any riparian habitat or other sensitive natural community identified in local or regional plans, policies, regulations or by the California Department of Fish and Wildlife or U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service?				X
c) Have a substantial adverse effect state or federally protected wetlands (including, but not limited to, marsh, vernal pool, coastal, etc.) through direct removal, filling, hydrological interruption, or other means?				X

with the potential to occur within the assessment area are included in Table 1 of the Biological Assessment.

The only potential habitat within the Project Site is the walnut tree at the northern end of the Project Site and the adjacent trees on the Caltrans right of way which may serve as nesting locations for common and sensitive passerine and raptor species. Most of the special status plant and wildlife species identified are present because of the proximity of the California Department of Fish and Wildlife (CDFW) owned and managed Grizzly Island Wildlife Area located east of the Project Site. The entire Grizzly Island Wildlife Area consists of approximately 12,900 acres of prime estuarine marsh habitat within the greater Suisun Marsh. The marsh supports many species including common, threatened and endangered species. Because the Gold Hills Unit and Garibaldi Unit of the Wildlife Area are located east of the Project Site, the California Natural Diversity Database (CNDDB) lists a number of rare plants and animals with the potential to occur within the Project Site. However, this does not take into account the actual developed conditions and land use surrounding the Project Site. Given the existing freeway corridor serves as a barrier for wildlife, the immediately adjacent surrounding development, the lack of any aquatic features and the current unvegetated and disturbed conditions at the Project Site it is unlikely any special status plant or wildlife species would be affected by the proposed development.

Impact BIO-1: Nesting and Migratory Birds

Impacts to nesting bird species, protected by the federal Migratory Bird Treaty Act (MBTA) of 1918 and Fish and Game Code of California, may occur during construction near the walnut tree on the property and the adjacent trees within the Caltrans right of way.

Mitigation Measure BIO-1: Nesting and Migratory Birds

If construction is proposed between January 31 and August 31, a qualified biologist must conduct a nesting bird survey not more than 7 days prior to initiation of grading to document the presence or absence of nesting birds within or directly adjacent to (100 feet) of the Project Site.

The preconstruction survey(s) shall focus on identifying any raptors and/or passerines nests that may be directly or indirectly affected by construction activities. If active nests are documented, species-specific measures shall be prepared by a qualified biologist and implemented to prevent abandonment of the active nest. At a minimum, grading in the vicinity of a nest shall be postponed until the young birds have fledged. If an active nest is present, a minimum exclusion buffer of 100 feet shall be maintained during construction, depending on the species and location. The perimeter of the nest setback zone shall be fenced or adequately demarcated with stakes and flagging at 20-foot intervals, and construction personnel and activities restricted from the area. A survey report by a qualified biologist verifying that no active nests are present, or that the young have fledged, shall be submitted prior to initiation of grading in the nest-setback zone. The qualified biologist shall serve as a biological monitor during those periods when construction activities occur near active nest areas to ensure that no inadvertent impacts

unique archaeological resources under CEQA. If the deposits are not eligible, avoidance is not necessary. If they are eligible, they shall be avoided, or, if avoidance is not feasible, the adverse effects shall be mitigated.

Mitigation may include, but is not limited to, thorough recording on Department of Parks and Recreation form 523 records (DPR523) or data recovery excavation. If data recovery excavation is selected, the excavation must be guided by a data recovery plan prepared and adopted prior to beginning the data recovery work, and a report of findings shall be submitted to the City of Fairfield and the Northwest Information Center (NWIC) (CCR Title 14(3) 15126.(b)(3)(C)).

Impact CR-2: Archaeological Remains

Archaeological remains could be discovered during grading and potentially significant impacts could result to as-yet-unidentified archaeological remains at the construction stage.

Mitigation Measure CR-2: Archaeological Remains

If archaeological remains are discovered during grading activities, work within 25 feet of the discovery will be redirected and the County Coroner notified immediately. At the same time an Archeologist will be contacted to assess the situation. If human remains are of Native American origin, the Coroner must notify the Native American Heritage Commission within 24 hours of identification. The Native American Heritage Commission will identify a Most Likely Descendant (MLD) 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 MLD. The report shall be submitted to the City of Fairfield and the Northwest Information Center.

(Source: 4, 6, 7, 8, 10)

	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant With Mitigation	Less than Significant Impact	No Impact
VI. <u>ENERGY</u> – Would the project:				
a) Result in potentially significant environmental impact due to wasteful, inefficient, or unnecessary consumption of energy resources, during project construction or operation?			X	
b) Conflict with or obstruct a state or local plan for renewable energy or energy efficiency?			X	

VII. GEOLOGY AND SOILS – Would the project:

	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant With Mitigation	Less than Significant Impact	No Impact
a) Directly or indirectly cause potential substantial adverse effects, including the risk of loss, injury, or death involving:				
i) Rupture of a known earthquake fault, as delineated on the most recent Alquist-Priolo Earthquake Fault Zoning Map issued by the State Geologist for the area or based on other substantial evidence of a known fault? Refer to Division of Mines and Geology Special Publication 42.			X	
ii) Strong seismic ground shaking?			X	
iii) Seismic-related ground failure, including liquefaction?			X	
iv) Landslides?			X	
b) Result in substantial soil erosion or the loss of topsoil?			X	
c) Be located on a geologic unit or soil that is unstable, or that would become unstable as a result of the project, and potentially result in on- or off-site landslide, lateral spreading, subsidence, liquefaction or collapse?			X	
d) Be located on expansive soil, as defined in Table 18-1B of the Uniform Building Code (1994), creating substantial risks direct or indirect to life or property?			X	
e) Have soils incapable of adequately supporting the use of septic tanks or alternative waste water disposal systems where sewers are not available for the disposal of waste water?				X
f) Directly or indirectly destroy a unique paleontological resource or site or unique geologic feature?		X		

Discussion: The project site is considered to be a seismically active area as is all of northern California. Earthquakes are a common occurrence in the vicinity of the area, and damage to people and structures during earthquakes can be caused by actual surface rupture along an active fault or by ground shaking from a nearby or distant fault. Strong

VIII. GREENHOUSE GAS EMISSIONS – Would the project:

	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant With Mitigation	Less than Significant Impact	No Impact
a) Generate greenhouse gas emissions, either directly or indirectly, that may have a significant impact on the environment?		X		
b) Conflict with any applicable plan, policy or regulation of an agency adopted for the purpose of reducing the emissions of greenhouse gases?		X		

Discussion: An Air Quality Analysis was prepared for the project by Yorke Engineering. The results of the analysis indicate that annual operational greenhouse gas emissions (GHG) for the project will be above the BAAQMD threshold of significance, 1,100 metric tons per year, at 1,260 metric tons per year. Long-term operation of the proposed project would generate GHG emissions from area and mobile sources as well as indirect emissions from sources associated with energy consumption. Mobile-source GHG emissions would include project-generated vehicle trips associated with trips to and from the proposed project. The sectors which contribute the most to the project's operational GHG emissions are: 1) mobile sources – 66%, 2) electricity consumption – 16%, and 3) natural gas use – 12%.

The emissions calculation does not take into account reductions that result from state and regional rules and regulations or City of Fairfield design and development requirements as part of the project as proposed in the analysis. The City of Fairfield requires that all new construction comply with the State of California Green Building Code. According to BAAQMD guidelines, this requirement will reduce GHG emissions related to electricity use by 17% and natural gas use by 9% for a total project GHG emissions reduction of 4.1%.

In order to further reduce operational GHG emissions to a less than significant level, the project will be required to implement certain design characteristics which have been identified by BAAQMD to lead to lower emissions. For example, installation of a cool roof can reduce GHG emissions related to electricity by 69% and HVAC duct sealing can reduce emissions in this sector by 30%. Installation of a tank-less water heater can reduce GHG emissions related to natural gas use by 35%. Incorporating these three design elements would reduce total project GHG emissions by 20% to well below the threshold of significance. With the implementation of these design elements and the additional mitigating design features identified below, GHG emissions will be reduced to a less than significant level.

In addition to the GHG emission reductions described above, it is important to note that the estimates from mobile sources are likely much greater than the emissions that would

9. Construction and demolition waste shall be reused and recycled (including, but not limited to, soil, vegetation, concrete, lumber, metal, and cardboard); and
10. Interior and exterior storage areas shall be provided for recyclables and green waste; adequate recycling containers shall be located in public areas.

(Source: 2, 4, 6, 7, 8, 27)

IX. HAZARDS AND HAZARDOUS MATERIALS –

Would the project:

	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant With Mitigation	Less than Significant Impact	No Impact
a) Create a significant hazard to the public or the environment through the routine transport, use, or disposal of hazardous materials?				X
b) Create a significant hazard to the public or the environment through reasonably foreseeable upset and accident conditions involving the release of hazardous materials into the environment?				X
c) Emit hazardous emissions or handle hazardous or acutely hazardous materials, substances, or waste within one quarter mile of an existing or proposed school?				X
d) Be located on a site which is included on a list of hazardous materials sites compiled pursuant to Government Code Section 65962.5 and, as a result, would it create a significant hazard to the public or the environment?				X
e) For a project located within an airport land use plan or, where such a plan has not been adopted, within two miles of a public airport or public use airport, would the project result in a safety hazard or excessive noise for people residing or working in the project area?				X
f) Impair implementation of or physically interfere with an adopted emergency response plan or emergency evacuation plan?				X
g) Expose people or structures, either directly or indirectly, to a significant risk of loss, injury or death involving wildland fires?				X

Discussion: The project does not involve the use of hazardous chemicals or processes, nor was there a previous use of the land that involved potential hazards. It is not located

Discussion: All proposed on-site impervious surfaces would drain to the City storm drain system which includes an existing 24-inch storm drain that crosses the property and drains into a culvert underneath I-680. On-site sedimentation and retention ponds have been provided to adequately reduce the potential of impacting the ability of the culvert to carry sediment load to Suisun Marsh.

The site will be required to comply with the City's grading and erosion control ordinance as a condition of project approval. The project will comply with City and State codes to reduce erosion during construction. Specifically, the applicant will submit an erosion and sedimentation control plan and compliance with the National Pollution Discharge Elimination System (NPDES) Permit and Storm Water Pollution Prevention Plan (SWPPP) requirements is required.

The site for the proposed project is flat, containing no significant topographic features. The site is not located within the 100-year flood plain, according to the FEMA Flood Insurance Rate Map. The project site is located within the Fairfield-Suisun groundwater subbasin. The project is not proposing to create wells or utilize groundwater to supply the project. Therefore the project will not substantially decrease groundwater supplies or interfere with recharge. The project will receive water from the City of Fairfield. Fairfield's source water originates from Lake Berryessa and the Sacramento-San Joaquin Delta. The City meets the water quality guidelines set by the California Division of Drinking Water (CDDW) and the US Environmental Protection Agency (USEPA).

(Source: 4, 5, 6, 7, 8, 12, 14)

XI. <u>LAND USE AND PLANNING</u> – Would the project:	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant With Mitigation	Less than Significant Impact	No Impact
a) Physically divide an established community?				X
b) Cause a significant environmental impact due to a conflict with any land use plan, policy, or regulation adopted for the purpose of avoiding or mitigating an environmental effect?			X	

Discussion: A General Plan Amendment and corresponding Zoning Ordinance Amendment is proposed as part of the project. This would result in both the land use designation of the property from MU Mixed Use and the zoning designation from CC Community Commercial to RLM Low Medium Density Residential. The project is consistent with the requested Low Medium Density land use designation. The proposed project is located at the periphery of an existing neighborhood of single-family detached homes. In this location the project would create no physical division of the existing neighborhood. There are no Specific Plans to which this development is subject.

(Source: 4, 6, 7, 8)

The City of Fairfield General Plan Noise Element establishes 45 and 60 dB Ldn as being acceptable interior and exterior noise levels, respectively, for new residential uses affected by transportation noise sources. Where it is not possible to reduce noise in outdoor activity areas to 60 dB Ldn or less using a practical application of the best available noise reduction measures, an exterior noise level of up to 65 dB Ldn may be allowed provided that available exterior noise reduction measures have been implemented and interior noise levels are in compliance with the 45 dB Ldn standard. An interior noise level criterion of 45 dB Ldn is applied to residential land uses. The intent of this standard is to provide a suitable environment for indoor communication and sleep. The City of Fairfield General Plan also establishes noise standards for new projects affected by non-transportation sources, such as those generating from the existing commercial uses adjacent to the project site.

The existing ambient noise environment at the project site is primarily defined by traffic on Interstate 680, Gold Hill Road, and Lopes Road. To quantify existing traffic noise levels at the project site, long-term (24-hour) ambient noise level measurements were conducted at Site A, located in the northern corner of the site adjacent to the sewer lift station. In addition, short-term noise level measurements were conducted at two sites adjacent to the commercial use to the south in order to quantify existing noise exposure at the project site due to the commercial operations.

Measured traffic noise levels at Site A, 200 feet from the centerline of Interstate 680, were 71-72 dB Ldn. These levels exceed the City of Fairfield 60 dB Ldn exterior noise standard applicable to new residential uses. In addition, noise level measurements conducted adjacent to the existing gas station and mini-mart resulted in average noise levels of 58-59 dB Leq and maximum noise levels of 65-73 dB Lmax. However, measured noise levels at Sites 1 and 2 were attributable entirely to traffic on Lopes Road, and not due to activities at the adjacent commercial site (gas station/mini mart). Future traffic noise levels at the proposed outdoor activity areas (backyards) nearest to the project roadways are also predicted to exceed the City's exterior noise standard. At the nearest proposed residential upper-floor building facades of Lots 1-3, the data indicates that predicted future traffic noise exposure would be approximately 81 dB Ldn.

Impact N-1: Exterior Areas

The proposed Gold Hill Village 3 Residential Development project site will be exposed to future traffic noise exposure in excess of the City of Fairfield exterior traffic noise level standards applied to residential developments.

Mitigation Measure N-1: Exterior Areas

At the lots nearest to Interstate 680, Lots 1-6, satisfying the City of Fairfield normally acceptable exterior noise level standard of 60 dB Ldn may be infeasible due to required barriers heights in excess of 14 feet. The resulting recommended noise barrier heights along the property line nearest to Interstate 680 range from 8 to 11 feet in height and have been illustrated on Figure 2 of the Environmental Noise Assessment. After

reduced ground absorption of sound at elevated locations, traffic noise levels are expected to be approximately 3 dB higher at upper-floor facades than first-floor locations. Standard residential construction (wood siding, STC-27 windows, door weather-stripping, exterior wall insulation, composition plywood roof), results in an exterior to interior noise reduction of at least 25 dB with windows closed and approximately 15 dB with windows open.

After consideration of the shielding provided the recommended noise barriers, first-floor facades of residences within the development are expected to be exposed to future traffic noise levels of less than 65 dB L_{cn}. Therefore, standard construction (STC-27 windows) would be acceptable for shielded first-floor facades. However, at elevated (unshielded) second-floor facades, standard construction would fail to provide the required noise reduction. In addition to the recommended window upgrades, mechanical ventilation (air conditioning) should be provided for all residences within this development to allow the occupants to close doors and windows as desired for additional acoustical isolation.

Mitigation Measures N-3: Interior Areas

1. The recommended window ratings within the development shall range from the standard rating of STC-27 up to a rating of STC-38. The recommended window upgrades are applicable to all windows from which the either Highway 680, Lopes Road, or Gold Hill Road would be visible. The window STC ratings required to achieve satisfaction with the city's 45 dB L_{dn} interior traffic noise level standard are summarized in Table 5 and illustrated in Figure 2 of the Environmental Noise Assessment. The recommended window upgrade locations shall be in accordance with Table 5 and Figure 2 of the Environmental Noise Assessment.
2. Mechanical ventilation (air conditioning) shall be provided for all residences in this development to allow the occupants to close doors and windows as desired to achieve compliance with the applicable interior noise level criteria.

Impact N-4: Commercial Area

A portion of the project site is located immediately adjacent to an existing commercial use. Specifically, an existing gas station is located adjacent to proposed Lots 30-33 and 39-42. The primary noise source during the measurements was attributed to traffic noise generated from Lopes Road with limited activity at the adjacent parking lot. Due to the proposed interface between residential and commercial uses, a 6-foot tall noise barrier is recommended along the rear of the adjacent lots. The location of the recommended noise barrier is illustrated on Figure 2 of the Environmental Noise Assessment.

Mitigation Measure N-4: Commercial Area

A 6-foot tall noise barrier, as illustrated on Figure 2 of the Environmental Noise Assessment, shall be constructed along the shared property line of the existing adjacent commercial use and the proposed residential lots. The noise barrier shall be a solid masonry wall. The recommended noise barrier will ensure satisfaction with the City of

Discussion: Responses were solicited from public service providers regarding the proposal. No adverse comments were received. The project has been reviewed by the Building and Fire Safety Division, Fire Department and Police Department. The project has been forwarded to all public service providers that would service the site.

It is anticipated that the City of Fairfield will be adequately prepared to respond to and administer emergency fire and medical services to the site. The City of Fairfield established threshold for fire services is stated in the City's General Plan Public Facilities and Services Element, Policy PF 15.1:

Provide enough staffing and fire stations to ensure that at least 80 percent of residential dwelling units in any response area are located within five minutes maximum travel time of a station. Where the number of dwelling units within five minutes' travel time of any response area falls below 80 percent, the City shall take the appropriate steps to ensure that the above standard is maintained. In addition, fire stations shall be located to ensure that all target hazards are within five minutes travel time from a fire station where feasible.

Fire Department Station 35 is located 1.1 miles north of the project site at 600 Lopes Road. The proposed project is located within the 5-minute response time window and is anticipated to respond to service requests at the project site, with the ability to call upon mutual aid and auto response agreements when needed. Station 35 currently and historically receives the lowest call volume of all Fairfield Fire Stations and is equipped with brand new facilities. Therefore, additional or modified facilities will not be needed in order to maintain established performance objectives.

The Fairfield Police Department provides law enforcement services within the City and is adequately equipped to provide emergency services to the site. The nearest police station operated by the City of Fairfield Police Department is located at 1000 Webster Street and is located approximately 10 miles away from the project site. The Cordelia reporting area of the City, where the project is located, has a higher than average call volume when compared to other areas of the City. However, the Police Department actively patrols the Cordelia area and the Department has an average response time of 4 minutes, 1 second from dispatch to arrival for Priority One calls which is within the City's established threshold. The City of Fairfield established threshold for police services is stated in the City's General Plan Public Facilities and Services Element, Policy PF 16.1:

Maintain an average emergency response time of under 5 minutes and an average non-emergency response time of under 20 minutes.

Emergency response times for the Department are almost a full minute below (better than) the City's established threshold. As the department actively patrols the area and operates well below established thresholds, it is not anticipated that new facilities will be needed in order to maintain acceptable response times as a result of the proposed project nor are any facilities proposed.

XVII. TRANSPORTATION – Would the project:

Potentially
Significant
Impact Less Than
Significant
With
Mitigation Less than
Significant
Impact No
Impact

- c) Substantially increase hazards due to a geometric design feature (e.g., sharp curves or dangerous intersections) or incompatible uses (e.g., farm equipment)? X
- d) Result in inadequate emergency access? X

Discussion: The threshold of significance for traffic analysis is contained in Objective CI3 of the Circulation element of the General Plan. The Objective states that to “Provide timely and effective means of programming street and highway improvements to maintain a P.M. peak hour Level of Service of “D” or better for arterial streets, Level of Service “C” or better for collector streets, and LOS “B” or better for local streets, unless other public health, safety, or welfare factors determine otherwise.”

A Transportation Impact Report was prepared for the project by Abrams Associates. Existing traffic operating conditions (LOS levels) have been determined for all key local intersections that may be affected by the project. Five (5) study intersections have been selected as those most likely to be affected by the proposed project and include:

- 1) Lopes Road at the Proposed Project Entrance
- 2) Lopes Road at Oakbrook Drive
- 3) Lopes Road at Gold Hill Road
- 4) 1-680 Southbound Ramps at Gold Hill Road
- 5) 1-680 Northbound Ramps at Gold Hill Road

The following table summarizes the associated LOS computation results for the existing weekday AM and PM peak hour conditions. As shown in following table, existing study intersections currently operate at acceptable conditions (LOS D or better) during the weekday AM and PM peak hours with the exception of Intersection #5 (the 1-680 Northbound Ramps at Gold Hill Road) which currently operates at LOS F during the AM peak hour.

INTERSECTION		CONTROL	PEAK HOUR	EXISTING	
				Delay	LOS
1	LOPES RD & PROJECT ENTRANCE	Two Way Stop	AM	N/A	N/A
			PM	N/A	N/A
2	OAKBROOK DR & LOPES RD	Two Way Stop	AM	12.2	B
			PM	12.0	B
3	GOLD HILL RD & LOPES RD	Signalized	AM	27.2	C
			PM	17.7	B
4	I-680 SOUTHBOUND RAMPS & GOLD HILL RD	Two Way Stop	AM	17.9	C
			PM	15.2	C

Hill Village Unit 2 subdivision currently under construction and the approved Pacific Flyway Center project. This scenario was developed based on the assumption that the earliest completion date for this project would be 2019. All study intersections would continue to operate at acceptable intersections (LOS D or better) during the weekday and weekend peak hours with the exception of the I-680 NB Ramps at Gold Hill road which would continue to operate at LOS F during A.M. peak hour. This intersection is not forecast to meet any of Caltrans' established warrants for the installation of a traffic signal and therefore, this would not be considered a significant impact.

The project Cumulative Scenario (year 2035) corresponds to the build-out of the Solano County and City of Fairfield General Plans which include significant transportation and land use changes. The major freeway improvements assumed in this scenario are collectively known as the I-80/I-680/SR 12 Interchange Project. Given the significant land use and roadway network changes proposed for the project study area and the proximity to the freeway interchange, the Solano Transportation Authority (STA) Travel Demand Model was selected as the most appropriate tool to provide future traffic projections. The forecasted traffic volumes at the study intersections and roadway segments for year 2035 were based on the most recently updated version of the STA Travel Demand Model. The model includes all capital improvement program roadway improvements programmed through 2035 as well as full General Plan build-out land uses within Solano County.

The projected intersection turning movement volume for Cumulative 2035 conditions plus project traffic at the study intersections (during the weekday and weekend AM and PM peak hours) is shown in the following table. All study intersections would continue to operate at acceptable conditions (LOS D or better) during AM and PM peak hours with the exception of the I-680 NB Ramps at Gold Hill Road which would continue to operate at LOS F during the weekday A.M. peak hour.

	INTERSECTION	CONTROL	PEAK HOUR	EXISTING		EXISTING PLUS PROJECT	
				Delay	LOS	Delay	LOS
1	LOPES RD & PROJECT ENTRANCE	Two Way Stop	AM	N/A	N/A	12.7	B
			PM	N/A	N/A	11.9	B
2	OAKBROOK DR & LOPES RD	Two Way Stop	AM	10.6	B	11.2	B
			PM	12.8	B	14.4	B
3	GOLD HILL RD & LOPES RD	Signalized	AM	22.3	C	23.0	C
			PM	19.1	B	19.5	B
4	I-680 SOUTHBOUND RAMPS & GOLD HILL RD	Two Way Stop	AM	21.8	C	22.5	C
			PM	18.7	C	19.8	C
5	I-680 NORTHBOUND RAMPS & GOLD HILL RD	Two Way Stop	AM	>50.0	F	>50.0	F
			PM	27.7	D	30.7	D

In all scenarios evaluated in the Traffic Impact Report, none of the five intersections evaluated experienced LOS levels below the acceptable conditions (LOS D or better) during P.M. peak hours. The project does not conflict with the City's General Plan

XVIII. TRIBAL CULTURAL RESOURCES – Would the project cause a substantial adverse change in the significance of a tribal cultural resource, defined in Public Resources Code section 21074 as either a site, feature, place, cultural landscape that is geographically defined in terms of the size and scope of the landscape, sacred place, or object with cultural value to a California Native American tribe, and that is:

	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant With Mitigation	Less than Significant Impact	No Impact
a) Listed or eligible for listing in the California Register of Historical Resources, or in a local register of historical resources as defined in Public Resources Code section 5020.1(k), or			X	
b) A resource determined by the lead agency, in its discretion and supported by substantial evidence, to be significant pursuant to criteria set forth in subdivision (c) of Public Resources Code Section 5024.1. In applying the criteria set forth in subdivision (c) of Public Resources Code Section 5024.1, the lead agency shall consider the significance of the resource to a California Native American tribe.		X		

Discussion: The City notified the Yocha Dehe Wintun Nation pursuant to Public Resources Code Section 21080.3.1 of the project on September 26, 2018. On October 23, 2018 the Yocha Dehe Wintun Nation concluded that the project site is within their aboriginal territories, and that the project could impact known archeological deposits and cultural sites. City staff began a dialogue with the Yocha Dehe Wintun Nation to determine their concerns. Subsequently, the Yocha Dehe Wintun Nation requested a formal consultation on the project to evaluate their cultural concerns on November 19, 2018. Although outside of the 30 day window to request such consultation, City staff attempted to contact and work with the Yocha Dehe Wintun Nation and to provide them with additional information on the project necessary for their review. The Yocha Dehe Wintun Nation was initially responsive to the City staff in their attempts to schedule a consultation and provide additional project information. After 5 attempts to contact the Yocha Dehe by phone and email to schedule a consultation that received no response, the City halted efforts to consult with the Tribe. On January 11, 2019, the Yocha Dehe Wintun Nation sent a letter recommending cultural monitors at the project site during development and ground disturbance to reduce potential impacts to any known cultural resources. While no known cultural resources exist on site, ground disturbance activities could result in the identification of previously undiscovered tribal cultural resources.

XIX. UTILITIES AND SERVICE SYSTEMS – Would the project:

Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant With Mitigation	Less than Significant Impact	No Impact
--------------------------------------	--	------------------------------------	--------------

- g) Comply with federal, state, and local management and reduction statutes and regulations related to solid waste?

X

Discussion: The responsible departments and agencies for wastewater and water supply have reviewed the project and determined that capacities will be adequate. Existing utilities and service systems are able to accommodate this development. The project will connect to existing City of Fairfield water lines and storm drain facilities. Fairfield's source water originates from Lake Berryessa and the Sacramento-San Joaquin Delta. The City meets the water quality guidelines set by the California Division of Drinking Water (CDDW) and the US Environmental Protection Agency (USEPA).

The Fairfield-Suisun Sewer District (FSSD) has reviewed the project and is identified as a Responsible Agency. The project is proposing to connect to the Fairfield-Suisun Sewer District (FSSD) line that currently transects the project site. The applicant will make the connection to the collection system per FSSD standards.

The FSSD has allocated treatment capacity not being used for the site in which it was originally intended and analyzed. The sewer district incorporated this property into their previous master plan and determined that enough capacity exists to serve the site under its current land use designation of Mixed Use. A Mixed Use project on the 11.44-acre site would have an estimated maximum daily flow of 40,268 gallons per day (gpd). There is a known treatment capacity available which greatly exceeds the anticipated flows for the Project. Using the same FSSD design standards for flow projections, the estimated maximum daily flow for the 79-unit residential Project is between 18,170-25,675 gpd. Utilizing this FSSD analyzed sewer capacity for the Project's anticipated flow is appropriate and will not negatively affect FSSD's ability to meet the demands of the provider's existing commitments.

The FSSD is currently updating their sewer master plan using new dynamic modeling software. As such, the applicant is unable to run a precise capacity analysis with the FSSD according to their standards at this time. FSSD is incorporating the proposed project into their master plan update efforts to look at capacity issues however, these efforts will not be complete for some months. A capacity analysis of the collection system will be formally completed by the applicant and submitted to FSSD once the plan has been updated, to determine the precise capacity availability and if any excess, beyond the amounts described here, is available

Additionally, the FSSD operates a sewer lift station located on Lopes Road that lies southwest of the proposed project entrance. The applicant will be required to provide

Although the project is not located within an SRA, moderate fire hazard severity zones exist on site. The site is adjacent to LRA unzoned land to the west which contains urban developed land consisting of single-family subdivisions. The project is adjacent to LRA high fire hazard severity zone to the east within the Suisun Marsh. The project site itself is flat and the nearest sloped land is roughly a quarter mile to the west through the adjacent single-family subdivisions. Prevailing winds blow southwest. The site is not expected to be affected by downstream flooding or landslides, as a result of runoff, post-fire slope instability or drainage changes.

(Source: 6, 7, 8, 21)

	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant With Mitigation	Less than Significant Impact	No Impact
XXI. <u>MANDATORY FINDINGS OF SIGNIFICANCE</u>				
a) Does the project have the potential to significantly degrade the quality of the environment, substantially reduce the habitat of a fish or wildlife species, cause a fish or wildlife population to drop below self-sustaining levels, threaten to eliminate a plant or animal community, substantially reduce the number or restrict the range of a rare or endangered plant or animal or eliminate important examples of the major periods of California history or prehistory?			X	
b) Does the project have impacts that are individually limited, but cumulatively considerable? ("Cumulatively considerable" means that the incremental effects of a project are considerable when viewed in connection with the effects of past projects, the effects of other current projects, and the effects of probable future projects)?		X		
c) Does the project have environmental effects which will cause substantial adverse effects on human beings, either directly or indirectly?		X		

Discussion: The Initial Study identified potential significant project impacts relative to biological resources, cultural resources, greenhouse gas and noise. All of the identified impacts can be reduced to insignificant levels through implementation of Mitigation Measures referenced in the Initial Study. Therefore, a Mitigated Negative Declaration has been prepared for the project to satisfy the requirements of the California Environmental Quality Act.

18. State of California, Department of Conservation, *Solano County Williamson Act Map*, FY 2013/2014.
19. State of California, Department of Conservation, *Solano County Important Farmland Map*, 2016.
20. State of California, Department of Conservation, State Geologist, *Special Studies Zones, Revised Map*, 2015.
21. State of California, Department of Forestry & Fire Protection, Solano County: *Draft Fire hazard Severity Zones in LRA*, October 3, 2007.
22. State of California, Department of Transportation, *Officially Designated Scenic Highways List*, 2017.
23. Solano County, Department of Resource Management, *Travis Air Force Base Land Use Compatibility Plan*, Adopted October 8, 2015.
24. Solano County, Solano Local Agency Formation Commission, *Pacific Flyway Education Center Focused MSR and SOI*, Adopted December 10, 2018.
25. Swaim Biological Inc., *Biological Resources Assessment for the Gold Hill Village 3 Project*, August 2017.
26. TRC Engineers, *Phase 1 Environmental Site Assessment*, August 17, 2017.
27. Yorke Engineering, LLC., *Air Quality Analysis for Gold Hill III*, September 21, 2017.