

## 2.7 HAZARDS AND HAZARDOUS MATERIALS

ENVIRONMENTAL ISSUES	Impacts not Peculiar to the Project	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant with Mitigation Incorporated	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
<b>VII. Hazards and Hazardous Materials. Would the project:</b>					
a) Create a significant hazard to the public or the environment through the routine transport, use, or disposal of hazardous materials?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
b) Create a significant hazard to the public or the environment through reasonably foreseeable upset and/or accident conditions involving the release of hazardous materials into the environment?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
c) Emit hazardous emissions or handle hazardous or acutely hazardous materials, substances, or waste within one-quarter mile of an existing or proposed school?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
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?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
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 for people residing or working in the project area?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
f) For a project within the vicinity of a private airstrip, would the project result in a safety hazard for people residing or working in the project area?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
g) Impair implementation of or physically interfere with an adopted emergency response plan or emergency evacuation plan?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
h) Expose people or structures to a significant risk of loss, injury, or death involving wildland fires, including where wildlands are adjacent to urbanized areas or where residences are intermixed with wildlands?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>

## ENVIRONMENTAL SETTING

The types of hazards and hazardous materials analyzed within the General Plan EIR include hazardous and toxic materials, hazardous waste, toxic releases, leaking underground storage tanks, brownfields, transportation of hazardous and toxic materials, wildfire risk, and airports. The County Department of Resource Management is the certified unified program agency for all cities and unincorporated areas in Solano County and is responsible for permitting and inspecting businesses regarding hazardous materials and waste.

Most of the Suisun Valley is within the Travis Air Force Base Airport influence area. The *Travis AFB Land Use Compatibility Plan* (Travis LUCP) addresses restrictions on residential development using compatibility zones. Non-residential development is also addressed by the Travis LUCP according to the number of people per acre and established noise sensitivity of different land uses and activities. The General Plan requires the County to comply with the Travis LUCP. There are no restrictions on development associated with the airport's area of influence.

Most of Suisun Valley is within a low or no wildland fire hazard area. For those areas within very high or extremely high wildland fire hazard areas, the General Plan includes policies restricting development within such areas. There are also policies governing the general safety of the area through site planning, fire agency coordination, and fire prevention.

## DISCUSSION

**a) Create a significant hazard to the public or the environment through the routine transport, use, or disposal of hazardous materials?**

The Draft SVSP is consistent with the land use assumptions evaluated in the General Plan EIR. The General Plan EIR (pages 4.13-10 and 4.13-11) concluded that implementation of the programs within the General Plan combined with existing federal and state regulations would reduce the potential impacts of the routine transportation of hazardous materials on county roadways. This impact would be **less than significant**.

**b) Create a significant hazard to the public or the environment through reasonably foreseeable upset and/or accident conditions involving the release of hazardous materials into the environment?**

The Draft SVSP is consistent with the land use assumptions evaluated in the General Plan EIR. The General Plan EIR (pages 4.13-10 and 4.13-11) concluded that implementation of the programs within the General Plan combined with existing federal and state regulations would reduce the potential impacts involved with the potential release of hazardous materials into the environment. This impact would be **less than significant**.

- c) **Emit hazardous emissions or handle hazardous or acutely hazardous materials, substances, or waste within one-quarter mile of an existing or proposed school?**

The Draft SVSP is consistent with the land use assumptions evaluated in the General Plan EIR. The General Plan EIR (pages 4.13-10 and 4.13-11) concluded that implementation of the programs within the General Plan combined with existing federal and state regulations would reduce the potential impacts involved with the potential emission of hazardous materials within one-quarter mile of an existing or proposed school. This impact would be **less than significant**.

- d) **Be located on a site which is included on a list of hazardous materials sites compiled pursuant to Government Code §65962.5 and, as a result, would it create a significant hazard to the public or the environment?**

No hazardous materials sites are located within the Suisun Valley. Therefore, **no impact** would occur.

- 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 for people residing or working in the project area?**

The Draft SVSP is consistent with the land use assumptions evaluated in the General Plan EIR. The General Plan EIR (pages 4.13-11 and 4.13-12) concluded that implementation of policies and programs within the General Plan address potential airport hazards. This impact would be **less than significant**.

- f) **For a project within the vicinity of a private airstrip, would the project result in a safety hazard for people residing or working in the project area?**

No private airstrips operate within or near the Suisun Valley. Therefore, **no impact** would occur.

- g) **Impair implementation of or physically interfere with an adopted emergency response plan or emergency evacuation plan?**

The Draft SVSP is consistent with the land use assumptions evaluated in the General Plan EIR. The General Plan EIR (pages 4.13-12 and 4.13-13) concluded that implementation of policies would ensure that future development would not interfere with emergency response plans. This impact would be **less than significant**.

- h) **Expose people or structures to a significant risk of loss, injury, or death involving wildland fires, including where wildlands are adjacent to urbanized areas or where residences are intermixed with wildlands?**

The Draft SVSP is consistent with the land use assumptions evaluated in the General Plan EIR. The General Plan EIR (pages 4.13-14 and 4.13-15) concluded that implementation of policies would ensure that people or structures would not be exposed to a significant risk of loss of injury involving wildland fires. This impact would be **less than significant**.

## 2.8 HYDROLOGY AND WATER QUALITY

ENVIRONMENTAL ISSUES	Impacts not Peculiar to the Project	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant with Mitigation Incorporated	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
<b>VIII. Hydrology and Water Quality. Would the project:</b>					
a) Violate any water quality standards or waste discharge requirements?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
b) Substantially deplete groundwater supplies or interfere substantially with groundwater recharge such that there would be a net deficit in aquifer volume or a lowering of the local groundwater table level (e.g., the production rate of pre-existing nearby wells would drop to a level that would not support existing land uses or planned uses for which permits have been granted)?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
c) Substantially alter the existing drainage pattern of the site or area, including through the alteration of the course of a stream or river, in a manner which would result in substantial on- or off-site erosion or siltation?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
d) Substantially alter the existing drainage pattern of the site or area, including through the alteration of the course of a stream or river, or substantially increase the rate or amount of surface runoff in a manner which would result in on- or off-site flooding?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
e) Create or contribute runoff water which would exceed the capacity of existing or planned stormwater drainage systems or provide substantial additional sources of polluted runoff?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
f) Otherwise substantially degrade water quality?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
g) Place housing within a 100-year flood hazard area as mapped on a federal Flood Hazard Boundary or Flood Insurance Rate Map or other flood hazard delineation map?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
h) Place within a 100-year flood hazard area structures that would impede or redirect flood flows?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
i) Expose people or structures to a significant risk of loss, injury, or death involving flooding, including flooding as a result of the failure of a levee or dam?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>

ENVIRONMENTAL ISSUES	Impacts not Peculiar to the Project	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant with Mitigation Incorporated	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
j) Result in inundation by seiche, tsunami, or mudflow?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>

## ENVIRONMENTAL SETTING

Water resources in the Suisun Valley include the Putah South Canal, various wells, and pipelines. Exhibits 4.5-1 and 4.5-2 within the General Plan EIR show the water service areas and major water resources, watersheds, and water bodies in Solano County. The EIR discussed the surface and groundwater supplies in Solano County. This includes the Putah South Canal which runs through Suisun Valley near Mankas Corner to the western boundary. The General Plan included numerous policies and programs aimed at analyzing and planning for the County's water supply.

The Suisun Valley would not be at risk in case of a levee failure, but could potentially be at risk with the failure of one of Solano County's 18 dams. As shown on page 4.5-29 of the General Plan EIR, areas of Suisun Valley including Mankas Corner Road, Rockville Road, Abernathy Road, and Suisun Valley Road fall within the 100-year floodplain. Along with existing the Solano County Water Agency Flood Control Master Plan, the General Plan also addressed flooding issues by limiting development within the floodplain, restoring riparian areas and water channels, and requiring methods to reduce sedimentation leading to local flooding.

## DISCUSSION

### a) Violate any water quality standards or waste discharge requirements?

The Draft SVSP is consistent with the land use assumptions evaluated in the General Plan EIR. The General Plan EIR (pages 4.5-38 to 4.5-45 and 4.5-51 to 4.5-53) concluded that implementation of policies and programs in the General Plan, combined with current land use, stormwater, grading, erosion, and flood control regulations, would result in a **less-than-significant** impact.

### b) Substantially deplete groundwater supplies or interfere substantially with groundwater recharge such that there would be a net deficit in aquifer volume or a lowering of the local groundwater table level (e.g., the production rate of pre existing nearby wells would drop to a level that would not support existing land uses or planned uses for which permits have been granted)?

The Draft SVSP is consistent with the land use assumptions evaluated in the General Plan EIR. The General Plan EIR (pages 4.5-53 to 4.5-55) concluded that implementation of policies and programs in the General Plan would result in a **less-than-significant** impact.

- c) **Substantially alter the existing drainage pattern of the site or area, including through the alteration of the course of a stream or river, in a manner which would result in substantial on- or off-site erosion or siltation?**

The Draft SVSP is consistent with the land use assumptions evaluated in the General Plan EIR, and would not result in the alteration of the course of a stream or river. This impact was analyzed within the General Plan EIR on pages 4.5-45 to 4.5-51. The General Plan EIR concluded that implementation of the policies and programs in the General Plan, combined with current grading, erosion, and flood control regulations, would result in a **less-than-significant** impact.

- d) **Substantially alter the existing drainage pattern of the site or area, including through the alteration of the course of a stream or river, or substantially increase the rate or amount of surface runoff in a manner which would result in on- or off-site flooding?**

The Draft SVSP is consistent with the land use assumptions evaluated in the General Plan EIR. This impact was analyzed within the General Plan EIR on pages 4.5-45 to 4.5-51. The General Plan EIR concluded that implementation of the policies and programs in the General Plan, combined with current grading, erosion, and flood control regulations, would result in a **less-than-significant** impact.

- e) **Create or contribute runoff water which would exceed the capacity of existing or planned stormwater drainage systems or provide substantial additional sources of polluted runoff?**

The Draft SVSP is consistent with the land use assumptions evaluated in the General Plan EIR. The General Plan EIR (page 4.5-50) concluded that implementation of the policies and programs in the General Plan, combined with current grading, erosion, and flood control regulations, would result in a **less-than-significant** impact.

- f) **Otherwise substantially degrade water quality?**

The Draft SVSP is consistent with the land use assumptions evaluated in the General Plan EIR. The General Plan EIR (pages 4.5-38 to 4.5-45 and 4.5-51 to 4.5-53) concluded that implementation of the policies and programs in the General Plan, combined with current land use, stormwater, grading, and erosion control regulations, would result in a **less-than-significant** impact.

- g) **Place housing within a 100-year flood hazard area as mapped on a federal Flood Hazard Boundary or Flood Insurance Rate Map or other flood hazard delineation map?**

The Draft SVSP is consistent with the land use assumptions evaluated in the General Plan EIR. The General Plan EIR (pages 4.5-55 to 4.5-62) concluded that implementing the policies and programs in the General Plan combined with flood control regulations would minimize the exposure of people or structures to flood hazards resulting from development, thereby resulting in a **less-than-significant** impact.

**h) Place within a 100-year flood hazard area structures that would impede or redirect flood flows?**

See “g)” above.

**i) Expose people or structures to a significant risk of loss, injury, or death involving flooding, including flooding as a result of the failure of a levee or dam?**

The Draft SVSP is consistent with the land use assumptions evaluated in the General Plan EIR. The General Plan EIR (pages 4.5-55 to 4.5-62) concluded that implementing the policies in the General Plan combined with relevant state and local regulations would minimize the potential for effects on Solano County from inundation as a result of dam or levee failure. Therefore, this impact would be **less than significant**.

**j) Result in inundation by seiche, tsunami, or mudflow?**

Suisun Valley is located over seven miles from Grizzly Bay/Suisun Bay and over 15 miles from Lake Berryessa. Therefore, no water bodies are nearby that could cause flooding by seiche or tsunami. Future development pursuant to the Draft SVSP would need to comply with codes and regulations for appropriate development setbacks from areas subject to mudflows, in compliance with local, state, and federal requirements. Compliance with such regulation would result in a **less-than-significant impact**.

## 2.9 LAND USE AND PLANNING

ENVIRONMENTAL ISSUES	Impacts not Peculiar to the Project	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant with Mitigation Incorporated	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
<b>IX. Land Use and Planning. Would the project:</b>					
a) Physically divide an established community?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
b) Conflict with any applicable land use plan, policy, or regulation of an agency with jurisdiction over the project (including, but not limited to, a general plan, specific plan, local coastal program, or zoning ordinance) adopted for the purpose of avoiding or mitigating an environmental effect?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
c) Conflict with any applicable habitat conservation plan or natural community conservation plan?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>

### ENVIRONMENTAL SETTING

The General Plan EIR, starting on page 4.1-2, describes Solano County as having been rural in character since the county was established, with most land used for either agricultural purposes (crop cultivation and grazing) or natural resources. The County has historically required areas that receive water and sewer service to be incorporated within a city. Approval of the Orderly Growth Initiative in 1994 furthered the direction of growth into cities. Because of the robust agricultural economy and these growth management policies, 95% of Solano County's population lives within the cities. In 2000, only 19,322 of the county's 394,542 residents lived in the unincorporated area. As shown in Table 1 in the project description, 92% of the land uses on the Suisun Valley's 9,084 acres are in agriculture.

As described in the Project Description (page 3-7) of the General Plan EIR, the General Plan proposed new land uses within the Suisun Valley: 75 acres of Neighborhood Agricultural/Tourist Centers (ATCs). The General Plan mapped and described the general locations of eight such centers. The Draft SVSP delineates the size and locations for the eight ATCs consistent with the General Plan.

### DISCUSSION

#### a) Physically divide an established community?

The Draft SVSP would allow for the development of ATCs and additional uses within the agricultural zone, and describes potential right-of-way expansions. This type of proposed development would not result in the division of an



established community. Furthermore, the Draft SVSP is consistent with the land use assumptions evaluated in the General Plan EIR. The General Plan EIR (starting on page 4.1-11) concluded that implementing the General Plan would not result in significant division of existing communities. This impact would be **less than significant**.

**b) Conflict with any applicable land use plan, policy, or regulation of an agency with jurisdiction over the project (including, but not limited to, a general plan, specific plan, local coastal program, or zoning ordinance) adopted for the purpose of avoiding or mitigating an environmental effect?**

The Draft SVSP is consistent with the land use assumptions evaluated in the General Plan EIR. The General Plan EIR (page 4.1-15) concluded that there would be no conflict with applicable land use plans, policies, or regulatory agencies. However, the proposed project includes an update to certain zoning regulations which, by definition, would result in a conflict with existing zoning. As such updates to the zoning regulations were anticipated within the General Plan and General Plan EIR, the impact would be **less than significant**.

**c) Conflict with any applicable habitat conservation plan or natural community conservation plan?**

See response “f)” in the Biological Resources section. This impact would be **less than significant**.

## 2.10 MINERAL RESOURCES

ENVIRONMENTAL ISSUES	Impacts not Peculiar to the Project	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant with Mitigation Incorporated	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
<b>X. Mineral Resources. Would the project:</b>					
a) Result in the loss of availability of a known mineral resource that would be of value to the region and the residents of the state?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
b) Result in the loss of availability of a locally important mineral resource recovery site delineated on a local general plan, specific plan, or other land use plan?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>

### ENVIRONMENTAL SETTING

Mineral resources mined or produced within Solano County include mercury, sand and gravel, clay, stone products, calcium, and sulfur. Known mineral resource zones in Solano County consist of areas located northeast of Vallejo, south and southeast of Green Valley, and south and east of Travis Air Force Base. Some portions of the mineral resource zones are located within the SVSP area. The General Plan EIR described the policies and programs in the General Plan to reduce the impacts to mineral resources. These actions included ensuring that future development is compatible with the resource areas and preserving the mineral resource areas for the future. The EIR found that implementation of General Plan policies and programs, along with compliance with existing California Surface Mining and Reclamation Act (SMARA) regulations, reduce the impacts to mineral resources to a less-than-significant level.

Additional detail on these resources may be found within the General Plan EIR on pages 4.7-34 to 4.7-36.

### DISCUSSION

- a) **Result in the loss of availability of a known mineral resource that would be of value to the region and the residents of the state?**

The Draft SVSP is consistent with the land use assumptions evaluated in the General Plan EIR. The General Plan EIR (page 4.7-52) concluded that, with the implementation of General Plan policies ensuring that areas within or near known mineral resources are designated for compatible uses, the impact related to loss of availability of a known mineral resource would be **less than significant**.

**b) Result in the loss of availability of a locally important mineral resource recovery site delineated on a local general plan, specific plan, or other land use plan?**

The Draft SVSP is consistent with the land use assumptions evaluated in the General Plan EIR. The General Plan EIR (page 4.7-53) concluded that, as the only known area of a locally important mineral resource recovery was designated for agriculture, and agriculture is compatible with mineral resource extraction, the impact would be **less than significant**.

## 2.11 NOISE

ENVIRONMENTAL ISSUES	Impacts not Peculiar to the Project	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant with Mitigation Incorporated	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
<b>XI. Noise. Would the project result in:</b>					
a) Exposure of persons to or generation of noise levels in excess of standards established in the local general plan or noise ordinance, or in other applicable local, state, or federal standards?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
b) Exposure of persons to or generation of excessive groundborne vibration or groundborne noise levels?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
c) A substantial permanent increase in ambient noise levels in the project vicinity above levels existing without the project?	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
d) A substantial temporary or periodic increase in ambient noise levels in the project vicinity above levels existing without the project?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
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 expose people residing or working in the project area to excessive noise levels?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
f) For a project within the vicinity of a private airstrip, would the project expose people residing or working in the project area to excessive noise levels?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>

## ENVIRONMENTAL SETTING

The Federal Highway Administration Highway Traffic Noise Prediction Model (FHWA-RD-77-108), with California Vehicle Noise (CALVENO) emission levels, was used to predict traffic noise levels within the Solano County limits. The use of the Federal Highway Administration model is considered acceptable for the development of traffic noise predictions for projects consistent with the General Plan.

The General Plan EIR concluded that future development of noise-sensitive uses (e.g., residential dwellings, schools, hospitals, parks, hotels, places of worship, libraries) would occur in areas that either are currently exposed to or will be exposed to future traffic, railroad, or aircraft noise with a day-night average noise level ( $L_{dn}$ ) exceeding 35 A-weighted decibels (dBA) for sensitive interior areas and 64 dBA for sensitive outdoor areas. Development would also

occur within areas exposed to non-transportation noise exceeding 55 dBA energy-equivalent noise level ( $L_{eq}$ ) and 70 dBA maximum noise level ( $L_{max}$ ) during the day and 50 dBA  $L_{eq}$  and 65 dBA  $L_{max}$  at night in outdoor areas; and 35 dBA  $L_{eq}$  and 50 dBA  $L_{max}$  at night for day and night for interior areas. Noise levels exceeding these standards (listed in Tables 4.3-9 and 4.3-10 of the General Plan EIR) would represent a significant impact. Programs in the General Plan require implementation of project-specific noise mitigation measures (acoustical studies, buffering, and other noise abatement measures, as necessary) to mitigate this impact.

As indicated in Table 4.3-8 of the General Plan EIR, implementation of the General Plan, combined with regional growth and traffic conditions, would cause changes in traffic noise levels in Suisun Valley and elsewhere relative to existing levels, generally ranging from a decrease of 2 dBA to an increase of 5 dBA. A 12-dBA increase is projected on the North Connector in south Suisun Valley. Because a traffic noise level increase of 1.5 to 5 dBA  $L_{dn}$  is commonly considered the threshold of significance, depending on existing levels without the proposed project, the thresholds of significance would be exceeded. The General Plan EIR concludes that implementation of General Plan policies and Mitigation Measure 4.3-4a, individually or collectively, could result in a reduction of traffic noise levels at the locations of affected sensitive receptors. Despite the implementation of such a noise abatement program, it is infeasible to ensure that existing residential uses would not be exposed to future traffic noise levels exceeding the County's noise standards or significantly exceeding levels they are exposed to today. For this reason, the General Plan EIR found that buildout of the General Plan could result in a substantial permanent increase in ambient noise levels.

Airport land use compatibility plans help to reduce the potential for land use conflicts between the airports and surrounding uses. State law requires future land use development near airports to be consistent with compatibility criteria included in such a plan. Policies in the General Plan reiterate this law and require all development within airport land use compatibility areas/safety zones to comply with height, noise, and safety policies set forth by the airport land use commission in the airports' comprehensive land use plans. There are no public airports or public use airports within two miles of Suisun Valley. The closest airports are Travis Air Force Base, about eight miles away and the Nut Tree Airport, about 11 miles away.

## DISCUSSION

- a) **Exposure of persons to or generation of noise levels in excess of standards established in the local general plan or noise ordinance, or in other applicable local, state, or federal standards?**

The Draft SVSP is consistent with the land use assumptions evaluated in the General Plan EIR. The General Plan EIR (page 4.3-29) concluded that implementing the General Plan's programs would reduce the potential for noise levels in areas of new noise-sensitive land uses within the Suisun Valley to exceed the standards shown in the General Plan

EIR and adopted by the County within the General Plan, and would reduce the potential for noise levels from new noise-generating land uses to exceed the noise standards. Therefore, this impact would be **less than significant**.

**b) Exposure of persons to or generation of excessive groundborne vibration or groundborne noise levels?**

Construction and demolition activities associated with future projects implemented under the Draft SVSP have the potential to result in varying degrees of temporary groundborne vibration, depending on the specific construction equipment used, the location of construction activities relative to receptors, and the operations involved. Vibration generated by construction equipment spreads through the ground and diminishes in magnitude with increases in distance. Also, the type and density of soil can affect the transmission of energy.

The Draft SVSP is consistent with the land use assumptions evaluated in the General Plan EIR. The construction equipment required for future projects is not known at this time, but it could include maximum generation of vibration from trucks and bulldozers. Implementing Mitigation Measure 4.3-4a (Adopt Countywide Noise Reduction Program) as described in the General Plan EIR on page 4.3-31 would reduce this impact to a **less-than-significant** level.

**c) A substantial permanent increase in ambient noise levels in the project vicinity above levels existing without the project?**

The Draft SVSP is consistent with the land use assumptions evaluated in the General Plan EIR. The General Plan EIR (page 4.3-29) concluded that that buildout of the General Plan could result in a substantial permanent increase in ambient noise levels. However, the project's contribution to this is **not an impact peculiar to the project** within the meaning of State CEQA Guidelines Section 15183. The General Plan EIR, and the related findings adopted by the Solano County Board of Supervisors, identified noise impacts as significant and unavoidable. To the extent that the proposed project contributes incrementally to those impacts, Section 15183 permits the County to conclude that such impacts have been adequately discussed and disclosed in the County's EIR.

**d) A substantial temporary or periodic increase in ambient noise levels in the project vicinity above levels existing without the project?**

The Draft SVSP is consistent with the land use assumptions evaluated in the General Plan EIR. The General Plan EIR (page 4.3-29) concluded that the policies and programs in the General Plan require the use of project-specific noise mitigation measures (acoustical studies, buffering, and other noise abatement measures, as necessary) to mitigate this impact. Therefore, this impact would be **less than significant**.

- 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 expose people residing or working in the project area to excessive noise levels?**

There are no public airports or public use airports within two miles of Suisun Valley. The closest airports are at Travis Air Force Base, about eight miles away and the Nut Tree Airport, about 11 miles away. The project area is not within the noise contours of any airport; therefore, there would be **no impact**.

- f) **For a project within the vicinity of a private airstrip, would the project expose people residing or working in the project area to excessive noise levels?**

There are no private airstrips in or near Suisun Valley. There would be **no impact** related to exposure to noise from private airstrips.

## 2.12 POPULATION AND HOUSING

ENVIRONMENTAL ISSUES	Impacts not Peculiar to the Project	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant with Mitigation Incorporated	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
<b>XII. Population and Housing. Would the project:</b>					
a) Induce substantial population growth in an area, either directly (for example, by proposing new homes and businesses) or indirectly (for example, through extension of roads or other infrastructure)?	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
b) Displace substantial numbers of existing homes, necessitating the construction of replacement housing elsewhere?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
c) Displace substantial numbers of people, necessitating the construction of replacement housing elsewhere?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>

### ENVIRONMENTAL SETTING

Most land in the unincorporated area of Solano County is in use for either agricultural purposes (crop cultivation and grazing) or natural resources. The County has historically required areas that receive water and sewer service to be incorporated within a city. Approval of the Orderly Growth Initiative in 1994 furthered the direction of growth into cities. Because of the robust agricultural economy and these growth management policies, 95% of the county's population lives within cities. In 2000, only 19,322 of Solano County's 394,542 residents lived in the unincorporated area.

Solano County's total population grew by 7% between 2000 and 2006, with growth occurring largely within the incorporated cities. The rate of growth in the unincorporated portions of the county was only 2%. Although growth has been slow in recent years, it should be noted that between 1980 and 1990 the unincorporated portions of the county experienced a 33% increase in population. The growth that occurred during this time period occurred primarily as rural residential development within areas designated Rural Residential in the County General Plan.

Solano County's housing stock increased by 22.8% between 1990 and 2005. The vast majority of the housing stock was developed in the cities. Housing stock grew by only 2.6% in the unincorporated areas of the county between 1990 and 2005.

The potential for population growth within the Suisun Valley was accounted for within the General Plan. Although minimal, this population growth would be a part of the County's overall growth. As described within the General Plan EIR, no feasible mitigation is available for the expected population growth that would not interfere with other adopted



goals and policies. For this reason, the General Plan EIR found that buildout of the General Plan could result in substantial population growth.

## DISCUSSION

**a) Induce substantial population growth in an area, either directly (for example, by proposing new homes and businesses) or indirectly (for example, through extension of roads or other infrastructure)?**

The Draft SVSP is consistent with the land use and population assumptions evaluated in the General Plan EIR. The General Plan EIR (page 4.1-21) concluded that growth would be induced. However, the project's contribution to this is **not an impact peculiar to the project** within the meaning of State CEQA Guidelines Section 15183. The General Plan EIR, and the related findings adopted by the Solano County Board of Supervisors, identified population growth impacts as significant and unavoidable. To the extent that the proposed project contributes incrementally to those impacts, Section 15183 permits the County to conclude that such impacts have been adequately discussed and disclosed in the General Plan EIR.

**b) Displace substantial numbers of existing homes, necessitating the construction of replacement housing elsewhere?**

However, the Draft SVSP is consistent with the land use assumptions analyzed in the General Plan EIR. The General Plan EIR found that, although it would be possible that buildout of the General Plan would result in the displacement of existing dwelling units, the occurrence of such displacement would be rare. As stated in the EIR, the General Plan did not include any redevelopment areas and did not explicitly convert designated residential areas to nonresidential designations. Incidents of displacement would occur primarily as existing dwellings on agricultural land are displaced as the land is converted to a nonagricultural use. The number of dwelling units displaced by such conversions would be limited and the impact would be less than significant (Page 4.1-22). Therefore, because the Draft SVSP implements the General Plan, implementation of the Draft SVSP would result in a **less-than-significant** impact.

**c) Displace substantial numbers of people, necessitating the construction of replacement housing elsewhere?**

The Draft SVSP is consistent with the population and land use assumptions analyzed in the General Plan EIR. The General Plan EIR found although it would be possible that people would be displaced through implementation of the General Plan, the number of dwelling units that would be removed would be low. Additionally, all development that results in the displacement of people or dwelling units would be subject to the California Relocation Law, and the County would be required to prepare a relocation plan, provide relocation payments, and identify substitute housing opportunities. For these reasons, the General Plan EIR found that the impact would be less than significant (Page 4.1-23).

Therefore, because the Draft SVSP implements the General Plan, implementation of the Draft SVSP would result in a **less-than-significant** impact.

## 2.13 PUBLIC SERVICES

ENVIRONMENTAL ISSUES	Impacts not Peculiar to the Project	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant with Mitigation Incorporated	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
<b>XIII. Public Services. Would the project:</b>					
a) Result in substantial adverse physical impacts associated with the provision of new or physically altered governmental facilities, or the need for new or physically altered governmental facilities, the construction of which could cause significant environmental impacts, in order to maintain acceptable service ratios, response times, or other performance objectives for any of the public services:					
Fire protection?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Police protection?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Schools?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Parks?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Other public facilities?	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>

### ENVIRONMENTAL SETTING

Public services within the Suisun Valley are provided through a wide variety of agencies: two fire districts, the Solano County Office of Education, Solano Community College, the County Sheriff's Office, and the Solano County Library. Further descriptions of these agencies and services are found within the General Plan EIR, starting on page 4.9-1.

Implementing the Draft SVSP would allow for additional residents, businesses, and other development, which would increase the need for law enforcement services, fire protection services, schools, parks, and other facilities which serve residents. The General Plan is intended to achieve steady and orderly growth that allows for adequate provision of services and community facilities. To support this goal, the General Plan outlines policies to ensure the provision of adequate public services to provide a safe environment in Solano County.

Although student enrollment has shown an average decline over the last 5 years, based on the growth that could be accommodated in the General Plan, it can be assumed that new school facilities would need to be constructed. The actual location of new and expanded facilities would depend on where growth occurs relative to city limits and planning areas; schools would probably be located in residential areas, near the student populations they serve. New development projects would be assessed impact fees in accordance with Senate Bill 50, the Leroy F. Greene School Facilities Act of 1998 (Chapter 407, Statutes of 1998) to finance capital improvements for public school facilities.

Payment of these fees would help to ensure that adequate facilities are provided concurrently with growth. Note that potential environmental impacts that may occur as a result of new or expanded public school facilities would be analyzed as part of a separate environmental review process.

The 2003 Park and Recreation Element of the General Plan contains goals, objectives, and policies meant to guide the development and management of Solano County's parks and recreational facilities. Objective 2 of the element requires an acres-to-population park standard of 10 total acres of local and regional parkland for every 1,000 persons living in the county. Policy A of Objective 2 directs the County to work with other agencies and private interests to provide for adequate regional parkland and facilities. Policy C of Objective 2 requires the County to encourage efforts by local agencies to achieve their objectives for providing local parkland. Other chapters of the General Plan contain additional policies and programs that augment the element, and Mitigation Measure 4.14-1a of the General Plan EIR requires developers to pay fair-share park and recreation impact fees. Environmental impacts that may occur as a result of new or expanded parks in the Suisun Valley or elsewhere would be evaluated as part of a separate environmental analysis.

The County's library facilities have been unable to keep pace with the growing size of Solano County's population. Expansion of existing branches and construction of new facilities would be required to maintain an acceptable level of service. The construction of these facilities could result in significant environmental impacts. Such impacts could include dust, noise, erosion, and sedimentation from construction and grading activities. Policies and programs of the General Plan would help to offset the need for additional library services by requiring that new development pay fair-share fees and that the County review and assess potential impacts of new development on existing services. For this reason, the General Plan EIR found that buildout of the General Plan could result in impacts to the County's libraries.

## DISCUSSION

- a) **Result in substantial adverse physical impacts associated with the provision of new or physically altered governmental facilities, or the need for new or physically altered governmental facilities, the construction of which could cause significant environmental impacts, in order to maintain acceptable service ratios, response times, or other performance objectives for any of the public services:**

### Fire protection?

The Draft SVSP is consistent with the land use and population assumptions evaluated in the General Plan EIR. The General Plan EIR (page 4.9-52) concluded that implementing the goal and policies included in the General Plan would address impacts related to population growth for Solano County under buildout of the plan, including fire protection. Therefore, this impact would be **less than significant**.

### **Police protection?**

The Draft SVSP is consistent with the land use and population assumptions evaluated in the General Plan EIR. The General Plan EIR (page 4.9-53) concluded that implementation of the goals and policies would reduce this impact to a **less-than-significant** level.

### **Schools?**

Implementing the Draft SVSP could result in a population increase. However, the Draft SVSP is consistent with the land use and population assumptions evaluated in the General Plan EIR. The General Plan EIR (page 4.9-51) concluded that potentially significant impacts that may result from increased enrollment in schools are addressed by General Plan goals and policies, and the required payment of impact fees. Therefore, this impact would be **less than significant**.

### **Parks?**

The Draft SVSP is consistent with the land use and population assumptions evaluated in the General Plan EIR. The General Plan EIR (pages 4.14-4 to 4.14-6) concluded that implementation of Mitigation Measure 4.14-1 would result in a **less-than-significant** impact.

### **Other public facilities?**

The Draft SVSP is consistent with the land use and population assumptions evaluated in the General Plan EIR. The General Plan EIR (page 4.9-54) concluded that buildout of the General Plan could result in impacts to the County's libraries. However, the project's contribution to this is **not an impact peculiar to the project** within the meaning of State CEQA Guidelines Section 15183. The General Plan EIR, and the related findings adopted by the Solano County Board of Supervisors, identified library impacts as significant and unavoidable. To the extent that the proposed project contributes incrementally to those impacts, Section 15183 permits the County to conclude that such impacts have been adequately discussed and disclosed in the County's EIR.

## 2.14 RECREATION

ENVIRONMENTAL ISSUES	Impacts not Peculiar to the Project	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant with Mitigation Incorporated	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
<b>XIV. Recreation. Would the project:</b>					
a) Increase the use of existing neighborhood and regional parks or other recreational facilities such that substantial physical deterioration of the facility would occur or be accelerated?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
b) Include recreational facilities or require the construction or expansion of recreational facilities that might have an adverse physical effect on the environment?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>

### ENVIRONMENTAL SETTING

The Suisun Valley is a rural area with limited residential and business uses. The California Department of Parks and Recreation operates two parks in Solano County, neither of which is located in the Suisun Valley. The park closest to the Suisun Valley is Rockville Hills Regional Park, located to the west of the Suisun Valley and owned and managed by the City of Fairfield. No neighborhood or community parks are located in the Suisun Valley. Solano County as a whole has 10 open-space areas open to public recreation.

Objective 1 of the 2003 Park and Recreation Element of the General Plan requires the coordination of the planning and development of regional recreational facilities. Policy E of Objective 1 directs the County to pursue cost-effective joint or reciprocal agreements with other governmental jurisdictions or private groups for the acquisition, development, and operation of regional recreational facilities. Policy B of Objective 1 requires the County to work with local agencies and districts in identifying regional recreational needs and supporting plans and programs for those facilities. Mitigation Measure 4.14-1a of the General Plan EIR requires developers to pay fair-share park and recreation impact fees.

## DISCUSSION

- a) **Increase the use of existing neighborhood and regional parks or other recreational facilities such that substantial physical deterioration of the facility would occur or be accelerated?**

The Draft SVSP is consistent with the land use and population assumptions evaluated in the General Plan EIR. The General Plan EIR (page 4.14-6) concluded that implementation of Mitigation Measure 4.14-1 would result in a **less-than-significant** impact.

- b) **Include recreational facilities or require the construction or expansion of recreational facilities that might have an adverse physical effect on the environment?**

The Draft SVSP would not include recreational facilities, nor would it require the construction or expansion of recreational facilities that might have an adverse physical effect on the environment. Therefore, **no impact** would occur.

## 2.15 TRANSPORTATION/TRAFFIC

ENVIRONMENTAL ISSUES	Impacts not Peculiar to the Project	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant with Mitigation Incorporated	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
<b>XV. Transportation/Traffic. Would the project:</b>					
a) Cause an increase in traffic which is substantial in relation to the existing traffic load and capacity of the street system (i.e., result in a substantial increase in either the number of vehicle trips, the volume to capacity ratio on roads, or congestion at intersections)?	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
b) Exceed, individually or cumulatively, a level of service standard established by the county congestion management agency for designated roads or highways?	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
c) Result in a change in air traffic patterns, including either an increase in traffic levels or a change in location that results in substantial safety risks?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
d) Substantially increase hazards due to a design feature (e.g., sharp curves or dangerous intersections) or incompatible uses (e.g., farm equipment)?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
e) Result in inadequate emergency access?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
f) Result in inadequate parking capacity?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
g) Conflict with adopted policies, plans, or programs supporting alternative transportation (e.g., bus turnouts, bicycle racks)?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>

## ENVIRONMENTAL SETTING

Transportation in Solano County is provided through many different modes. These transportation modes present various mobility choices for county residents, employees, and visitors, depending on their destinations and the reasons for their trips. The longest trips on the transportation network are taken by persons commuting to work. Commuters often use the transportation network during the mornings and afternoons, creating the most congestion on a regional basis. Table 4.4-1 on page 4.4-1 of the General Plan EIR summarizes the modes used by Solano County residents when they commuted to work during 2000, when the last large survey was taken. These data showed that the largest percentage of residents commuted in single-occupant vehicles, and that carpoolers were another substantial share of the county's commuters.



The General Plan EIR, starting on page 4.4-1, described the current (2007) traffic conditions, projects scheduled within the General Plan time horizon, transportation safety, transit service, rail operations, area airports, waterway transportation, the pedestrian network, and the bicycle network.

The General Plan EIR examined the traffic impacts potentially caused by implementing the General Plan. With adoption and implementation of the policies in the General Plan, combined with implementation of roadway improvement projects, impacts on roadway LOS in Solano County would be reduced. However, implementing the General Plan policies alone would not be sufficient to reduce these impacts to a less-than-significant level. Furthermore, many of the proposed roadway projects (listed on page 4.4-41 of the General Plan EIR) are under the jurisdiction of the California Department of Transportation (Caltrans), and others are sponsored by local cities and funded substantially by project development fees in those cities; as a result, the County cannot guarantee their implementation, nor can funding for those projects be guaranteed. For this reason, the General Plan EIR found that buildout of the General Plan could result in an increase in traffic volume and traffic congestion.

## DISCUSSION

- a) **Cause an increase in traffic which is substantial in relation to the existing traffic load and capacity of the street system (i.e., result in a substantial increase in either the number of vehicle trips, the volume to capacity ratio on roads, or congestion at intersections)?**

The Draft SVSP is consistent with the land use and population assumptions evaluated in the General Plan EIR. The General Plan EIR (pages 4.4-41 to 4.4-43) concluded that this impact would be significant. However, the project's contribution to this is **not an impact peculiar to the project** within the meaning of State CEQA Guidelines Section 15183. The General Plan EIR, and the related findings adopted by the Solano County Board of Supervisors, identified traffic impacts as significant and unavoidable. To the extent that the proposed project contributes incrementally to those impacts, Section 15183 permits the County to conclude that such impacts have been adequately discussed and disclosed in the General Plan EIR.

- b) **Exceed, individually or cumulatively, a level of service standard established by the county congestion management agency for designated roads or highways?**

See "a)" above.

- c) **Result in a change in air traffic patterns, including either an increase in traffic levels or a change in location that results in substantial safety risks?**

The Draft SVSP is consistent with the land use and population assumptions evaluated in the General Plan EIR. The General Plan EIR (page 4.4-52) concluded implementing the General Plan could result in increased air traffic safety risks or changed air traffic patterns at the county's two general-aviation airports and one military airport. However,

with implementation of existing airport land use compatibility plans, development regulations, and policies contained in the General Plan, this impact would be **less than significant**.

**d) Substantially increase hazards due to a design feature (e.g., sharp curves or dangerous intersections) or incompatible uses (e.g., farm equipment)?**

Land uses proposed within the Draft SVSP are the same as those within the General Plan. No design features are proposed in the Draft SVSP that would result in increased hazards. The Draft SVSP does propose roadway modifications that would result in improved access, turning lanes, visibility, lane width, and shoulder width. These improvements would allow space for disabled vehicles to be removed from traveling lanes, provide greater visibility for pedestrians, and alert drivers when they were entering a known pedestrian area. Implementation of the Draft SVSP would improve current conditions for drivers, pedestrians, and bicyclists, therefore, this impact would be **less than significant**.

**e) Result in inadequate emergency access?**

The Draft SVSP is consistent with the land use, population, and transportation assumptions evaluated in the General Plan EIR. The General Plan EIR (page 4.4-44) concluded that implementing the General Plan could create an increase in conditions that could negatively affect emergency access. The General Plan, however, includes policies such as maintaining and improving the roadway system to design standards that would result in a **less-than-significant** impact.

**f) Result in inadequate parking capacity?**

Implementing the Draft SVSP would result in additional parking demand for new activities that are allowed. Depending on the nature of the new activities, the potential exists for inadequate parking capacity. However, with application of parking standards contained in the County Zoning Regulations, this impact would be **less than significant**.

**g) Conflict with adopted policies, plans, or programs supporting alternative transportation (e.g., bus turnouts, bicycle racks)?**

The Draft SVSP is consistent with the land use and population assumptions evaluated in the General Plan EIR. The General Plan EIR (page 4.4-51) concluded that a policy in the General Plan providing alternative transportation equivalent standing to travel by automobile would ensure that if a proposed project conflicts with the support of alternative transportation, the viability of alternative modes of transportation would be upheld. For this reason, this impact would be **less than significant**.

## 2.16 UTILITIES AND SERVICE SYSTEMS

ENVIRONMENTAL ISSUES	Impacts not Peculiar to the Project	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant with Mitigation Incorporated	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
<b>XVI. Utilities and Service Systems. Would the project:</b>					
a) Exceed wastewater treatment requirements of the applicable Regional Water Quality Control Board?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
b) Require or result in the construction of new water or wastewater treatment facilities or expansion of existing facilities, the construction of which could cause significant environmental effects?	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
c) Require or result in the construction of new storm water drainage facilities or expansion of existing facilities, the construction of which could cause significant environmental effects?	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
d) Have sufficient water supplies available to serve the project from existing entitlements and resources, or are new or expanded entitlements needed?	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
e) Result in a determination by the wastewater treatment provider that serves or may serve the project that it has adequate capacity to serve the project's projected demand, in addition to the provider's existing commitments?	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
f) Be served by a landfill with sufficient permitted capacity to accommodate the project's solid waste disposal needs?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
g) Comply with federal, state, and local statutes and regulations related to solid waste?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>

### ENVIRONMENTAL SETTING

Unincorporated areas of Solano County obtain water from a variety of sources. Some unincorporated areas are in Municipal Service Areas (MSAs) or are served by existing water districts. Unincorporated areas, such as the Suisun Valley, outside of these districts demand water for agricultural and domestic purposes, with agriculture being the largest water user. The discussion in the General Plan EIR, starting on page 4.9-1, describes the water sources and supply in Solano County, including surface water supplied by Solano County Water Agency, groundwater sources, local supplies of surface water provisions through existing water districts, and public and private water wells.

Within MSAs in Solano County, existing wastewater treatment is provided by wastewater facilities; where treatment systems are not available, including most rural areas of the county, wastewater is treated using centralized systems and on-site septic systems. The Division of Environmental Health of the County's Department of Resource Management regulates wastewater provisions throughout the unincorporated areas outside of MSAs; larger systems are subject to the approval by the San Francisco Bay and Central Valley Regional Water Quality Control Boards.

Demand for water would continue to increase with the population and job growth projected under the General Plan, and the need for additional water supply facilities could increase. Facilities required to serve projected population growth and development could include additional groundwater wells, water treatment facilities, pipelines, pump houses, and wells. As water reuse increases, facilities that recycle used water may also be needed. Wastewater facilities could include additional on-site or shared septic and packaged treatment plants. Additional stormwater facilities could also be needed. The site-specific impacts of these facilities cannot be determined until such facilities are proposed and subjected to environmental review. Typical impacts related to new facilities would be the responsibility of those service districts where expansion is proposed, but would likely consist of impacts from construction-related noise, dust, and grading. Because facilities may be located near streams or water bodies, impacts on fish and wildlife, erosion, and streamflow may also occur. Although General Plan policies may reduce some of the adverse environmental impacts associated with the construction and operation of new or expanded water supply or wastewater facilities, analysis of site-specific impacts was beyond the scope of the General Plan EIR. Such impacts would be evaluated as part of a separate environmental review for the individual project.

Current water supplies should be sufficient to serve the proposed growth in the unincorporated areas. However, the amount of water extracted from independent groundwater wells, including small systems and private wells, is not restricted and has not been quantified. Most water users in rural areas of the county would continue to be dependent on groundwater to meet their water needs. Uncertainty about long-term availability of water supplies and facilities and the lack of direct County jurisdiction over public water supplies in the region results in a level of uncertainty about the adequacy of future supplies in unincorporated areas. Further, recent depletion of the Tehama Formation aquifer would suggest that groundwater availability may also be compromised in the future. Mitigation Measure 4.9-1a(1) in the General Plan EIR may reduce some portion of the impact associated with water supply—this includes actions to ensure sufficient water supplies for development projects—but the measure would not reduce this impact to a less-than-significant level. Similarly, implementing Mitigation Measure 4.9-1a(2) (countywide groundwater balance budget and monitoring program) would partially reduce the impact of insufficient water supplies associated with uncertain future availability of groundwater. However, the ability of groundwater supplies to meet the increased water demand resulting from implementation of the General Plan would remain uncertain.

Buildout of the General Plan would result in increased urban development in unincorporated areas that would generate additional wastewater. Most new development approved by the county would be served by individual septic systems, and possibly a small number of centralized treatment systems. The County anticipates that additional residential development and some agricultural industrial development will occur in rural portions of the county. Current County records of the number of individual wastewater systems do not quantify existing capacity limits. New developments are assessed for generation amounts, and treatment requirements are permitted on a case-by-case basis.

Project review procedures and policies and programs included in the adopted General Plan provide a framework to ensure adequate wastewater services for unincorporated areas using methods similar to those currently used, such as development of small-scale treatment systems and individual stand-alone wastewater systems (septic tanks and engineered systems). Compliance with the General Plan policies and programs would improve the likelihood that the increased demand for these services would be met. Furthermore, the County requires that new developments apply for and comply with permits for individual stand-alone and small-scale treatment systems. Current regulations and policies would provide an effective mechanism to provide wastewater services to areas where future development is expected; however, some uncertainty exists about the long-term ability to serve the growing county's wastewater needs. Implementing Mitigation Measure 4.9-3a in the General Plan EIR would assist the County in ensuring that sufficient service capacity is available to serve future growth projected in the General Plan, but this measure would not reduce this impact below the level of significance.

Growth permitted under the General Plan would result in additional solid waste in Solano County. The Hay Road Landfill has existing capacity and is expected to remain in operation for approximately 64 years, while the Potrero Hills Landfill has existing capacity and is projected to remain in operation until approximately 2058. The current and planned capacity of the Potrero Hills Landfill and the Hay Road Landfill would be sufficient to serve the population growth projected to occur under the General Plan.

## **DISCUSSION**

### **a) Exceed wastewater treatment requirements of the applicable Regional Water Quality Control Board?**

The Draft SVSP is consistent with the land use and population assumptions evaluated in the General Plan EIR. The General Plan EIR (page 4.5-45) concluded that the implementation of the goals, policies, and programs in the General Plan, combined with current land use, stormwater, grading, and erosion control regulations would result in a **less-than-significant** impact.

**b) Require or result in the construction of new water or wastewater treatment facilities or expansion of existing facilities, the construction of which could cause significant environmental effects?**

The Draft SVSP is consistent with the land use and population assumptions evaluated in the General Plan EIR. The General Plan EIR (page 4.9-43) concluded that buildout of the General Plan could result in significant impacts related to the construction of new or expanded water or wastewater treatment facilities. Such impacts would be evaluated as part of a separate environmental review for the individual project. However, the Draft SVSP's contribution to this is **not an impact peculiar to the project** within the meaning of State CEQA Guidelines Section 15183. The General Plan EIR, and the related findings adopted by the Solano County Board of Supervisors, identified impacts as significant and unavoidable. To the extent that the proposed project contributes incrementally to those impacts, Section 15183 permits the County to conclude that such impacts have been adequately discussed and disclosed in the General Plan EIR.

**c) Require or result in the construction of new storm water drainage facilities or expansion of existing facilities, the construction of which could cause significant environmental effects?**

The Draft SVSP is consistent with the land use and population assumptions evaluated in the General Plan EIR. The General Plan EIR (page 4.5-52) concluded that buildout of the General Plan could result in significant impacts related to the construction of new or expanded storm water drainage facilities. Such impacts would be evaluated as part of a separate environmental review for the individual project. However, the Draft SVSP's contribution to this is **not an impact peculiar to the project** within the meaning of State CEQA Guidelines Section 15183. The General Plan EIR, and the related findings adopted by the Solano County Board of Supervisors, identified impacts as significant and unavoidable. To the extent that the proposed project contributes incrementally to those impacts, Section 15183 permits the County to conclude that such impacts have been adequately discussed and disclosed in the General Plan EIR.

**d) Have sufficient water supplies available to serve the project from existing entitlements and resources, or are new or expanded entitlements needed?**

The Draft SVSP is consistent with the land use and population assumptions evaluated in the General Plan EIR. The General Plan EIR (page 4.9-41) concluded that buildout of the General Plan could result in significant impacts related to the availability of sufficient water supplies. However, the Draft SVSP's contribution to this is **not an impact peculiar to the project** within the meaning of State CEQA Guidelines Section 15183. The General Plan EIR, and the related findings adopted by the Solano County Board of Supervisors, identified impacts as significant and unavoidable. To the extent that the proposed project contributes incrementally to those impacts, Section 15183 permits the County to conclude that such impacts have been adequately discussed and disclosed in the County's EIR.

- e) **Result in a determination by the wastewater treatment provider that serves or may serve the project that it has adequate capacity to serve the project's projected demand, in addition to the provider's existing commitments?**

The Draft SVSP is consistent with the land use and population assumptions evaluated in the General Plan EIR. The General Plan EIR (page 4.9-45) concluded that buildout of the General Plan could result in significant impacts related to wastewater treatment capacity. However, the project's contribution to this is **not an impact peculiar to the project** within the meaning of State CEQA Guidelines §15183. The General Plan EIR, and the related findings adopted by the Solano County Board of Supervisors, identified impacts as significant and unavoidable. To the extent that the proposed project contributes incrementally to those impacts, Section 15183 permits the County to conclude that such impacts have been adequately discussed and disclosed in the County's EIR.

- f) **Be served by a landfill with sufficient permitted capacity to accommodate the project's solid waste disposal needs?**

The Draft SVSP is consistent with the land use and population assumptions evaluated in the General Plan EIR. The General Plan EIR (page 4.9-49) concluded that implementation of policies in the General Plan regarding recycling, landfill capacity, and waste reduction, as well as compliance with the California Integrated Waste Management Act, would result in a **less-than-significant** impact.

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

The Draft SVSP is consistent with the land use and population assumptions evaluated in the General Plan EIR. The General Plan EIR (page 4.9-49) concluded that implementation of the policies in the General Plan regarding solid waste disposal and reduction, as well as compliance with the California Integrated Waste Management Act, would result in a **less-than-significant** impact.

## 2.17 MANDATORY FINDINGS OF SIGNIFICANCE

ENVIRONMENTAL ISSUES	Impacts not Peculiar to the Project	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant with Mitigation Incorporated	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
<b>XVII. Mandatory Findings of Significance.</b>					
a) Does the project have the potential to substantially 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, reduce the number or restrict the range of an endangered, rare, or threatened species, or eliminate important examples of the major periods of California history or prehistory?	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
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.)	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
c) Does the project have environmental effects that will cause substantial adverse effects on human beings, either directly or indirectly?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>

Authority: Public Resources Code Sections 21083 and 21087.

Reference: Public Resources Code Sections 21080(c), 21080.1, 21080.3, 21082.1, 21083, 21083.3, 21093, 21094, 21151; *Sundstrom v. County of Mendocino*, 202 Cal.App.3d 296 (1988); *Leonoff v. Monterey Board of Supervisors*, 222 Cal.App.3d 1337 (1990).

### DISCUSSION

- a) **Does the project have the potential to substantially 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, reduce the number or restrict the range of an endangered, rare, or threatened species, or eliminate important examples of the major periods of California history or prehistory?**

As evaluated in the Biological Resources section of this IS, the proposed project would not substantially degrade the quality of the environment; substantially reduce the habitat of a fish or wildlife species; cause a fish or wildlife species population to drop below self-sustaining levels; threaten to eliminate a plant or animal community; or reduce the number or restrict the range of an endangered, rare, or threatened species.



The Draft SVSP is consistent with the land use and population assumptions evaluated in the General Plan EIR. With respect to historical built-environment resources, the General Plan EIR found that implementation of the General Plan could eliminate important examples of the built environment which would result in a significant impact. However, the project's incremental contribution to this is **not an impact peculiar to the project** within the meaning of State CEQA Guidelines Section 15183. Rather, the General Plan EIR, and the related findings adopted by the Solano County Board of Supervisors, identified historical resource impacts as significant and unavoidable. To the extent that the proposed project contributes incrementally to those impacts, Section 15183 permits the County to conclude that such impacts have been adequately discussed and disclosed in the General Plan EIR.

**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.)**

With respect to air quality, the General Plan EIR found that future urban development under the General Plan would contribute considerably to nonattainment conditions in Solano County by adding vehicle trips, accommodating construction, and through other means, would result in a significant cumulative impact. However, the project's incremental contribution to nonattainment conditions is **not an impact peculiar to the project** within the meaning of State CEQA Guidelines Section 15183. Rather, the General Plan EIR, and the related findings adopted by the Solano County Board of Supervisors, identified cumulative air quality impacts as significant and unavoidable. To the extent that the proposed project contributes incrementally to those impacts, Section 15183 permits the County to conclude that such impacts have been adequately discussed and disclosed in the County's EIR.

With respect to greenhouse gas (GHG) emissions, the General Plan EIR found the General Plan's cumulative impact on climate change to be significant and unavoidable. The General Plan includes multiple policies and implementation programs that would reduce GHG emissions associated with activities in the County, which are discussed on pages 6-34 through 6-42 of the General Plan EIR. The Draft SVSP is consistent with the land uses identified in the General Plan. Thus, the project's incremental contribution to GHG emissions is **not an impact peculiar to the project** within the meaning of State CEQA Guidelines Section 15183. Rather, the General Plan EIR, and the related findings adopted by the Solano County Board of Supervisors, identified cumulative greenhouse gas impacts as significant and unavoidable. To the extent that the proposed project contributes incrementally to those impacts, Section 15183 permits the County to conclude that such impacts have been adequately discussed and disclosed in the County's EIR.

In addition to the above, the General Plan EIR found that the General Plan would make a cumulatively considerable contribution to impacts in respect to land use, noise, transportation and circulation, hydrology and water resources, biological resources, geology and soils, agricultural resources, public services and utilities, cultural and paleontological resources, aesthetic resources, energy, hazards and hazardous materials, recreation, and climate

change. However, the Draft SVSP is consistent with the land use and population assumptions analyzed in the General Plan EIR. Thus, the project's incremental contribution to cumulative impacts is **not peculiar to the project** within the meaning of State CEQA Guidelines Section 15183. Rather, the General Plan EIR, and the related findings adopted by the Solano County Board of Supervisors, identified the above-mentioned cumulative impacts as significant and unavoidable. To the extent that the proposed project contributes incrementally to those impacts, Section 15183 permits the County to conclude that such impacts have been adequately discussed and disclosed in the County's EIR.

**c) Does the project have environmental effects that will cause substantial adverse effects on human beings, either directly or indirectly?**

In the evaluation of environmental impacts in this IS, the potential for adverse direct or indirect impacts on human beings was considered in the response to certain questions in the sections "Aesthetics"; "Air Quality"; "Geology and Soils"; "Noise"; "Population and Housing"; and "Transportation/Traffic." As a result of this evaluation, there is no substantial evidence that implementation of the Draft SVSP would result in environmental effects that would cause a substantial adverse effect on human beings. Therefore, this project has been determined not to meet this mandatory finding of significance.

### 3 REFERENCES

California Air Resources Board. 2009. Ambient Air Quality Standards and Area Designation Maps - State and National. Available: <<http://www.arb.ca.gov/deg/adm/adm.htm#state>>. Accessed December 2, 2009.

ARB. *See* California Air Resources Board.

EPA. *See* U.S. Environmental Protection Agency.

Richter, K. R., and A. D. Sokolow. 2007 (September 14). *The Economic Roots of Solano County Agriculture. Report II: Solano Agricultural Futures Project*. University of California Agricultural Issues Center. Davis, CA. With assistance from J. Howard, Solano County Agricultural Commissioner; C. Patterson, UC Cooperative Extension, Solano County; and M. Moratorio, UC Cooperative Extension, Solano County.

Solano County. 2008. *General Plan*. Adopted August 4, 2008. Prepared by EDAW, Sacramento, CA.

UC Agricultural Issues Center. *See* University of California Agricultural Issues Center.

U.S. Environmental Protection Agency. 2009. Proposed Designations for Federal PM2.5 Standard. Available: <<http://www.epa.gov/pmdesignations/2006standards/documents/2009-10-08/map.htm> Accessed December 2, 2009.