Initial Study / Mitigated Negative Declaration
William J. Carroll Government Center
Vacaville, Solano County, California

Prepared for:

County of Solano
Department of General Services, Division of Architectural Services
675 Texas Street, Suite 2500
Fairfield, CA  94533
707.784.7908

Contact:  James M. Bezek, Associate County Architect

Prepared by:

Michael Brandman Associates
Bishop Ranch 3
2633 Camino Ramon, Suite 460
San Ramon, CA 94583
925.830.2733

Contact:  Jason M. Brandman, Project Director
Trevor Macenski, REA, Project Manger

April 19, 2010
TABLE OF CONTENTS

Section 1: Background ............................................................................................................... 1
  1.1 - Background Data ........................................................................................................... 1
  1.2 - Additional Data .............................................................................................................. 3

Section 2: Other Agencies ...................................................................................................... 9

Section 3: Consistency with Existing General Plan, Zoning, and Other Applicable Land Use Controls .......................................................................................................................... 11
  3.1 - Purpose ......................................................................................................................... 13
  3.2 - Project Description ....................................................................................................... 13

Section 4: Environmental Thresholds and Discussion ........................................................ 21
  4.1 - Aesthetics ...................................................................................................................... 21
  4.2 - Agriculture Resources .............................................................................................. 29
  4.3 - Air Quality .................................................................................................................. 31
  4.4 - Biological Resources ................................................................................................. 40
  4.5 - Cultural Resources ..................................................................................................... 49
  4.6 - Geology and Soils ....................................................................................................... 52
  4.7 - Greenhouse Gas Emissions (Climate Change) ............................................................ 58
  4.8 - Hazards and Hazardous Materials ............................................................................. 62
  4.9 - Hydrology and Water Quality .................................................................................... 68
  4.10 - Land Use and Planning ............................................................................................. 72
  4.11 - Mineral Resources ................................................................................................... 74
  4.12 - Noise .......................................................................................................................... 75
  4.13 - Population and Housing .......................................................................................... 86
  4.14 - Public Services .......................................................................................................... 88
  4.15 - Recreation .................................................................................................................. 91
  4.16 - Transportation / Traffic ............................................................................................ 93
  4.17 - Utilities and Service Systems ................................................................................... 113
  4.18 - Mandatory Findings of Significance ....................................................................... 116

Section 5: References ............................................................................................................ 119

Section 6: List of Preparers ................................................................................................... 123

Appendix A: Air Quality and Climate Change Analysis
Appendix B: Biological Data
Appendix C: Geotechnical Investigation
Appendix D: Phase I and II Environmental Site Assessments
Appendix E: Noise Data
Appendix F: Traffic Impact Analysis
Appendix G: Infrastructure Study
LIST OF TABLES

Table 1: Proposed Uses ................................................................. 15
Table 2: Estimated Construction Emissions .................................. 32
Table 3: Operational Emissions .................................................... 33
Table 4: Local Carbon Monoxide Concentrations ...................... 34
Table 5: Special-Status Wildlife Species .................................... 45
Table 6: Fault Summary ............................................................... 53
Table 7: Project Operational Greenhouse Gases ....................... 59
Table 8: Existing Noise Level Measurements Results ................ 76
Table 9: Near-Term Project Noise Contributions ........................ 78
Table 10: Cumulative Project Noise Contributions ..................... 79
Table 11: Vibration Source Levels for Construction Equipment .... 81
Table 12: Existing Conditions - Intersection Level of Service ...... 96
Table 13: Near-Term No Project - Intersection Level of Service .... 96
Table 14: Trip Generation ............................................................. 103
Table 15: Trip Distribution ......................................................... 103
Table 16: Near Term Plus Project - Intersection Levels of Service 104
Table 17: Cumulative Plus Project - Intersection Levels of Service 107

LIST OF EXHIBITS

Exhibit 1: Regional Location Map ............................................. 5
Exhibit 2: Local Vicinity Map General Plan Land Uses ............... 7
Exhibit 3: Site Concept .............................................................. 19
Exhibit 4: Site Photographs ....................................................... 27
Exhibit 5: Recorded Occurrences of Special-Status Species within 5 Miles of the Project ....................................................... 43
Exhibit 6: Study Area and Intersection Locations .................... 97
Exhibit 7: Existing Conditions Peak Hour Intersection Turning Movement Volumes 99
Exhibit 8: Near-Term No Project Peak Hour Intersection Turning Movement Volumes 101
Exhibit 9: Near-Term Plus Project Peak Hour Intersection Turning Movement Volumes 105
Exhibit 10: Cumulative (2030) Plus Project Peak Hour Intersection Turning Movement Volumes ............................................. 109
### SECTION 1: BACKGROUND

#### 1.1 - Background Data

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th><strong>Project Title</strong></th>
<th>William J. Carroll Government Center</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Application Number</strong></td>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Project Location</strong></td>
<td>The project site is located at 1119 East Monte Vista Avenue and is bound by Vacaville Redevelopment Agency property (currently vacant) to the north, a mobile home park to the east, East Monte Vista Avenue to the south, and private property to the west. (Exhibit 1 and Exhibit 2.)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Assessor's Parcel Number (APNs)</strong></td>
<td>0129-320-030 and 0129-320-210</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Project Sponsor’s Name and Address</strong></td>
<td>County of Solano, Lead Agency Department of General Services Division of Architectural Services 675 Texas Street, Suite 2500 Fairfield, CA 94533</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>General Plan Designation</strong></td>
<td>City of Vacaville - General Commercial County of Solano - Urban Commercial</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Zoning Designation</strong></td>
<td>City of Vacaville General Commercial (CG) Special Standard Overlay District 4 (SS-4)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Environmental Setting (Describe in Detail)</strong></td>
<td>The Project site is located at 1119 East Monte Vista Avenue and is bound by Vacaville Redevelopment Agency property (currently vacant) to the north, a mobile home park to the east, East Monte Vista Avenue to the south, and private property to the west. The Project site is a vacant lot located near the center of the City in an area characterized by commercial and residential development approximately one half mile northeast of the old downtown commercial center of Vacaville, 0.25 mile north of Interstate (I) 80, and approximately one mile southwest of the new Nut Tree commercial center. The site is flat with an</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
elevation of approximately 145-feet above mean sea level. The
site is considered an infill site that was previously the location of
an old automobile camp (where travelers drove in and camped)
that was active during the 1940s and 1950s. The camp included
service stations and possibly an automobile repair shop. The
Project site is vacant with the exception of concrete features
associated with the former automobile camp and possibly with
another planned development that was never completed.
Approximately one-third of the Project site is covered by a 100-
foot by 320-foot concrete slab from the previous auto camp.
Additionally, the remaining portions of the site are disturbed
compacted and mostly barren soils. A subsurface vault
containing telephone equipment is present onsite as are
underground utility pipes that break the surface but appear to
have been abandoned. The Project site vegetation generally
consists of ruderal species with half a dozen scattered Valley
Oaks and non-native trees. However, there are two mature oak
trees on the west side of the Project site that will be preserved, to
the greatest extent feasible, and incorporated into the proposed
Project.

Surrounding Land Uses

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>North</th>
<th>The site to the north is owned by Vacaville Redevelopment Agency and is designated General Commercial by the City of Vacaville. Farther north is single-family residential neighborhood. The Nut Tree Airport is located approximately 0.8 mile to the northeast.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>South</td>
<td>The site to the south is a neighborhood retail development and is designated General Commercial by the City of Vacaville.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>East</td>
<td>The site to the east is a mobile home park, a non-conforming use, that is designated General Commercial by the City of Vacaville. Farther east are commercial buildings fronting Callen Street.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>West</td>
<td>The site to the west is designated General Commercial by the City of Vacaville and contains a small business including Tom’s Glass. Across Brown Street is a 7-Eleven, a meat market, and single-family residential housing.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
1.2 - Additional Data

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Natural Resource Conservation Service Soil Classification:</th>
<th>Yolo-Brentwood Association</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Agricultural Preserve Status/Contract No.:</td>
<td>Not applicable.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Non-renewal filed (Date):</td>
<td>Not applicable.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Airport Land Use Referral Area</td>
<td>Nut Tree Airport Compatibility Area D.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Alquist-Priolo Special Study Zone</td>
<td>Not applicable.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Primary or Secondary Management Area of the Suisun Marsh:</td>
<td>Not applicable.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Primary or Secondary Zone identified in the Delta Protection Act of 1992</td>
<td>Not applicable.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td>Not applicable.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Exhibit 1
Regional Location Map

SECTION 2: OTHER AGENCIES

Other agencies whose approval is required (responsible, trustee and agencies with jurisdiction):

1. Solano County Board of Supervisors - Approval of the Project.
2. Bay Area Air Quality Management District (BAAQMD) - Air Quality permit for construction.
4. California Department of Fish and Game - Nesting Bird Survey (if vegetation is removed between February 1 and August 31).
5. Solano County Airport Land Use Commission - Determination of compatibility with the Nut Tree Airport Land Use Plan.
7. General Permit for Storm Water Discharge - Central Valley Regional Water Quality Control Board.
SECTION 3: CONSISTENCY WITH EXISTING GENERAL PLAN, ZONING, AND OTHER APPLICABLE LAND USE CONTROLS

The Project site is within the incorporated limits of the City of Vacaville and is, therefore, within the Vacaville General Plan land use boundaries. However, consistent with California case law, property owned by a county within an incorporated area is not subject to the zoning requirements of that city when the county is acting in its governmental or proprietary capacity.1 Nevertheless, the Project site, currently owned by the County of Solano, is burdened with 2 access and 1 utility easement for the benefit of the parcel adjacent to the north, currently owned by the Vacaville Redevelopment Agency. Therefore, given the unique adjacencies of these parcels, both the County’s and City General Plan land use designations and zoning classifications are described below in detail to provide additional context as both Plans relate to the proposed Project. Any associated improvements that take place within the public right-of-way, on either Monte Vista Avenue or Brown Street, are within the jurisdiction of the City of Vacaville.

The Solano County General Plan land use designation for the project site is Urban Commercial, which is defined as:

... retail and nonretail commercial areas within cities’ municipal service areas. Uses include retail and business and professional offices.

The proposed Project consists of an approximately 35,000-square-foot (sq ft) governmental building to house a proposed public health facility offices and clinics, which is consistent with the land uses allowed in this designation. In addition, the Project would be located in an urban area within the City of Vacaville’s municipal service area. As such, the proposed Project would be consistent with Solano County General Plan designation of Urban Commercial. A detailed breakdown of Project components is provided in Section 3.2.2, Description of the Proposed Project, below.

The proposed Project would be consistent with the City of Vacaville General Plan land use designation of General Commercial, which is defined as:

... a full-range of uses, including retail stores, food and drug stores, auto sales, businesses selling home furnishings, apparel, durable goods, and specialty items. Support facilities, such as entertainment and eating-and-drinking establishments, would also be permitted.

The proposed land use is not explicitly mentioned in the definition above; however, this definition does state that General Commercial can provide for a full-range of uses. The uses proposed by the Project are similar in that they are providing a service to the public in a public venue; additionally, the

---

proposed uses would not conflict with this designation or surrounding land uses. As described in greater detail below in Section 3.2, Project Description, the intention of the proposed Project and the future development of the Vacaville Government Center is to provide a government services campus to the public in a convenient, centrally located area with access to public transit. As such, the North County Facilities Master Plan (NCFMP), prepared by Kitchell/DSA/KMD (Kitchell) in April 2003 and approved by the Board of Supervisors on May 27, 2003, evaluated several sites for the proposed Project and concluded that the proposed Project site is the ideal location to serve this purpose. Also, see discussion of zoning below.

The Project site is zoned General Commercial (CG) Special Standard Overlay District 4 (SS-4) by the City of Vacaville. A summary of this zoning is as follows:

The CG-General Commercial district allows for both small and large commercial development, primarily on sites located along major streets and adjacent to the freeway. The CG district is established to achieve the following purposes:

A. To allow for the establishment of retail commercial, business, and personal services, recreation, and public uses, intended to serve the needs of the local community and to attract a regional market.

B. To provide sites which accommodate the demand for freeway oriented services.

C. To provide sites of adequate size and in appropriate locations to accommodate large commercial centers and large commercial uses.

D. To strengthen the economic base of the community through the generation of new employment opportunities and sales tax revenue.

E. To allow for the establishment of other appropriate uses, which are determined to be compatible with the intent of the district.

Many types of uses are permitted in the General Commercial District zoning category. The full list can be found under Section 14.09.087.030 of the City’s Municipal Code. Permitted uses listed under Section 14.09.087.030 include medical offices and clinics, and public service buildings and structures. The proposed Project is consistent with both of these uses.

The SS-Special Standards Overlay District is intended to be applied in residential, commercial, and industrial zoning districts to sites where master planning is required due to circulation, design, or compatibility issues or the existence of other land use limitations. Special Standards Overlay District 4 requires a coordinated access between parcels on East Monte Vista Avenue and Brown Street. As shown in Exhibit 3, Site Concept, shared access is planned between the Project site and the envisioned Vacaville Government Center to the north. Therefore, the proposed Project is consistent
with this zoning requirement. Should future development occur on parcels to the east, a shared access would need to be provided.

Based on a review of the City’s Municipal Code, the proposed Project is consistent with existing zoning of the site.

3.1 - Purpose

The purpose of this Initial Study and Mitigated Negative Declaration (IS/MND) is to identify any potential environmental impacts that would result from implementation of the William J. Carroll Government Center Project (proposed Project). By declaration of Solano County Board of Supervisors, the proposed Project is named after a former County Supervisor who had also previously served as City of Vacaville Mayor. The proposed Project consists of an approximately 35,000 sq ft two-story County public health facility and clinics, with associated site improvements, located on 2.78 acres in the City of Vacaville. As discussed above, the County of Solano (County) is the Lead Agency in the preparation of this IS/MND and any additional environmental documentation required for the Project. The County has primary responsibility for approval or denial of the Project. The City of Vacaville, as a permitting authority for the project, is a Responsible Agency, as defined in Section 21069 of the CEQA Statute. The intended use of this document is to determine the level of environmental analysis required to adequately prepare the Project IS/MND and to provide the basis for input from public agencies, organizations, and interested members of the public.

The remainder of this section provides a brief description of the Project location and the characteristics of the Project. Section 4, Environmental Thresholds and Discussion, includes a discussion of Project impacts and mitigation measures that explain the responses provided in the environmental checklist that precede each topic.

3.2 - Project Description

3.2.1 - Background

In response to growth in the community, the County has identified a need for expanded County facilities in the area known as North County, which includes the cities of Vacaville, Dixon, Rio Vista, and the related unincorporated portion of the County. Many of the services for this area are currently provided from Fairfield locations. Existing offices that are located in North County are overcrowded and have limited parking, a condition that is expected to worsen over the next 20 years as the need for additional staff and services in this area increase because of anticipated population growth.

The North County Facilities Master Plan (NCFMP) prepared by Kitchell/DSA/KMD in April 2003, provides an analysis of the needs and objectives for additional County facility space in North County. According to the NCFMP, by 2022, in North County staff is expected to increase to 262 members and approximately 76,000 sq ft of space will be needed to accommodate all County departments in the
area. Of the total square-footage, approximately 65,000 sq ft would be needed in a central location that would house several compatible departments with the majority of square footage used to house the Health and Social Services Department (H&SS). The proposed Project would provide just over 35,000 sq ft towards meeting the previously identified demand of 76,000 sq ft. It is anticipated that future efforts, unknown at this time, would provide the remainder of the square footage needed to accommodate other departments. The location and parameters to fill the remaining square footage needed is currently unknown. Efforts to fulfill the remaining need are not part of this project, and are not considered further in this document.

Key considerations for determining the location of the proposed Project included providing a space large enough to provide H&SS services in one convenient location with easy access for clients and employees and consistent with the NCFMP. Based on 2003 Kitchell Report which evaluated the inventory of County owned properties and the location and size of available parcels, “construction of a new 50,000 sq ft building at the corner of East Monte Vista Avenue and Brown Street” would be the preferred location. However, the size of the proposed building was scaled back to the currently proposed project of just greater than 35,000 sq ft.

The proposed Project site is located on two separate parcels (Assessor Parcel Numbers (APN): 0129-320-030 and 0129-320-210) both of which are owned by the County of Solano. Adjacent to the north of the site is another parcel owned by the Vacaville Redevelopment Agency upon which the Agency has future plans to construct a government building (Vacaville Government Center) that would provide space for various social service offices to complement the proposed Project. The proposed County H&SS facility (proposed Project) is designed with the intent of being architecturally connected with the Vacaville Redevelopment Agency’s proposed facility through the use of a public plaza, public open spaces, shared access, and perhaps common materials. However, due to funding constraints, the Vacaville Redevelopment Agency’s envisioned Government Center is conceptual in nature and is not anticipated to be constructed within the near future. The Vacaville Redevelopment Agency’s project is anticipated to be master planned in 2010, with construction to follow with in the next five years. Additionally, there is no identifiable link, other than geographic location, that connects the proposed Project to the Vacaville Redevelopment Agency’s envisioned project (Vacaville Government Center) and complimentary services. As such, the proposed Project and the envisioned Vacaville Government Center are mutually independent.

3.2.2 - Description of the Proposed Project

The proposed Project would be the first step in providing the space needed to house expanding County presence and facilities in North County. The proposed Project consists of an approximately 35,000 sq ft, two-story County public health facility, clinics, office space, and associated site improvements located on 2.78 acres in the City of Vacaville (Exhibit 3). Table 1, Proposed Uses, identifies the type of use by square footage. The final square footages may change give site development constraints, however the proposed percentages by use will remain similar. The
The proposed Project would be operated by Solano County H&SS and would serve to provide a centralized location within North County to dispense County government programs and services. Implementation of the proposed Project would create a maximum of 212 jobs. Some existing County employees would be transferred to the new facility; therefore, not all of the jobs would represent a potential new residents. For the purpose of this analysis, it is assumed that at least a portion if not all of the shared public space (to be shared in the future with neighboring government buildings) would be constructed by the proposed Project. The project will be designed to be LEED Silver or equivalent as per the Solano County General Plan requirement contained in Implementation Program RS.I-41.

Leadership in Energy and Environmental Design (LEED) is an internationally recognized green building certification system that provides third-party verification that a building or community was designed and built to meet the following goals: energy savings, water efficiency, CO2 emissions reduction, improved indoor environmental quality, and stewardship of resources and sensitivity to their impacts. Developed by the U.S. Green Building Council (USGBC), LEED provides building owners and operators a concise framework for identifying and implementing practical and measurable green building design, construction, operations, and maintenance solutions. LEED is flexible enough to apply to all building types—commercial as well as residential. It works throughout the building lifecycle—design and construction, operations and maintenance, tenant fit-out, and significant retrofit.

The proposed Project would be designed to meet County Standards in order to obtain the USGBC’s LEED Certification for New Construction. This feature would promote sustainable building practices that would lead to decreased energy and natural resource usage. The USGBC indicates that LEED buildings perform 25-30 percent better in terms of energy efficiency than non-LEED buildings. Additionally, the portions of the project subject to City Standards are restricted to any improvements that take place within the public right of way.

Table 1: Proposed Uses

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Use/Building Component</th>
<th>Square Feet</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Community Medical Primary Care Clinic</td>
<td>6,817</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dental Clinic</td>
<td>2,906</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Child Welfare Services / Older and Disabled Adults Services</td>
<td>317</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mental Health - Family Services</td>
<td>5,314</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Women, Infants and Children</td>
<td>3,253</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Public Health Nursing</td>
<td>182</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Employee Eligibility</td>
<td>5,773</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Employee Eligibility - CalWorks</td>
<td>5,039</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Special Investigations Bureau</td>
<td>390</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table 1 (cont.): Proposed Uses

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Use/Building Component</th>
<th>Square Feet</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Substance Abuse Services</td>
<td>1,232</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Public Spaces</td>
<td>1,950</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Building Services</td>
<td>1,362</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Support Spaces</td>
<td>782</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total Square Feet</strong></td>
<td><strong>35,317</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: Kitchell 2010 Program Summary.

Site Demolition and Improvements

To accommodate the proposed H&SS facility, a 100-foot by 320-foot concrete slab (approximately 32,000 sq ft) would be demolished and removed. If the County finds it economically feasible, the concrete will be recycled. The proposed building and associated parking lot would accommodate as many as 175 new parking spaces. Additionally the Project would include a public plaza(s), public art space, and potentially a public transit stop. The public plaza or shared public space is anticipated to be located at the north end of the William J. Carroll Government Center to provide future connectivity between the proposed Project (William J. Carroll Government Center) and the envisioned Vacaville Government Center. At least a portion of the shared public space would be constructed by the proposed Project. The design and location of the public plaza or shared public space is currently conceptual, and final design is not anticipated to be complete prior to the finalization of this document. However, final design will be coordinated with the City of Vacaville to ensure shared vision. Furthermore, final designed details for this component of the project are not necessary for adequate CEQA analysis. An agreement for construction of this space would be separately prepared between the County and City. Site lighting would also be provided in the new parking lot and public plaza(s), in compliance with Chapter 14.09.084 Light and Glare of the City of Vacaville Zoning Code as required.

Vehicular Access and Streets

Access to the proposed Project would be made from two points along East Monte Vista Avenue. There are two existing access easements to the Project site. Depending on final design, the easternmost existing access easement would be relocated and combined with an existing utility easement that would provide access off East Monte Vista Avenue. The access lane and utility easement would work as a single right-of-way that would provide access to the Vacaville Redevelopment Agency parcel. The western access easement will also be realigned to provide access to the Vacaville Redevelopment Agency property. Refer to Exhibit 3 for details on the proposed new entryways. Final alignment of the relocated easements will need to be negotiated and approved by the City Council. An encroachment permit from the City will be required, and the County anticipates
preparing a traffic control plan to mitigate construction traffic impacts. The County will also work with the City to determine if additional emergency access from Brown Street will be necessary.

The 175-space parking lot would be located on eastern portion of the Project site and would provide two access points to the envisioned Vacaville Government Center on the Vacaville Redevelopment Agency property.

**Utilities**

Water will be obtained from existing City services by way of a 10-inch pipe in the East Monte Vista Avenue right-of-way. Sanitary sewer service will be gravity-fed to a City 8-inch trunk line in East Monte Vista Avenue. Stormwater will be collected onsite through systems of curbs, gutters, and drains. This system will connect to an existing 21-inch storm drain stub on East Monte Vista Avenue. It is anticipated that the Vacaville Redevelopment Agency’s future development on the Agency’s property would similarly obtain services from E. Monte Vista Avenue and through the utility easement.

**Landscape / Hardscape Improvements**

The Project will be separated from surrounding residential land uses to the east by a 6-8 foot masonry wall on the eastern boundary of the Project site. The west side of the Project site will be improved with an ornamental fence if required that will provide security and separation between the existing land uses and the proposed Project as determined by Solano County. Both the north and south sides of the Project site will remain open and free of barriers to facilitate vehicular and pedestrian access to the Project site and the envisioned Vacaville Government Center on the Vacaville Redevelopment Agency property, thereby providing a ‘campus’ feel for the two projects.

The majority (as much as 90 percent) of the site surface will be disturbed by minor grading activities. There will be import of approximately 3,556 cubic yards of soil for grading, which will involve cuts of approximately 3 feet and fill depths of approximately 3 feet. In addition, several trees growing sporadically throughout the site will be removed. A large valley oak tree is located on the west side of the Project site and will be pruned and retained by the project. The oak has been inspected by a certified arborist who has verified the health of the tree; as such, the County has incorporated it into the proposed Project. The County will prune the tree prior to construction to limit impacts and secure the vitality of the tree. In addition, County will attempt to retain as many of the remaining oaks as possible. However, for a conservative, worst-case scenario, removal of the on-site trees is discussed in Section 4.4, Biological Resources.

Project landscaping will focus on the building frontage facing E. Monte Vista Avenue and adjacent properties. However, minor landscaping improvements will be made throughout the site to develop a ‘campus’ like feel. The County is proposing a mix of native and non-native trees, shrubs, vines, and groundcover. The flora ranges from 15 gallon-sized trees to one-gallon plants. Bio-swales will be incorporated into the design of the proposed parking lot if needed to meter on site stormwater and
limit the need for irrigation water. Additionally, night sky-sensitive streetlights will be provided in conformance with County Standards to limit the amount of glare and spillover light.

**Project Construction**

Construction is scheduled to begin in 2010/early 2011 with the opening of the facility to occur in 2012. Construction work shifts would generally occur between 7 a.m. and 4 p.m. The construction staging area for the proposed Project would be located onsite, in the proposed parking lot area. Small amounts of fuels, lubricants, and solvents may be stored in these areas. Parking for construction workers would be provided onsite as well. Earth-moving equipment, including backhoes, front-end loaders, and dump trucks, would be used during excavation for utilities and building foundations. Concrete trucks and pumpers would be onsite during concrete pours for foundations and slabs; forklifts would be used during erection of walls and delivery of materials from storage yards; and a single crane would be operated for installation of steel roof beams, and mechanical systems on the roof.
Source: County of Solano (August 19, 2009), MBA GIS (2010).

Exhibit 3
Site Concept
SECTION 4: ENVIRONMENTAL THRESHOLDS AND DISCUSSION

4.1 - Aesthetics

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Environmental Issues</th>
<th>Potentially Significant Impact</th>
<th>Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporated</th>
<th>Less Than Significant Impact</th>
<th>No Impact</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. Aesthetics</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Would the project:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>a) Have a substantial adverse effect on a scenic vista?</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☒</td>
<td>☐</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>b) Substantially damage scenic resources, including, but not limited to, trees, rock</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☒</td>
<td>☒</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>outcroppings, and historic building within a state scenic highway?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>c) Substantially degrade the existing visual character or quality of the site and its</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☒</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>surroundings?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>d) Create a new source of substantial light or glare which would adversely affect day</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☒</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>or nighttime views in the area?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

4.1.1 - Discussion

Environmental Setting

The following analysis is based on descriptions of the proposed Project and site reconnaissance performed by Michael Brandman Associates (MBA) in September 2009. High-resolution photographs were taken of the Project site and surrounding area and are shown in Exhibit 4.

Visual Distance Zones

The following distance zones (foreground, middle ground, and background) can be used to characterize the dominant visual character from each vantage point and describe views in terms that can be analyzed and compared. The sensitivity of views, which have been modified from the existing environment are defined in order to establish thresholds for the analysis of potential visual impacts resulting from the implementation of the proposed Project.

Foreground Views. These views include elements that can be seen at a close distance and that dominate the entire view. Impacted views at this distance are generally considered potentially adverse when viewed by a sensitive viewer group, such as surrounding residents, workers, pedestrians, or regular motorists.
Middle Ground Views. These views include elements that can be seen at a middle distance and that partially dominate the view. Impacted views at this distance are generally considered potentially adverse when viewed by a sensitive viewer group.

Background Views. These views include elements that are seen at a long distance and typically do not dominate the view although they are part of the overall visual composition of the view. Impacted views at this distance are generally not considered as an adverse impact when viewed by a sensitive viewer group.

Visual Setting
The Project site is located at 1119 East Monte Vista Avenue and is bound by Vacaville Redevelopment Agency property (currently vacant) to the north, a mobile home park to the east, East Monte Vista Avenue and commercial development to the south, and private property and Brown Street to the west. A 7-Eleven convenience store is on the northwest corner of the Brown Street and East Monte Vista Avenue intersection.

The Project site is a vacant lot located near the center of the City in an area characterized by commercial and residential development approximately one half mile northeast of the old downtown commercial center of Vacaville, 0.25 mile north of I-80, and approximately 1 mile southwest of the new Nut Tree commercial center. The site is flat with an elevation of approximately 145 feet above mean sea level. The site is considered an infill site that was previously the location of an old automobile camp that was active during the 1940s and 1950s. An automobile camp was, essentially, a location for travelers to park their cars and camp. The camp included service stations and possibly an automobile repair shop. The Project site is vacant with the exception of concrete slabs and other concrete features associated with the former automobile camp and possibly another planned development that was never completed. Exhibit 4 provides photographs of the Project site. Subsurface vaults containing telephone equipment are present onsite as are underground utility pipes that break the surface but appear to have been abandoned. Approximately one-third of the Project site is covered with a large cement slab and the remaining portions of the site are compacted, mostly barren soils and sporadic vegetation. The perimeter of the Project site is separated from adjacent uses by a mixture of fencing materials that range from cyclone or chain-link fencing to wood fencing. The western boundary of the site is separated by three mature oak trees.

Environmental Issues
a Neither the Solano County General Plan nor the City of Vacaville General Plan designate specific areas as scenic vistas. However, background views of ridgelines, located to the east and west of the Project site, are included as important scenic features in both plans. The foreground views of and from the Project site, are limited given the urban nature surrounding the site. The Project site can be described as a vacant lot located in a relatively flat area of the City, which is a primary factor to why the views of and from the site are limited. The proposed Project building heights will be designed to County Standards and will conform to
the maximum height limitations of the General Commercial zoning district; this coupled with
the limited view sheds of the Project site would result in less than significant impact to the
views of ridgelines to the east and west. Impacts would be less than significant.

b The Project site is not located near a designated State Scenic Highway. No designated State
Scenic Highways are present in Solano County at this time. The proposed Project would
remove a number of small trees and shrubs onsite to accommodate the proposed Project.
However, the County had a certified arborist evaluate all trees onsite and as such, the County
proposes to prune and preserve the single largest oak tree located on the west side of the
Project site. This single oak adds both visual and aesthetics character to the Project site and
surrounding parcels. No impacts would occur.

c The Project site is located in a built-up urban area. Currently, the site is vacant with the
exception of slabs of old concrete and is surrounded by a chain link fence. The site does
contain one large, mature oak at its western border that would be retained. In its current
condition, the Project site is not contributing to the visual character of the area. The proposed
Project would develop a modern building, landscaping, public plaza and gathering areas,
would feature public art, and would improve the visual characteristics of the surrounding
commercial and retail area. The proposed Project would be required to conform to all
applicable County Standards but would also attempt to conform to the General Commercial
zoning requirements listed in Chapter 14.09.084 of the Vacaville Zoning Code, including
those pertaining to set backs, building heights, and landscaping. However, as detailed
architectural drawings and landscape plans were not available at the time of this writing,
Mitigation Measures AES-1 and AES-2 are proposed to assess compliance with the
provisions of this code. Compliance with the City’s Zoning Code requirements is not
required. However, the County will strive to conform with the City’s zoning code to the
extent feasible. Additionally, to provide privacy to adjacent uses, the proposed Project
includes a privacy barrier on the eastern side of the Project site. Additionally, the proposed
Project will utilize the existing large oak trees on the western edge of the Project site as visual
screening. The combination of the Project’s design features and compliance with the City’s
Zoning Code, to the extent feasible, would ensure that impacts to the visual character of the
area would be less than significant.

d The proposed Project would construct a two-story approximately 35,000 sq ft building,
associated parking, and other site improvements. Exterior building and parking lot lighting
would introduce new sources of light to the area and glare from sun reflecting off building
windows and parked cars. Light and glare from the proposed Project would be similar to the
light and glare of the surrounding area and would not pose a significant impact to existing
commercial and retail uses; however, nighttime lighting could be perceived as a potential
impact to surrounding residential development. The proposed Project, although not required
to comply with the provisions in Chapter 14.09.084 Light and Glare of the City of Vacaville
Zoning Code, will conform with the provisions to the extent feasible. However since detailed plans were not available at the time of this writing, Mitigation Measures AES-1 and AES-3, are proposed to ensure light and glare impacts would be less than significant.

4.1.2 - Impact

Development of the proposed Project may conflict with zoning code requirements intended to ensure that new development is does not result in a degradation of visual character or new sources of light and glare to the surrounding area or surrounding residential land uses.

4.1.3 - Mitigation

The following mitigation measure is proposed to ensure compliance with zoning code provisions.

AES-1

Before construction, the County shall submit a detailed site plan to the County’s Department of Resource Management Building Official (Building Official) showing the design details and make specific reference to those features that meet the provisions of Chapter 14.09.084 of the Vacaville Zoning Code including but not limited to the following:

- A building height of no more than 40 feet. Exceptions can be made for structures such as towers, spires, cupolas, chimneys, flagpoles, monuments, scenery lofts, and other similar structures and necessary mechanical appurtenances covering not more than 10 percent of the ground area covered by the structures and extending no more than 25 feet above the height limit prescribed by the regulations for the district in which the site is located.

- The County shall consult with the City and plan to build a continuous solid decorative wall along the eastern boundary of the Project site.

- All mechanical equipment shall be screened from view from public and private property, whether developed or undeveloped to the satisfaction of the Building Official as follows:
  - Ground mounted mechanical equipment shall be screened by walls and fencing or landscaping.
  - Roof mounted mechanical equipment (with the exception of solar equipment) shall be screened by a parapet wall of equal or greater height than the highest piece of roof mounted equipment or vent.
  - All building mounted shall be painted a color that is consistent with the color scheme of the building to blend into the background of the structure or site.

- Outdoor refuse containers shall be located in trash enclosures, shall be subject to design review, and shall comply with the following standards:
- Trash enclosures storing containers with a cumulative capacity of one cubic yard to more shall be constructed with decorative masonry walls with solid metal doors. The exterior shall be compatible with the design of the main building.
- A minimum 8 ft-by-10 ft wide thickened concrete paving section shall be provided in from the enclosure gates.

AES-2
The County shall submit a detailed landscaping plan to the Building Official and make specific reference to those landscaping details that meet the provisions of Chapter 14.09.084 of the Vacaville Zoning Code including but not limited to the following:

- A minimum of 10 ft of landscaping area shall be provided along street frontages, in this case East Monte Vista Avenue and Brown Street.
- In addition to the required perimeter landscaping, an additional 5 percent of the gross parking lot area must be landscaped.
- Additional landscaping in all areas within the site or lot not used or specifically intended for structures, parking or other necessary site improvements.
- Planter areas must be separated from vehicular access by 6-inch raised concrete curbing.
- A parking lot plan shall be submitted and implemented which demonstrates that 50 percent of the parking lot will be shaded within 10 years.

AES-3
The County shall submit a lighting plan to the Building Official and make specific reference to those lighting details that meet the provisions of Chapter 14.09.127.110 of the Vacaville Zoning Code including but not limited to the following:

- Lighting shall be shielded and directed so as not to create a hazard or nuisance to other properties or impact traffic on adjacent streets.
- Exterior lighting should be installed to identify building entrances and to promote on-site safety or security.
- Parking lot lighting shall comply with the standards of the Off-Street Parking and Loading Design Guidelines, including, but not limited to, the following:
  - Exterior lighting shall be a minimum of 1 foot candle and a maximum of 6 foot candles.
- At the discretion of the Building Official, a photometric plan demonstrating compliance with these lighting standards and a site plan showing the location
and design of exterior lighting fixtures may be required as a condition of Project approval.

- Flickering or flashing lights shall not be permitted.

4.1.4 - Verification

Prior to construction, the final site plan, landscape and lighting plans will be prepared by the County and forwarded to the City for comment.
Photograph 1: Project site facing north.

Photograph 2: Southern portion of project site facing east.

Photograph 3: Viewing the western edge of the project site.

Photograph 4: Project site facing southeast.

4.2 - Agriculture Resources

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Environmental Issues</th>
<th>Potentially Significant Impact</th>
<th>Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporated</th>
<th>Less Than Significant Impact</th>
<th>No Impact</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

2. Agriculture Resources

In determining whether impacts to agricultural resources are significant environmental effects, lead agencies may refer to the California Agricultural Land Evaluation and Site Assessment Model (1997) prepared by the California Department of Conservation as an optional model to use in assessing impacts on agriculture and farmland.

Would the project:

a) Convert Prime Farmland, Unique Farmland, or Farmland of Statewide Importance (Farmland), as shown on the maps prepared pursuant to the Farmland Mapping and Monitoring Program of the California Resources Agency, to non-agricultural use?

b) Conflict with existing zoning for agricultural use, or a Williamson Act contract?

c) Involve other changes in the existing environment which, due to their location or nature, could result in conversion of Farmland, to non-agricultural use?

4.2.1 - Discussion

Environmental Issues

a According to the California Department of Conservation, Division of Land Resource Protection, the proposed Project site is not located on Prime Farmland, Unique Farmland, or Farmland of Statewide Importance, and is not under a Williamson Act Contract. The proposed Project site is in a built up urbanized area that is designated General Commercial under the City of Vacaville General Plan. No impacts would occur.

b The proposed Project site is not zoned for agricultural use. The City of Vacaville zoning designation is General Commercial. No Williamson Act contracts exist for the Project site. No impacts would occur.

c Indirect impacts on agricultural lands can occur under two types of conditions: (1) development (urban, residential) can place pressure on adjacent agricultural lands to convert to non-agricultural uses; or (2) land uses (urban, residential) adjacent to existing agricultural lands can create conflicts between the two types of uses, which can, in turn, lead to the abandonment of agricultural uses in the area of conflict. The proposed Project does not involve either of the conditions as the Project is located in a built up urbanized area near other urban development. No impacts would occur.
4.2.2 - Impact
No impacts would occur.

4.2.3 - Mitigation
No mitigation would be necessary.

4.2.4 - Verification
Not applicable.
4.3 - Air Quality

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Environmental Issues</th>
<th>Potentially Significant Impact</th>
<th>Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporated</th>
<th>Less Than Significant Impact</th>
<th>No Impact</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

3. Air Quality

*Where available, the significance criteria established by the applicable air quality management or air pollution control district may be relied upon to make the following determinations.*

*Would the project:*

a) Conflict with or obstruct implementation of the applicable air quality plan?  
   - [ ] Potentially Significant Impact  
   - [ ] Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporated  
   - [ ] Less Than Significant Impact  
   - [ ] No Impact

b) Violate any air quality standard or contribute substantially to an existing or projected air quality violation?  
   - [ ] Potentially Significant Impact  
   - [ ] Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporated  
   - [ ] Less Than Significant Impact  
   - [ ] No Impact

c) 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 (including releasing emissions, which exceed quantitative thresholds for ozone precursors)?  
   - [ ] Potentially Significant Impact  
   - [ ] Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporated  
   - [ ] Less Than Significant Impact  
   - [ ] No Impact

d) Expose sensitive receptors to substantial pollutant concentrations?  
   - [ ] Potentially Significant Impact  
   - [ ] Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporated  
   - [ ] Less Than Significant Impact  
   - [ ] No Impact

e) Create objectionable odors affecting a substantial number of people?  
   - [ ] Potentially Significant Impact  
   - [ ] Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporated  
   - [ ] Less Than Significant Impact  
   - [ ] No Impact

4.3.1 - Discussion

This analysis relies upon information contained in the Air Quality and Climate Change Analysis contained in Appendix A, Air Quality and Climate change Analysis, of this IS/MND. The following is a summary of the analysis.

The proposed Project is located in northern Solano County, which is part of the Sacramento Valley Air Basin (Basin). Yolo County and the Solano County portion of the Basin are regulated by the Yolo-Solano Air Quality Management District (YSAQMD). The YSAQMD is the regional agency that regulates air pollution from stationary sources through rules, regulations, and permits, as well as administers air quality regulations developed at the federal, state, and local levels. The YSAQMD has prepared the Handbook for Assessing and Mitigating Air Quality Impacts (CEQA Handbook). The CEQA Handbook sets forth recommended thresholds of significance, screening criteria, analysis methodologies, and provides guidance on mitigating significant impacts.

Ambient air quality standards for criteria pollutants are set by the U.S. Environmental Protection Agency and the California Air Resources Board (ARB) to protect the health of sensitive individuals. Criteria pollutants include ozone, particulate matter less than 10 microns in diameter (PM$_{10}$), fine...
particulate matter less than 2.5 microns in diameter (PM$_{2.5}$), carbon monoxide (CO), nitrogen dioxide, lead, and sulfur dioxide.

Ozone is a public health concern because it is a respiratory irritant that may increase vulnerability to respiratory infections. Ozone is not directly emitted into the air, but is formed through a series of photochemical reactions involving directly emitted compounds or precursors. These precursors include reactive organic gases (ROG), also known as volatile organic compounds (VOC) and oxides of nitrogen (NO$_X$). Ozone is an air pollutant of regional concern because precursors can be transported by wind as part of the photochemical reaction process. The YSAQMD is designated as a nonattainment area for the national eight-hour ozone standard and a nonattainment area for the state one-hour and eight-hour ozone standard.

PM$_{10}$ and PM$_{2.5}$ are small enough to be inhaled and cause adverse health effects. The YSAQMD is unclassified for the national PM$_{10}$ standards and classified as a nonattainment area for the state PM$_{10}$ standards. Unclassified areas are those for which air monitoring has not been conducted but which are assumed to be in attainment. The YSAQMD is in partial nonattainment for the PM$_{2.5}$ standards.

Carbon monoxide is a public health concern because it can reduce the amount of oxygen transported in the bloodstream. Carbon monoxide is more of a concern in urbanized portions of the Basin. The YSAQMD is an unclassified/attainment area for the national carbon monoxide 1-hour and 8-hour standards and classified as an attainment area for the state carbon monoxide 1-hour and 8-hour standards. Although the YSAQMD is in attainment for national and state carbon monoxide standards, carbon monoxide is a concern because carbon monoxide “hotspots” may occur in areas of heavy traffic congestion.

The Project site is currently vacant and would have minor emissions of windblown fugitive dust (PM$_{10}$ and PM$_{2.5}$). The pollutant sources in the area are primarily from motor vehicle exhaust from travel on the surrounding roadway network.

Construction emissions are shown in Table 2. As shown in the table, the emissions do not exceed the YSAQMD thresholds.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Construction Activity</th>
<th>Construction Emissions</th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>tons per year</td>
<td>Daily - pounds per day</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>VOC</td>
<td>NO$_X$</td>
<td>CO</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Demolition of Existing Concrete</td>
<td>0.02</td>
<td>0.25</td>
<td>29</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Grading</td>
<td>0.04</td>
<td>0.33</td>
<td>16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Asphalt Paving</td>
<td>0.02</td>
<td>0.10</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table 2 (cont.): Estimated Construction Emissions

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Construction Activity</th>
<th>Construction Emissions</th>
<th>tons per year</th>
<th>Daily - pounds per day</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>VOC</td>
<td>NOX</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Building Construction and Architectural Coatings</td>
<td></td>
<td>0.33</td>
<td>0.75</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total (or maximum emissions in one day for daily emissions)</td>
<td>0.41</td>
<td>1.43</td>
<td>29</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>YSAQMD Threshold</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>None</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Significant Impact?</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note:
The maximum daily emissions refer to the maximum emissions that would occur in one day; it was assumed that the grading activities do not occur at the same time as the other construction activities; therefore, their emissions are not summed.

VOC = volatile organic compounds
NOX = nitrogen oxides
CO = carbon monoxide
SOX = sulfur oxides
PM10 and PM2.5 = particulate matter
N/A = not applicable

Source: Appendix A, Air Quality and Climate Change Analysis.

Emissions during operation of the Project are shown in Table 3. As shown in the table, emissions are below the YSAQMD significance thresholds.

Table 3: Operational Emissions

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Source</th>
<th>Operational Emissions</th>
<th>tons per year</th>
<th>pounds per day</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>VOC</td>
<td>NOX</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Area Sources</td>
<td></td>
<td>&lt;0.1</td>
<td>&lt;0.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Motor vehicles</td>
<td></td>
<td>2.2</td>
<td>3.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td></td>
<td>2.2</td>
<td>3.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>YSAQMD Threshold</td>
<td></td>
<td>10</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Significant Impact?</td>
<td></td>
<td>No</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: Appendix A, Air Quality and Climate Change Analysis.

As shown in Table 4, the estimated 1-hour and 8-hour average CO concentrations at buildout in combination with background concentrations are below the State and national ambient air quality standards. No CO hot spots are anticipated because of traffic-generated emissions by the Project in combination with other anticipated development in the area.
Table 4: Local Carbon Monoxide Concentrations

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Intersection (Year)</th>
<th>1 Hour Estimated CO Concentration (ppm)</th>
<th>8 Hour Estimated CO Concentration (ppm)</th>
<th>Significant Impact?*</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. East Monte Vista Avenue / Depot Street / Markham Avenue (2030)</td>
<td>5.5</td>
<td>3.9</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Depot Street / Mason Street (2030)</td>
<td>5.4</td>
<td>3.8</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. East Monte Vista Ave / Allison Dr (2030)</td>
<td>5.7</td>
<td>4.0</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. East Monte Vista Ave / Allison Dr (2011)</td>
<td>6.9</td>
<td>4.8</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* Comparison of the 1-hour concentration to the State standard of 20 ppm and the 8-hour concentration to the State/national standard of 9 ppm.
Source: Appendix A, Air Quality and Climate Change Analysis.

Environmental Issues

a The YSAQMD CEQA Handbook contains the following instructions on how to address this potential impact:

In regards to environmental documents prepared for local or regional plans, the State CEQA Guidelines, Section 15125(d), states that an EIR shall discuss ‘any inconsistencies between a proposed project and applicable general plans and regional plans. Such regional plans include, but are not limited to, the applicable air quality attainment or maintenance plan or State Implementation Plan..."

The Project is consistent with the City and County General Plans. The Project would comply with all applicable air quality rules and regulations. The Project’s emissions are less than the YSAQMD significance thresholds. However, as identified in Air Quality Impact d, the YSAQMD guidance recommends implementation of best management practices to reduce dust emissions and avoid localized health impacts. As such, Mitigation Measure AQ-1 is required to reduce particulate matter emissions during construction. Therefore, mitigation is required to ensure that the Project does not conflict with any applicable attainment plan. With mitigation, impacts would be less than significant.

b Pollutants of concern include PM\textsubscript{10}, PM\textsubscript{2.5}, ozone, and carbon monoxide and are discussed below.

As shown in Table 2 (Construction Emissions), emissions of PM\textsubscript{10} during construction are less than the YSAQMD significance thresholds. However, implementation of the dust control measures contained in Mitigation Measure AQ-1 would reduce emissions of particulate matter even further and would ensure that the localized Project emissions would
not violate any air quality standard or contribute substantially to an existing or projected air quality violation for PM$_{10}$ or PM$_{2.5}$ in the Project vicinity.

As shown in Table 2 and Table 3, emissions of ROG and NO$_X$, ozone precursors, are under the YSAQMD significance thresholds. Therefore, those emissions would not result in a violation or contribute substantially to an existing or projected air quality violation of ozone.

Cumulative CO impacts are accounted for in the CO hotspot analysis. Traffic levels used in the model include all reasonably foreseeable projects that will contribute traffic to the intersections and road segments being analyzed. As shown in the CO hotspot analysis (see Table 4), the concentrations of CO at the impacted intersections are less than the ambient air quality standards. Therefore, this impact is less than significant.

c The Project area is in non attainment for ozone, PM$_{10}$, and PM$_{2.5}$, which means that sometimes the concentration of those pollutants in the atmosphere exceeds the respective ambient air quality standard.

CEQA defines cumulative impacts as two or more individual effects which, when considered together, are either significant or “cumulatively considerable,” meaning they add considerably to a significant environmental impact. Cumulative impacts can result from individually minor but collectively significant projects (CEQA Guidelines §15355). An adequate cumulative impact analysis considers a project over time and in conjunction with other past, present, and reasonably foreseeable future projects whose impacts might compound those of the project being assessed.

The YSAQMD CEQA Handbook indicates that project emissions that are not consistent with the AQAP, State Implementation Plan, or exceed YSAQMD thresholds will have a significant cumulative impact unless offset. As discussed in Environmental Issue “a” above, the Project is consistent with the AQAP and the State Implementation Plan with incorporation of mitigation. As shown in Table 2 (construction emissions) and Table 3 (operational emissions), the Project’s emissions are under the YSAQMD significance thresholds. Therefore, Project emissions during construction and operation would not significantly contribute to a cumulative impact for ozone, PM$_{10}$, and PM$_{2.5}$. There would be less than significant cumulative health effects from exposure to criteria pollutants as a result of the Project.

As shown in Table 2 (Construction Emissions), emissions of PM$_{10}$ during construction are less than the YSAQMD significance thresholds. Implementation of the dust control measures contained in Mitigation Measure AQ-1 would reduce emissions of particulate matter even further and would ensure that the Project emissions would not contribute to a cumulatively considerable net increase of PM$_{10}$ or PM$_{2.5}$.
Two situations have the potential to cause localized impacts to sensitive receptors:

1. A (new) source of air pollutants is proposed to be located close to existing receptors. For example, an industrial facility is proposed for a site near a school; or

2. A (new) development project with receptors is proposed near an existing source of air pollutants. For example, a hospital is proposed for a site near an industrial facility.

Those who are sensitive to air pollution include children, the elderly, and persons with preexisting respiratory or cardiovascular illness. For purposes of CEQA, a sensitive receptor is a location where a sensitive individual could remain for 24 hours, such as residences, hospitals, or convalescent facilities (nursing home). Commercial and industrial facilities are not included in the definition because employees do not typically remain onsite for 24 hours.

The Project is not considered a “sensitive receptor” as any sensitive receptors (children, elderly, or the sick) would not remain onsite for a long period of time. The Project is a clinic, not a hospital or a nursing home. The closest existing sensitive receptors are mobile homes located in the Vacaville Mobile Home Park located at 312 Brown Street, adjacent to the northwestern corner of the Project site.

The YSAQMD CEQA Handbook states that, “without control, dust emissions from grading, trenching, or land clearing can create nuisances or localized health impacts… even projects not exceeding district PM thresholds should implement best management practices to reduce dust emissions and avoid localized health impacts.” As shown in Table 2 (Construction Emissions), emissions of PM\textsubscript{10} and PM\textsubscript{2.5} during construction are less than the YSAQMD significance thresholds. However, pursuant to the YSAQMD CEQA Handbook, implementation of the dust control measures (see Mitigation Measure AQ-1) would reduce the potential exposure of sensitive receptors to substantial concentrations of PM\textsubscript{10} or PM\textsubscript{2.5}.

Construction equipment generates diesel particulate matter, which is identified as a carcinogen by the ARB. The State of California determined that particulate matter from diesel-fueled engines poses a chronic health risk with chronic (long-term) inhalation exposure. The California Office of Environmental Health Hazard Assessment recommends using a 70-year exposure duration for determining residential cancer risks. Because of the short duration of construction, and limited size of the Project, it is highly unlikely that the construction would pose a toxic risk to adjacent residents. This impact would be considered less than significant.

During operation, the primary source of air pollutants would be from the motor vehicles that would access the Project site. Diesel particulate matter is emitted from diesel fueled vehicles and trucks. Benzene, a carcinogen, is emitted in small quantities from gasoline fueled cars and trucks. Motor vehicles would emit pollutants onsite to and from the entrance and parking...
spots. However, the onsite emissions from these sources is not substantial and would not expose sensitive receptors to substantial pollutants.

In April 2005, ARB published the “Air Quality and Land Use Handbook: A Community Health Perspective” (ARB Handbook) to provide information to local planners and decision-makers about land use compatibility issues associated with emissions from industrial, commercial and mobile sources of air pollution. The ARB Handbook contains recommendations to prevent sensitive receptors from certain land uses, such as fueling stations, dry cleaners, and distribution centers. There is a small distribution center located near the southeast corner of Callen Street and East Monte Vista Avenue, approximately 500 feet from the proposed Project. The Project is not considered a sensitive receptor; therefore, these recommendations would not apply.

The Project is not considered to be a sensitive receptor because any sensitive receptors that visit the site (i.e., the sick, children, or the elderly) would not remain on the site for long periods of time. Therefore, the impact to the Project from cumulative toxic air contaminants is less than significant. Although the Project would emit diesel particulate matter during construction, this impact would not contribute significantly to cumulative toxic air contaminants to the nearby sensitive receptors.

While offensive odors rarely cause any physical harm, they can be very unpleasant, leading to considerable distress among the public and often generating citizen complaints to local governments and the YSAQMD. The YSAQMD is responsible for enforcing the provisions of California Health and Safety Code Section 41700, which prohibits the discharge of anything that could endanger the comfort or health of the public. Nuisance odors are regulated by this section, although certain odors are exempted, such as odors from agricultural activities and composting facilities. The YSAQMD enforces Section 41700 through its nuisance rule (Rule 2.5). Any actions related to odors are based on citizen complaints to local governments and the YSAQMD. According to the YSAQMD CEQA Handbook, a project may reasonably be expected to have a significant adverse odor impact where it “generates odorous emissions in such quantities as to cause detriment, nuisance, or annoyance to any considerable number of persons or to the public, or which may endanger the comfort, repose, health, or safety of any such person or the public, or which may cause, or have a natural tendency to cause, injury or damage to business or property.”

Although distance between an odor source and a receptor is the primary factor in determining the significance of an odor impact, the prevailing wind direction is also considered. Since odors more or less travel downwind of a source, a receptor that is upwind of a source may not experience the same impact as a receptor that is at a similar distance from the source, but is downwind.
Screening of potential odor impacts should be conducted for the following two situations:

1. Projects that would potentially generate odorous emissions proposed to locate near existing sensitive receptors or other land uses where people may congregate, and

2. Residential or other sensitive receptor projects or other projects that may attract people locating near existing odor sources.

Land uses typically considered associated with odors include wastewater treatment facilities, waste-disposal facilities, or agricultural operations. The Project does not contain land uses typically associated with emitting objectionable odors. The Project is not considered a sensitive receptor. Diesel exhaust and VOCs would be emitted during construction of the Project, which are objectionable to some; however, emissions would disperse rapidly from the Project site and, therefore, should not reach a level to induce a negative response.

4.3.2 - Impact

The Project may conflict with attainment plans, may cumulatively contribute to ozone, PM$_{10}$, and PM$_{2.5}$ criteria pollutants, and may expose sensitive receptors to substantial pollutant concentrations.

4.3.3 - Mitigation

With implementation of the following mitigation measures, impacts related to air quality would be less than significant.

**AQ-1**

The following dust control measures shall be incorporated into the construction specifications and contract requirements by the Project Engineer of the County’s Division of Public Works. These requirements include, but are not limited to, the following:

1. Water active construction sites at least twice daily, and as needed to avoid visible dust plumes.

2. Apply nontoxic soil stabilizers to all previously graded, inactive construction sites (no construction activity for 10 consecutive days or more).

3. Cover or maintain at least two feet of freeboard on all vehicles hauling dirt, sand, soil, or other loose material.

4. Reestablish ground cover in disturbed areas quickly.

5. Enclose, cover, or stabilize exposed stockpiles.

6. Limit construction vehicles to 15 miles per hour on all unpaved areas.

7. Sweep streets if visible soil material is carried out from the construction site.
4.3.4 - Verification

Construction specifications, including the dust control measures shall be submitted to the Project Engineer of the County’s Division of Public Works with copies forwarded to the County’s Department of General Services, Division of Architectural Services. Additionally a courtesy copy of the proposed dust control measures will be forwarded to the City of Vacaville for comment.
## 4.4 - Biological Resources

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Environmental Issues</th>
<th>Potentially Significant Impact</th>
<th>Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporated</th>
<th>Less Than Significant Impact</th>
<th>No Impact</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>4. Biological Resources</strong>&lt;br&gt;Would the project:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>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 Game or U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service?</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☒</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>b) Have a substantial adverse effect on any riparian habitat or other sensitive natural community identified in local or regional plans, policies, and regulations or by the California Department of Fish and Game or U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service?</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☒</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>c) Have a substantial adverse effect on federally protected wetlands as defined by Section 404 of the Clean Water Act (including, but not limited to, marsh, vernal pool, coastal, etc.) through direct removal, filling, hydrological interruption, or other means?</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☒</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>d) Interfere substantially with the movement of any native resident or migratory fish or wildlife species or with established native resident or migratory wildlife corridors, or impede the use of wildlife nursery sites?</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☒</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>e) Conflict with any local policies or ordinances protecting biological resources, such as a tree preservation policy or ordinance?</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☒</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>f) Conflict with the provisions of an adopted Habitat Conservation Plan, Natural Community Conservation Plan, or other approved local, regional, or state habitat conservation plan?</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☒</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### 4.4.1 - Discussion

**Methodology**

MBA biologist/ecologist, Deborah Stout, conducted a field assessment on September 22, 2009. The assessment included describing the wildlife habitat present (Mayer and Laudenslayer 1988); identifying common plant and wildlife species observed; determining the potential presence of any special habitat features, such as waters of the U.S. or state, including wetlands; and identifying any linkages within the Project site to important adjacent wildlife habitats. Habitat types were evaluated...
for their potential to support special-status plant and wildlife species and any other sensitive biological resources. Prior to conducting the field assessment of the Project site, the following information sources were reviewed:

- The Elmira, California USGS 7.5-minute topographic quadrangle (1980).
- Aerial photography of the Project site (Google Earth undated).
- A Natural Resource Conservation Service (NRCS) soils map of the Project site (Soil Survey Staff undated).
- California Department of Fish and Game (CDFG) California Natural Diversity Data Base (CNDDB) records for the Elmira, California 7.5-minute topographic quadrangle and the surrounding eight quadrangles (CNDDB 2009) (Appendix B, Biological Data).
- CDFG California Wildlife Habitat Relationship System (CWHR) (CDFG 2005).
- U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service (USFWS) list of endangered and threatened species that may occur, or be affected by the Project, in the Elmira, California quadrangle (USFWS 2009) (Appendix B, Biological Data).
- The California Native Plant Society (CNPS) online Inventory of Rare and Endangered Vascular Plants of California (CNPS 2009) (Appendix B, Biological Data).
- Pertinent literature, including The Jepson Manual, Higher Plants of California (Hickman 1993); Amphibian and Reptile Species of Special Concern in California (Jennings and Hayes 1994); California Birds: Their Status and Distribution (Small 1994); California Bird Species of Special Concern (Shuford and Gardali, eds. 2008); and Mammalian Species of Special Concern in California (Williams 1986).

Results

Vegetation Communities

Vegetation communities within the Project site are classified according to the nomenclature of the Guide to Wildlife Habitats of California (Mayer and Laudenslayer 1988).

Habitat within the Project site is best classified as Urban. The site is highly disturbed and appears to have been previously developed. Approximately one-third of the site is covered with a large cement slab. Remaining portions of the site are compacted, mostly barren soils. Plant species observed on the site include alkali heliotrope (*Heliotropium curassavicum*), chicory (*Cicorium intybus*), oak grass (*Avena* sp.), valley oak (*Quercus lobata*), Bermuda grass (*Cynodon dactylon*), prickly lettuce (*Lactuca serriola*), cocklebur (*Xanthium strumarium*), giant reed (*Arundo donax*), eucalyptus (*Eucalyptus* sp.), common sheep sorrel (*Rumex acetosella*), and field bindweed (*Convolvulus arvensis*).
Special-Status Species
For the purposes of this analysis, special-status species are those species:

- Listed as threatened or endangered under the Endangered Species Act (ESA) and those species formally proposed or candidates for listing.
- Listed as threatened or endangered under California ESA (CESA) or candidates for listing.
- Designated as endangered or rare pursuant to California Fish and Game Code (Section 1901).
- Designated as fully protected pursuant to California Fish and Game Code (Section 3511, Section 4700, Section 5050).
- Designated as a species of special concern by CDFG.
- Designated as Medium or High Priority by the Western Bat Working Group (WBWG).
- Plants listed as rare under the California Native Plant Protection Act or considered by CNPS as List 1A, 1B, or 2 species.

Special-Status Plant Species
The special-status plant species reviewed in this document are listed in Appendix B, Biological Data. This list was compiled based upon query results from CNDDB and the CNPS on-line inventory, as well as a list obtained from USFWS.

Several regionally occurring species do not have the potential to occur within the Project site either because the distribution of the species does not extend into the Project area, or because the habitat and/or microsite conditions (e.g., serpentine soils, rocky substrates) required by the species are not present.

Recorded occurrences of special-status plant species within 5 miles of the Project site are shown in Exhibit 5. Based upon results of the species review, there are no special-status plant species with at least a Low potential to occur within the Project site.
Exhibit 5
Recorded Occurrences of Special-Status Species within 5 Miles of the Project

**CNDDB Plant Species**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Common Name (Scientific Name)</th>
<th>Scientific Name</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Baker's navarretia (Navarretia leucocephala ssp. bakeri)</td>
<td>Navarretia leucocephala ssp. bakeri</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Brewer's western flax (Hesperolinon breweri)</td>
<td>Hesperolinon breweri</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Contra Costa goldfields (Lasthenia conjugens)</td>
<td>Lasthenia conjugens</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>San Joaquin spearscale (Atriplex joaquiniana)</td>
<td>Atriplex joaquiniana</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>dwarf downingia (Downingia pusilla)</td>
<td>Downingia pusilla</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>legenere (Legenere limosa)</td>
<td>Legenere limosa</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**CNDDB Wildlife Species**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Common Name (Scientific Name)</th>
<th>Scientific Name</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>California linderiella (Linderiella occidentalis)</td>
<td>Linderiella occidentalis</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>California tiger salamander (Ambystoma californiense)</td>
<td>Ambystoma californiense</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Swainson's hawk (Buteo swainsoni)</td>
<td>Buteo swainsoni</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>burrowing owl (Athene cunicularia)</td>
<td>Athene cunicularia</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>foothill yellow-legged frog (Rana boylii)</td>
<td>Rana boylii</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>vernal pool fairy shrimp (Branchinecta lynchi)</td>
<td>Branchinecta lynchi</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>vernal pool tadpole shrimp (Lepidurus packardi)</td>
<td>Lepidurus packardi</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>western pond turtle (Actinemys marmorata)</td>
<td>Actinemys marmorata</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>white-tailed kite (Elanus leucurus)</td>
<td>Elanus leucurus</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Special-Status Wildlife Species

The special-status wildlife species considered for review in this document are included in Appendix B, Biological Data. This list was compiled based on the USFWS list and query results from CNDDDB.

Recorded occurrences of special-status wildlife species within 5 miles of the Project site are shown in Exhibit 5. Several regionally occurring species do not have potential to occur within the Project site, either because the distribution of the species does not extend into the Project area, or because the habitat or habitat elements (e.g., caves, tall snags) required by the species are not present. Based upon results of the species review, there are 2 special-status wildlife species with at least a low potential to be impacted by the Project. Table 5 below lists these species’ status, habitat requirements, and identifiable period; and describes the potential for these species to be impacted by the proposed Project.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Scientific Name</th>
<th>Listing Status USFWS/CDFG</th>
<th>General Habitat Description</th>
<th>Potential for Impacts</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Accipiter cooperi</td>
<td>—/—/—</td>
<td>Year-round resident throughout the state except the deserts and the Central Valley. Moist lowlands, or dry and riparian upland areas with moderately old coniferous or mixed conifer-hardwood. Also in suburban an urban setting in parks, campuses, business parks, cemeteries, and residential areas.</td>
<td>Low. Mature valley oak trees at the western edge of the site may be used for nesting. There are no recorded occurrences of this species within 5 miles of the Project site (CNDDB 2009).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Elanus leucurus</td>
<td>—/CFP/—</td>
<td>Rolling foothills and valley margins with scattered oaks and river bottomlands or marshes next to deciduous woodland. Open grasslands, meadows, or marshes for foraging close to isolated, dense-topped trees for nesting and perching.</td>
<td>Low. Although there are suitable nest trees, the Project site and vicinity is heavily urbanized, making nesting unlikely. The Project site was previously developed and contains compacted, graded soils and paved areas. There are 2 recorded occurrences of this species approximately 4 miles east of the Project site (CNDDDB 2008).</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Waters of the U.S., Including Wetlands

No water features were observed during the field assessment conducted on September 22, 2009.
Local Policies Pertaining to Biological Resources
The City of Vacaville Municipal Code contains a Tree Preservation chapter (Chapter 14.09.131). The Code requires a permit for removal of any tree with a single stem or an aggregate stem circumference of 31 inches or more diameter at breast height. Prior to cutting down, removing, or destroying any tree on any public or private property, a tree removal permit application must be submitted. This is not required when approval of a development project is approved in which trees slated for removal are clearly designated as part of the project application. The Code also details measures for the preservation and maintenance of trees during the construction process. As a County project, this project is not required to conform to the City’s Municipal Code or zoning requirements. However, the County will design and implement the project to County standards but will attempt to address the City’s Municipal Code and zoning requirements to the extent feasible.

Environmental Issues
a  Construction of the proposed Project may impact individuals and/or nests of Cooper’s hawk, white-tailed kite, and other raptors and migratory songbirds protected under the Fish and Game Code and the Migratory Bird Treaty Act. Implementation of Mitigation Measure BIO-1 would reduce these impacts to a less-than-significant level.

b  The Project site is disturbed and previously developed. The site contains a large area of concrete; the remainder of the site is compacted largely barren soil. There are no riparian or other sensitive natural communities within the Project site. Construction of the Project would not impact any sensitive communities.

c  The Project site contains no federally protected wetlands; no wetlands were observed during the September 22, 2009 field assessment. Construction of the Project would not impact federally protected wetlands.

d  The Project site is a heavily disturbed area surrounded by commercial and residential developments. The Project site does not function as a movement corridor for any native resident or migratory fish or wildlife species. Construction of the Project would not interfere with the movement of wildlife or impede the use of any wildlife nursery sites.

e  Construction of the Project would not conflict with any local policies or ordinances, including the City of Vacaville Tree Preservation Code. While the larger oak tree on the west side of the Project site will be retained, construction of the Project will result in the removal of smaller onsite trees. Implementation of Mitigation Measures BIO-2 and BIO-3 would reduce these impacts to a less-than-significant level.

The operation and maintenance of the Project may result in the decline and or possible death of the mature valley oaks that are proposed to be retained on site. Implementation of
Mitigation Measure BIO-4 would reduce these potential impacts to a less-than-significant level.

The Project site is not located in an area covered by any habitat conservation plan, natural community conservation plan, or other approved local, regional, or state habitat conservation plan. The Project would not impact any conservation plan.

### 4.4.2 - Impact

The Project may impact individuals and/or nests of migratory songbirds and raptors, and may impact mature valley oak trees that would be retained on the Project site.

### 4.4.3 - Mitigation

**BIO-1**

If construction of the Project is initiated during the nesting season (February 15 through September 1), pre-construction surveys for nesting Cooper’s hawk, white-tailed kite, and other raptors shall be conducted within 250 feet of the Project site. If an active raptor nest is found, a 250-foot buffer shall be established around the nest, within which no construction activity may occur until all chicks have fledged (as determined by a qualified biologist), or unless approved by CDFG. Any nests of migratory songbirds identified during the survey requires establishment of a 100-foot buffer, within which no construction activity may occur until all chicks have fledged (as determined by a qualified biologist), or unless approved by CDFG.

**BIO-2**

Prior to removal of any valley oak tree, the County will prepare a detailed project landscaping plan showing all Project components, and the location of all trees within the Project site. Trees to be removed shall be differentiated from those that will be retained and protected during construction.

**BIO-3**

For retained trees, no ground disturbance shall occur within the dripline of the tree. The dripline is defined as the ground surface beneath the tree that is located between from the base of the tree, extending outward to the tip of the branch furthest from the trunk at ground level. Prior to initiation of any ground disturbing activities, brightly colored construction fencing shall be installed around the greatest dripline of all retained trees to prevent encroachment of any construction activities into this zone. The fencing shall be maintained until construction is completed. Dumping of liquids and the storage of equipment shall not be permitted in this zone.

**BIO-4**

In order to prevent the decline and mortality of valley oaks retained on the site, no landscaping shall be installed beneath the dripline of any retained valley oak trees, with the exception of species identified in “Compatible Plants Under and Around Oaks” (California Oak Foundation 2007). All plantings shall be installed at a distance of 6 or more feet from the trunk of the tree. In lieu of live plantings, ground
cover can be installed beneath the oak canopies including cobbles, gravel, or wood chips. No impermeable barriers or other materials that impede passage of water and oxygen shall be placed beneath the canopies of retained valley oak trees.

Irrigation shall not be installed in any manner or location that results in the deposition of water beneath the canopies of retained valley oak trees. If supplemental watering is needed during particularly dry years, it shall be done at the outer edge of the canopy only via a slow, all-day soaking. Supplemental watering shall not occur more than twice during any given summer.

4.4.4 - Verification

BIO-1  The nesting bird survey shall be submitted to the Department of Fish and Game for review if avian nesting habitat is to be removed between February 1 and August 31. In addition, prior to initiation of any ground disturbing activities, brightly colored construction fencing shall be installed around the greatest dripline of all retained trees to prevent encroachment of any construction activities into this zone. The fencing shall be maintained until construction is completed.

BIO-2 to BIO-4  Copies of the prepared plans and specifications will be prepared by the County and forwarded to the City for comment.
4.5 - Cultural Resources

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Environmental Issues</th>
<th>Potentially Significant Impact</th>
<th>Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporated</th>
<th>Less Than Significant Impact</th>
<th>No Impact</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>5. Cultural Resources</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Would the project:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>a) Cause a substantial adverse change in the significance of a historical resource as defined in §15064.5?</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☒</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>b) Cause a substantial adverse change in the significance of an archaeological resource pursuant to §15064.5?</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☒</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>c) Directly or indirectly destroy a unique paleontological resource or site or unique geologic feature?</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☒</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>d) Disturb any human remains, including those interred outside of formal cemeteries?</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☒</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

4.5.1 - Discussion

Record Search Results

To determine if prehistoric or historic resources have been previously recorded within the Project area, MBA conducted a records search on September 10, 2009 that included a review of National Register of Historic Places, the California Register of Historic Resources, the California Inventory of Historic Resources, the California Historical Landmarks, and the California Points of Historical Interest listings. The record search included the Project area and a 0.25-mile search radius outside the Project site. The record search results indicated that no prehistoric or historic resources have been recorded within the Project site or a 0.25-mile radius. Four previous investigations have been conducted within the search 0.25-mile search radius; S-005166, S-029303, S-005113, S-005071. None of the previous investigations included the Project site.

The Project site does not contain features such as natural watercourses, springs, ponds, or elevated ground such as ridges and knolls that could be considered archaeologically or historically sensitive. Human remains are not known to exist at the subject site.

Field Survey Results

On October 15, 2009, MBA conducted a field investigation to determine the presence/absence of prehistoric or historic resources within the Project area. Although there were two large concrete pads and eight concrete “planter boxes” around trees, these were not considered historically significant and therefore no historic resources were found during the course of the survey. In addition, no prehistoric
resources were discovered during the survey and the Project area’s sensitivity for prehistoric resources is considered low.

Environmental Issues

a  The record search and field survey conducted for the proposed Project indicated that no historical resources have been recorded within the Project area or within a 0.25-mile radius. The proposed Project is located on land that has been used for commercial purposes and is highly disturbed by grading and the construction of concrete pads. The disturbance level at the Project site is high and as a result, there are no historic structures on or near the Project site, there is always the possibility that previously unknown historic resources, below grade, could be discovered during Project development. Damage to buried historic resources would be minimized through implementation Mitigation Measure CR-1 that will reduce this potential impact to a less than significant level.

b  The record search and field survey conducted for the proposed Project indicated that no archaeological resources have been recorded on the Project site or a 0.25-mile radius. The proposed Project is located on land that is considered an unlikely place for prehistoric resources to be present. However, there is always the possibility that previously undiscovered prehistoric resources are present below the ground surface. Buried archaeological resources such as prehistoric midden deposits, flaked and ground stone artifacts, bone, shell, and other cultural materials could be uncovered during excavation, grading, and other construction related activities. However, if significant archaeological resources are discovered, implementation of Mitigation Measure CR-1 will reduce this potential impact to a less than significant level.

c  The proposed Project site is not located in an area that is considered likely to have paleontological resources present. Fossils of plants, animals, or other organisms of paleontological significance have not been discovered at the Project site, nor has the site been identified to be within an area where such discoveries are likely. The type of depositional environment at the Project area typically does not present favorable conditions for the discovery of paleontological resources. In this context, the proposed Project would not result in impacts to paleontological resources or unique geologic features. However, if significant paleontological resources are discovered, implementation of Mitigation Measure CR-1 will reduce this potential impact to a less than significant level.

d  No human remains are known to exist within the proposed Project site, nor were there any indications of human remains found during the field survey. Although it is considered highly unlikely, there is always the possibility that human remains could be found during Project development. Implementation of Mitigation Measure CR-2 will reduce this potential impact to a less than significant level.
4.5.2 - Impact
Archaeological resources, fossils, or burial sites could be disturbed or destroyed during grading and excavation.

4.5.3 - Mitigation
Damage to significant buried resources, including human remains, would be minimized through implementation of the following mitigation measures that will reduce this potential impact to a less than significant level.

CR-1 If potentially significant historic, archaeological, or paleontological resources are discovered during ground-disturbing activities associated with construction of the proposed Project, all work within 100 feet of the resource shall stop until a qualified archaeologist or paleontologist can assess the significance of the resource, and, if necessary, develop appropriate mitigation measures in consultation with Solano County and other appropriate agencies and individuals. If significant resources are discovered, a formal evaluation using CEQA criteria will be conducted to determine if further study, test excavations, or data recovery procedures are necessary.

CR-2 Pursuant to Section 7050.5 of the Health and Safety Code and Section 5097.94 of the Public Resources Code of the State of California, the following shall occur:

In the event of the discovery of human remains during construction, there shall be no further excavation or disturbance of the site or any nearby area reasonably suspected to overlie adjacent remains; at least a minimum of 100 feet. The Solano County Coroner shall be notified and shall make a determination as to whether the remains are Native American. If the Coroner determines that the remains are not subject to his authority, he shall notify the Native American Heritage Commission who shall attempt to identify descendants of the deceased Native American. If no satisfactory agreement can be reached as to the disposition of the remains pursuant to this State law, then the landowner shall re-inter the human remains and items associated with Native American burials on the property in a location not subject to further subsurface disturbance.

4.5.4 - Verification
CR-1 Inspection of log sheets to verify that cultural resource monitoring is being properly conducted if required.

CR-2 The Solano County Coroner, the Most Likely Descendent, and a representative from the Department of the Solano County General Services shall consult and determine appropriate procedures to be followed.
### 4.6 - Geology and Soils

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Environmental Issues</th>
<th>Potentially Significant Impact</th>
<th>Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporated</th>
<th>Less Than Significant Impact</th>
<th>No Impact</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>6. Geology and Soils</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Would the project:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>a) Expose people or structures to potential substantial adverse effects, including the risk of loss, injury or death involving:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>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.</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☒</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ii) Strong seismic ground shaking?</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☒</td>
<td>☒</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>iii) Seismic-related ground failure, including liquefaction?</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☒</td>
<td>☒</td>
<td>☒</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>iv) Landslides?</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☒</td>
<td>☒</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>b) Result in substantial soil erosion or the loss of topsoil?</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☒</td>
<td>☒</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>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?</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☒</td>
<td>☒</td>
<td>☒</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>d) Be located on expansive soil, as defined in Table 18-1-B of the Uniform Building Code (1994), creating substantial risks to life or property?</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☒</td>
<td>☒</td>
<td>☒</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>e) Have soils incapable of adequately supporting the use of septic tanks or alternative wastewater disposal systems where sewers are not available for the disposal of wastewater?</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☒</td>
<td>☒</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**4.6.1 - Discussion**

The following analysis is based on descriptions of the Project site under the Preliminary Geotechnical Exploration Report prepared in October 2009 (ENGEO Incorporated, 2009) (Appendix C, Geotechnical Investigation). Additional information was obtained from the County of Solano General Plan and the Natural Resources Conservation Service (NRCS).
Environmental Setting

The site is located on the western flank of the Sacramento Valley. The Sacramento and San Joaquin Valleys together form the Great Valley of California, which experienced near-constant submarine deposition from Cretaceous until Eocene time. An ancient mountain belt to the west and the ancestral Sierra Nevada to the east provided the necessary sediment to fill the basin. Post-Eocene uplift has dragged the western side of the Great Valley upwards which most likely accounts for the easterly dip of the mapped bedrock in the Vacaville area. (ENGEO 2009).

The subject property is mapped as young Quaternary alluvium consisting of interbedded, unconsolidated silt, clay, and silty sand. A localized zone to the east of the site and the bedrock underlying the site is mapped as the Tehama Formation. This formation is characterized as sand, gravel, silt, and silty clay, which are interstratified with volcaniclastics. The clay found in the volcaniclastics is smectic in nature and generally form highly expansive soils (ENGEO 2009).

Environmental Issues

a.i According to the preliminary geotechnical report prepared by ENGEO, Inc. for the William J. Carroll Government Center, there are no known faults crossing the subject property that could endanger the proposed Project. The Project site is not located within an Alquist-Priolo Earthquake Fault Zone. This condition precludes the possibility of fault rupture occurring on the Project site. No impacts would occur.

a.ii Based on the preliminary geotechnical report prepared by ENGEO, Inc. for the William J. Carroll Government Center, the Project site may experience considerable ground shaking from possible ruptures at nearby faults. The closest active faults nearest to Project site are summarized in Table 6.

Table 6: Fault Summary

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Fault</th>
<th>Distance from Kerman (miles/direction)</th>
<th>Fault Classification</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Great Valley</td>
<td>5 (west)</td>
<td>Inactive</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Concord-Green Valley</td>
<td>9 (west)</td>
<td>Active</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hunting Creek-Berryessa</td>
<td>15 (north)</td>
<td>Active</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>West Napa</td>
<td>20 (west)</td>
<td>Active</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hayward</td>
<td>32 (southwest)</td>
<td>Active</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>San Andreas</td>
<td>50 (west)</td>
<td>Active</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: ENGEO, Inc. 2009 and USGS 2006

The proposed Project would implement all applicable requirements of the 2007 California Building Standards Code or the California Building Standards in force at time of project construction, which provides criteria for the seismic design of buildings. Seismic design
criteria account for peak ground acceleration, soil profile, and other site conditions, and they establish corresponding design standards intended primarily to protect public safety and secondly to minimize property damage. The proposed building will comply with all seismic standards the California Building Standards Code. This will ensure that potential impacts would be less than significant.

a.iii The site has been mapped by the Association of Bay Area Governments as an area that may have a moderate susceptibility to liquefaction. Liquefaction is a phenomenon in which saturated cohesionless soils are subject to a temporary loss of shear strength because of pore pressure build-up under the cyclic shear stresses associated with earthquakes. ENGEO, Inc. prepared a preliminary subsurface study and found that the site soils are generally stiff to hard clayey material, and very dense clayey sands, and siltstone bedrock at depths below 16 to 17 feet. Based on the subsurface study information, the risk of liquefaction is considered low at the site. Additionally, the proposed Project would comply with the California Building Standards Code’s seismic design requirements, ensuring that appropriate ground excavation is completed to stabilize soils. Therefore, impacts are considered less than significant.

a.iv The Project site is characterized by flat relief and is surrounded by equally flat lands. Figure HS-4 of the Solano County General Plan Public Health and Safety Chapter identifies the Project site and surrounding areas as containing slopes of less than four percent. This condition precludes the possibility of earthquake-induced landslides. No impacts would occur.

b Construction activities associated with the proposed Project would involve grading, and excavation activities that could expose barren soils to sources of wind or water, resulting in the potential for erosion and sedimentation on and off the Project site. National Pollutant Discharge Elimination System (NPDES) stormwater permitting programs regulate stormwater quality from construction sites, which includes erosion and sedimentation. Under the NPDES permitting program, the preparation and implementation of a Stormwater Pollution Prevention Plan (SWPPP) are required for construction activities that would disturb an area of 1 acre or more. The SWPPP must identify potential sources of erosion or sedimentation that may be reasonably expected to affect the quality of stormwater discharges as well as identify and implement Best Management Practices (BMPs) that ensure the reduction of these pollutants during stormwater discharges. Typical BMPs intended to control erosion include sand bags, detention basins, silt fencing, storm drain inlet protection, street sweeping, and monitoring of water bodies.

The proposed Project would be required to prepare and implement a SWPPP. The implementation of an SWPPP and its associated BMPs would reduce potential erosion impacts to a level of less than significant.
The Preliminary Geotechnical Exploration, prepared by ENGEO, Inc. identified three main geotechnical concerns for the future development of the site, however recommendations for addressing these concerns have been incorporated as mitigation measures. The first concern involved the presence of remnant foundations, buried structures and utilities, septic tanks, etc., from previous site uses that if not properly abandoned and/or removed could pose a risk of excessive settlement for future planned development. The second concern involved the presence and extent of undocumented “man-made” existing fills at the site, which may be considered highly susceptible to excessive total and differential settlement. The third concern involved the presence of moderate to highly expansive near-surface clays; this is discussed in Item d. below.

Design level geotechnical studies are necessary to characterize variations in depth and extent of the existing fills at the Project site to develop design level conclusions and recommendations for treatment of the fills to reduce risk for the planned future development. Additionally, the location of the foundation remnants, buried structures, utilities, septic tanks, etc. need to be researched and such elements removed and replaced with engineered fill to accommodate the future planned development. One measure to treat undocumented existing fills and reduce potential settlement is to completely over-excavate these and restore grades with engineered fill.

As part of the proposed Project, the Project site would be graded and soil engineered in accordance with the 2007 California Building Standards Code and the recommendations included in the Preliminary Geotechnical Exploration report prepared by ENGEO, Inc. These practices would ensure that the proposed Project is located on stable soils and geologic units and would not be susceptible to settlement or ground failure. In addition, mitigation measures have been incorporated which will reduce potential impacts to less than significant.

cd The General Soil Map Solano County indicates that the Project site is underlain by soils of the Yolo-Brentwood Association. The Natural Resources Conservation Service (NRCS) characterizes the Yolo-Brentwood Association as a “well-drained soil with nearly level topography, characterized by silt loams to silty clay loams, on alluvial fans. The shrink-swell potential associated with the dominant soil components typically ranges from moderate to high. The Preliminary Geotechnical Exploration report prepared by ENGEO, Inc. identified the soils in the region as having moderate to high plasticity and high expansion potentials with Plasticity Indices (P.I) ranging from 28 to 29. Expansive soils shrink and swell as a result of seasonal fluctuation in moisture content. This can cause heaving and cracking of slabs-on-grade, pavements and structures founded on shallow foundations. Building damage due to volume changes associated with expansive soils can be reduced through proper grading and foundation design. Successful construction on expansive soils requires special attention during construction. It is imperative that exposed soils be kept moist by watering for several days before placement of concrete. It is extremely difficult to re-moisturize
clayey soils without excavation, moisture conditioning, and recompaction. It is further recommended that design level geotechnical studies be undertaken to characterize expansion soils to provide recommendations for mitigation (such as placement of near surface low to non-expansive select fills, lime treatment, etc.) as these relate to the planned site improvements. In addition, mitigation measures include the prevention of moisture variation. These recommendations have been incorporated as mitigation. With implementation of the recommendations, the impacts would be reduced to a level of less than significant.

The proposed Project would be served by the City of Vacaville’s sanitary sewer collection system. This condition precludes the use of septic systems or alternative wastewater disposal systems. No impacts in this regard would occur.

4.6.2 - Impact

Development of the proposed Project could expose persons or structures to hazards associated with unstable geologic units or soils and expose persons or structures to hazards associated with expansive soils.

4.6.3 - Mitigation

The following mitigation is proposed to reduce impacts from development on unstable geologic units or soils and expansive soils to a less than significant level.

GEO-1 Prior to construction a comprehensive geotechnical engineering investigation indicating the design and construction specifications for the proposed Project shall be completed by the County.

GEO-2 During grading and construction, the County shall adhere to all applicable recommendations for dealing with undocumented existing fills and remnant structures contained in the Preliminary Geotechnical Exploration report or comparable geotechnical study.

GEO-3 During grading and construction, the County shall adhere to all applicable recommendations for abating expansive soil conditions contained in the Preliminary Geotechnical Exploration report or comparable geotechnical study. This includes the excavation of expansive soils near surface levels and the subsequent replacement of such soils with non-expansive engineered fill and the prevention of moisture variation.

4.6.4 - Verification

GEO-1 Copies of the completed comprehensive geotechnical engineering investigation will be filed with the County’s Department of General Services, Division of Architectural Services. Copies of the prepared study will be forwarded to the City for comment.
GEO-2  Inspection of log sheets to verify that geotechnical recommendations are being properly followed.

GEO-3  Inspection of log sheets to verify that geotechnical recommendations are being properly followed.
4.7 - Greenhouse Gas Emissions (Climate Change)

![Table]

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Environmental Issues</th>
<th>Potentially Significant Impact</th>
<th>Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporated</th>
<th>Less Than Significant Impact</th>
<th>No Impact</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>7. Greenhouse Gas Emissions</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Would the project:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>a) Generate greenhouse gas emissions, either directly or indirectly, that may have a</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☑</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>significant impact on the environment?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>b) Conflict with any applicable plan, policy or regulation of an agency adopted for</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☑</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>the purpose of reducing the emissions of greenhouse gases?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

4.7.1 - Discussion

Climate change is a change in the average weather of the earth that is measured by alterations in wind patterns, storms, precipitation, and temperature. Climate change is believed to be caused by greenhouse gases, which are gases that trap heat in the atmosphere. The potential adverse impacts of climate change include the exacerbation of air quality problems, a reduction in the quality and supply of water to the state from the Sierra snowpack, a rise in sea levels resulting in the displacement of thousands of coastal businesses and residences, damage to marine ecosystems and the natural environment, and an increase in the incidences of infectious diseases, asthma, and other human health-related problems. For more background information on climate change and greenhouse gases, please refer to Appendix A, Air Quality and Climate Change Analysis.

**Environmental Issues**

a. The Project would emit greenhouse gases during construction and operation. Construction equipment and motor vehicles emit greenhouse gases in the form of exhaust. During construction, approximately 159 MTCO$_2$e (metric tons of carbon dioxide equivalents) would be emitted.

During operation, greenhouse gases are emitted from the motor vehicles of those that would go to and from the Project, offsite generation of electricity used for the Project, natural gas used on the Project site, and fugitive emissions of hydrofluorocarbons from air conditioning systems and refrigerators. Other minor sources of greenhouse gases, which are not estimated, include emissions from landscape equipment, emissions from waste, and electricity emissions from the transportation and treatment of the water to be used on the Project site. A summary of the main sources of operational greenhouse gases are shown in Table 7.
Table 7: Project Operational Greenhouse Gases

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Source</th>
<th>Unmitigated Emissions (MTCO2e per year)</th>
<th>Reduction (%)</th>
<th>Mitigated Emissions (MTCO2e per year)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Motor vehicles</td>
<td>2,150</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2,107</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Natural gas</td>
<td>46</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>44</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Electricity</td>
<td>204</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>194</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Refrigerants</td>
<td>91</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>91</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>2,491</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>2,436</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

MTCO2e = metric tons of carbon dioxide equivalent, converted from tons per year by multiplying by the global warming potential and 0.9072 to convert to metric tons.

Source: Appendix A, Air Quality and Climate Change Analysis.

The YSAQMD does not have significance thresholds for greenhouse gases. The YSAQMD CEQA Handbook indicates the following regarding evaluating project greenhouse gases:

While there are no specific thresholds associated with greenhouse gases, it is still recommended to at least include a qualitative discussion of greenhouse gases in air quality analyses for sizable projects. The issue of greenhouse gases is increasingly becoming an area of comment on draft environmental documents. The EIR’s for several transportation plans and general plans have received comments from the State Attorney General asking that an analysis of greenhouse gases be included. In order to pro-actively address this issue, Lead Agencies should consider preparing such an analysis for larger projects as part of their full analysis….

The Governor has recognized, “mitigation efforts will be necessary to reduce greenhouse gas emissions and adaptation efforts will be necessary to prepare Californians for the consequences of global warming.” (Executive Order S-3-05, June 1, 2005.) The Lead Agency can require mitigation measures through alterations of its building codes or permit requirements; e.g., it might require solar heating capabilities for all new development, or require that carbon sequestration credits be purchased for developments exceeding a certain size. The Lead Agency could take direct action to offset its own carbon emissions, or those of its residents, by providing for increased public transportation service, increased support of alternative fuels and technologies, or other measures to reduce the impacts of CO₂.

Mitigation Measures CC-1 through CC-4 are recommended to reduce the Project’s contribution of greenhouse gases, as recommended by the YSAQMD. The proposed project would be designed to meet and obtain the U.S. Green Building Council’s LEED Silver or Certification for New Construction or equivalent as required by the Solano County General Implementation Program RS.I-41 assuring minimal energy use and, therefore, further
minimizing emissions from operations. Therefore, with implementation of mitigation measures, and given the minimal trip generation associated with the proposed project and the design elements to reduce emissions, the proposed project would not considerably contribute to GHG emissions, this impact is less than significant and the Project’s greenhouse gases would not have a significant impact on the environment.

b The County of Solano is currently in the process of preparing a Climate Action Plan. However, a draft has not been released to the public. As discussed in Environmental Issue “a” above, the YSAQMD does not have significance thresholds but suggests that Lead Agencies apply mitigation measures to reduce emissions of greenhouse gases. Therefore, with mitigation, the Project is consistent with the YSAQMD’s recommendations.

In 2006, the California State Legislature enacted AB 32, the California Global Warming Solutions Act of 2006. AB 32 focuses on reducing greenhouse gas emissions in California. Greenhouse gases, as defined under AB 32, include carbon dioxide, methane, nitrous oxide, hydrofluorocarbons, perfluorocarbons, and sulfur hexafluoride. AB 32 requires that greenhouse gases emitted in California be reduced to 1990 levels by the year 2020. The ARB adopted a Scoping Plan to outline the steps to reduce the State’s emissions pursuant to AB 32. The Scoping Plan contains strategies such as increasing green building and energy efficiency, reducing waste, and reducing water use. These strategies are to be implemented as regulations at the State level. With implementation of Mitigation Measures CC-1 through CC-4, the Project would increase energy efficiency, reduce waste, and reduce water use, which is consistent with the strategies in AB 32.

4.7.2 - Impact
The proposed Project has the potential to generate greenhouse gas emissions and conflict with AB 32, the California Global Warming Solutions Act of 2006.

4.7.3 - Mitigation
With implementation of the following mitigation measures, greenhouse gas emissions and conflicts with AB 32 would be less than significant.

Mitigation Measure CC-1 incorporates feasible measures from the YSAQMD CEQA Handbook, the California Attorney General’s Office (AG 2008), and the California Air Pollution Control Officers Association (CAPCOA 2008).

CC-1 The Project shall implement the following measures to increase energy efficiency and reduce greenhouse gases from energy generation:

- There shall be a duct system which is insulated within the building thermal envelope to a value of R-8.
• There shall be passive cooling strategies including passive or fan-aided cooling planned for or designed into structure.

• There shall be outdoor lighting designed for high efficiency, solar-powered, or controlled by motion detectors.

• Natural interior lighting shall be maximized to the extent feasible.

• Energy efficient appliances and lighting shall be installed.

CC-2 The Project shall implement the following measures to reduce greenhouse gases from motor vehicles:

• There shall be a minimum of four short-term bicycle parking spaces located within 50 feet of the main building entrance if feasible.

• There shall be a minimum of two priority parking spaces for alternative fuel vehicles (hybrid, electric, natural gas, biodiesel) located near the Project entrances.

CC-3 The Project shall implement the following measures to reduce greenhouse gases associated with waste:

• The Project shall ensure that the site is to be serviced with recycling services during operation.

CC-4 The Project shall implement the following measures to reduce greenhouse gas emissions associated with water consumption:

• The trees, shrubs, and groundcover shall be drought tolerant.

• The landscaping shall consist of drought-resistant plants in lieu of irrigated grass, wherever feasible.

4.7.4 - Verification

Plans demonstrating energy and water efficient features shall be prepared by the County and submitted to the County Building and Safety Services department with copies forwarded to the County Department of General Services, Division of Architectural Services and the City for comment.
## 4.8 - Hazards and Hazardous Materials

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Environmental Issues</th>
<th>Potentially Significant Impact</th>
<th>Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporated</th>
<th>Less Than Significant Impact</th>
<th>No Impact</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>8. Hazards and Hazardous Materials</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Would the project:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>a) Create a significant hazard to the public or the environment through the routine transport, use, or disposal of hazardous materials?</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☒</td>
<td>☐</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>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?</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☒</td>
<td>☐</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>c) Emit hazardous emissions or handle hazardous or acutely hazardous materials, substances, or waste within one-quarter mile of an existing or proposed school?</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☒</td>
<td>☐</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>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?</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☒</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>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?</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☒</td>
<td>☐</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>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?</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☒</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>g) Impair implementation of or physically interfere with an adopted emergency response plan or emergency evacuation plan?</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☒</td>
<td>☐</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>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?</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☒</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
4.8.1 - Discussion

The following discussion is based on information obtained from the following reports, most of which are found or referenced within Appendix D, Phase I and II Environmental Site Assessments, those which are not included are available upon request from Solano County:


Environmental Issues

a-b The proposed Project consists of a two-story H&SS building, associated parking, and other site improvements. The new building would house clinical uses that would generate limited quantities of medical waste. This facility would be required to comply with all Federal, State, and County standards concerning the transportation, storage, use, handling, and disposal of medical waste, and compliance with these standards would ensure that no hazardous materials releases would occur. Overall, the uses of the building would not expose the public or the environment to hazardous materials. Impacts would be less than significant.

c The Vaca Valley Montessori Preschool and Childcare School is located within 0.25 mile of the Project site. As stated above, the proposed Project would be required to comply with all Federal, State, and County standards concerning the storage, use, handling, and disposal of medical waste, and compliance with these standards would ensure that no hazardous materials releases would occur. Impacts would be less than significant.

d Former gas station and auto camp uses on the Project site resulted in soil and groundwater contamination on both APNs of the Project site. In addition, one incidence of a Leaking
Under Ground Storage Tank LUST had occurred in 1984 from a site across Brown Street and may have resulted in contamination under the site. Reports were prepared for both parcels in order to identify and mitigate any possible contamination at the site or contamination that may have occurred from previous or surrounding land uses. The results are summarized below and recent reports are provided in their entirety in Appendix D, Phase I and II Environmental Site Assessments.

**APN 0129-320-030**

A Phase I Site Assessment (Phase I ESA) was conducted for APN 0129-320-030 in 2006. According to the Phase I ESA, no environmental violations, hazardous waste violations, Underground Storage Tank (UST) permits or Leaking Underground Storage Tank (LUSTs) were listed for the Project site. However, a data base search of parcels within one-half mile of the Project site revealed a fuel leak associated with 1097 East Monte Vista Avenue, the 7-Eleven Store across Brown Avenue may have impacted groundwater under the site. The one-half mile search also identified APN 0129-320-210 (now part of the Project site) as the site of a former gasoline station that may contain Under Ground Storage Tanks.

Stormwater ponding was noted on the east and west side of the central concrete slab; with the west side containing a sewer grate that may have been used for disposal during previous uses. The Phase I ESA recommended a Phase II Subsurface Investigation to identify any UST, to determine if the auto camp and gas stations had resulted in contamination beneath the subject site, and to determine if hazardous substances were discharged into sewer.

As such, a Phase II Subsurface Investigation was performed on APN 0129-320-030 in September 2006, which revealed two subsurface anomalies and a metal covered vault containing two water shut-off valves. A small UST was removed according to agency procedure at the site of one of the anomalies. At the site of the other anomaly, the buried manhole of an inactive storm sewer system has uncovered. Soil samples from around the UST and buried storm sewer system were below the screening levels of the Regional Water Quality Control Board (RWQCB). However, groundwater samples found Total Petroleum Hydrocarbons as diesel (TPH-d) in all borings ranging from 190 micro grams per liter to 840 micro grams per liter with the highest concentrations found near the steel-plated concrete vault and the lowest near the sites of the UST and inactive storm sewer system. The strictest Environmental Screening Levels (ESL) for TPH-d is 100 micro grams per liter and is used when groundwater is used as a drinking water source. In this case, since ground water is not used as a drinking water source, the less stringent ESL of 2,500 micro grams per liter is a more appropriate level. A second investigation was performed to determine if the contamination originated from the vault and to identify the extent of the contamination. Although the 2006 Phase II Subsurface Investigation recommended no further action based
on the relatively low levels of TPH-d, the Solano County of Resource Management (SCDRM) requested the installation of three monitoring wells at the site.

Three monitoring wells were installed on the site and four monitoring events were performed between September 11, 2007 and January 3, 2008. Two monitoring events revealed concentrations of up to 140 and 70 micro grams per liter, during the other monitoring events TPH-d was not detected. Because of the relatively low concentrations of contamination, the 2007 Phase II Subsurface Investigation recommended no further monitoring and that a “No Further Action” letter be issued for the Project site. The No Further Action letter was issued December 8, 2009.

APN 0129-320-210

A second Phase II Subsurface Investigation dated January 22, 2007 was performed on parcel APN 0129-320-210 to identify the presence of USTs and to determine if soil or groundwater contamination had occurred. The survey included visual inspection, groundwater and soil samples, and subsurface imaging techniques. According to the results, one anomalous zone was detected that could be a UST, and another area may contain miscellaneous metal objects buried beneath the surface; groundwater samples taken from these areas did not indicate contamination. MTBE was detected in one ground water sample at concentrations of 8.7 micrograms per liter and likely originated from the 7-Eleven LUST site. Soil staining was observed in one sample that was taken from beneath an existing concrete slab; TPH was detected in soil samples taken from this area at concentrations of 19 mg/kg and 2.4 mg/kg at depths of five feet below ground surface and 17 feet below ground surface respectively. These levels are below screening levels of the RWQCB; however, the Phase II Subsurface Investigation notes that further contamination could exist under the concrete slab given the limited scope of the investigation. Because the nature of anomaly A is unknown, the 2007 Phase II Subsurface Investigation recommended an exploratory excavation at this location to determine whether or not a UST exists at this location. This recommendation has been proposed as Mitigation Measure HAZ-1. The 2007 Phase II ESA, recommended that an environmental professional monitor the demolition of the concrete slab on this parcel and the associated soil removal and grading activities to ensure impacts from undiscovered soil or groundwater contamination or USTs would less than significant. This recommendation has been included as Mitigation Measure HAZ-2. With proposed mitigation, impacts would be less than significant.

The Project site is located approximately 0.75 mile southwest of Nut Tree Airport. As discussed in the noise analysis (Section 4.12, Noise), the Project site is located in areas of acceptable exterior noise levels. As such, employees and visitors to the center would not be exposed to noise hazards associated with the airport. The project is located within Nut Tree Airport Compatibility Area D, as described in City of Vacaville’s City Ordinance Chapter
14.09.134 (Supplemental Standards, Airport, Helistop, and Heliport Land Use Compatibility). Compatibility Area D allows uses include offices with a maximum of two stories, as well as any other uses, including multi-story buildings that do not have an anticipated maximum density of more than 100 persons per acre in buildings, and not more than 150 persons per acre outside of buildings. Uses normally not allowed in Compatibility Area D include large community care facilities. The project consists of construction of an approximately 35,000 sq ft public health facility, clinics, office space and associated site improvements on a 2.78-acre site. As the proposed project includes a mix of offices and community care facilities, and would be 35,317 sq ft., it is not considered a large community care facility. Furthermore, the City Ordinance provides the following exception to Compatibility Area D:

*In Compatibility Areas D, E, and F where substantial development already exists, additional infill development of similar land uses may be allowed to occur on parcels of three acres or less even if such land uses are prohibited elsewhere in the area.*

In addition, the height of the proposed building would not impede aircraft flight paths, nor would it result in other substantial changes such as light or glare that could be distracting to pilots, or include land uses that would pose a flight hazard. As such, impacts related to aviation and airport compatibility would be less than significant.

f The Project site is not located within the vicinity of a private airstrip. No impacts would occur.

g The City of Vacaville does not have an Emergency Response Plan or Emergency Evacuation Plan. However, Solano County has adopted an Emergency Operations Plan and the Solano County General Plan specifies Routes of significance as providing an improved response route. According to Figure TC-1 of the Solano County General Plan, the Project site is not located near a Route of Significance and therefore would not interfere with traffic flows on these routes. The proposed Project would not significantly alter existing roadways in the area of the Project site, in a manner that could interfere with existing traffic flows. Impacts would be less than significant.

h The Project site is not located in a fire hazard zone as indicated on Figure 9-4 of the General Plan. The Project site is located in an urban built up area and would not be subject to wildland fires. No impacts would occur.

4.8.2 - Impact

The proposed Project could expose persons to previously undiscovered soil and groundwater contamination, or hazardous materials associated with previously undiscovered USTs.
4.8.3 - Mitigation

With implementation of the following mitigation measures impacts from hazards and hazardous materials would be less than significant.

HAZ-1  Prior to construction, an exploratory investigation at the location of anomaly A on APN 0129-320-210 shall be performed to determine if an UST exists at this location. If the presence of an UST is confirmed, it shall be removed in accordance with Solano County Department of Resource Management requirements.

HAZ-2  A Registered Environmental Assessor (REA) that is certified by the California Department of Toxic Substances Control and approved by the Solano County Department of Resource Management shall be present during the demolition of the concrete slab on parcel APN 0129-320-210 and the associated soil removal and grading activities. In the event undiscovered soil or groundwater contamination or USTs are identified, construction activities shall cease until the recommendations of the environmental monitor have been stated and implemented. To document the implementation of the prescribed mitigation measure the contracted REA must provide a memorandum of observations to the Solano County Department of Resource Management.

4.8.4 - Verification

HAZ-1  Exploratory investigation results shall be submitted to the Solano County Department of Resource Management.

HAZ-2  On-site monitoring results of demolition activities shall be submitted to the Solano County Department of Resource Management.
4.9 - Hydrology and Water Quality

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Environmental Issues</th>
<th>Potentially Significant Impact</th>
<th>Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporated</th>
<th>Less Than Significant Impact</th>
<th>No Impact</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>9. Hydrology and Water Quality</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Would the project:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>a) Violate any water quality standards or waste discharge requirements?</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☒</td>
<td>☐</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>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 which would not support existing land uses or planned uses for which permits have been granted?</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☒</td>
<td>☐</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>c) Substantially alter the existing drainage pattern of area, including through the alteration of the course of a stream or river, in a manner which would result in substantial erosion or siltation on- or off-site?</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☒</td>
<td>☐</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>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 flooding on- or off-site?</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☒</td>
<td>☐</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>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?</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☒</td>
<td>☐</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>f) Otherwise substantially degrade water quality?</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☒</td>
<td>☐</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>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?</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☒</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>h) Place within a 100-year flood hazard area structures which would impede or redirect flood flows?</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☒</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>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?</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☒</td>
<td>☐</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>j) Inundation by seiche, tsunami, or mudflow?</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☒</td>
<td>☐</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
4.9.1 - Discussion

Environmental Issues

a  The proposed Project would be served by the City of Vacaville’s sanitary sewer collection system and would not discharge effluent directly into any water bodies. There are three existing sanitary sewer services stubbed to the subject property. As discussed in Section 4.17, Utilities and Service Systems, wastewater would be treated at the Easterly Wastewater Treatment Plant (WWTP). The City is currently upgrading the Easterly WWTP, which will ensure future compliance with ammonia and nitrate limits, as well as eliminating blending of primary effluent with secondary effluent during peak wet weather flow and requiring seasonal filtration and advanced disinfection, consistent with Title 22 reclamation requirements by 2015. The City is currently in the environmental review process for the required upgrades to the City plant. The proposed Project will not interfere with the upgrade process nor will it exacerbate the existing baseline situation identified in the Title 22 reclamation requirements. As such, impacts would be less than significant.

b  The new approximately 35,000 sq ft building would connect to the City of Vacaville’s potable water system. The City of Vacaville’s water supply is from both groundwater and surface sources. No new wells would be drilled as part of the proposed Project. Water demand for the Project is based on estimated building plus irrigation flow of 250 gallons per day per 1,000 sq ft of the office building (Kitchell 2009), for a total of 8,750 gallons per day (gpd). According to the 2005 Urban Water Management Plan, the City has a surplus of approximately 15 million gallons per day, and is expected to have at least a 13 mgd surplus by the year 2030. The Project represents less than 0.05 percent of the projected total surplus. As such, a significant increase in groundwater use is not expected. Impacts would be less than significant.

c-f  There are no creeks on the Project site and no such waterways would be affected in any way. The Project site is a vacant lot in a relatively flat area that is surrounded by urban development. The Project site would be graded and the location and constitution of impervious surfaces would be modified. The Draft Infrastructure Report prepared by Kitchell provided stormwater calculations for the project site for ‘existing condition’ and ‘developed condition’ (Kitchell 2009). However, the calculations for the ‘existing condition’ were made under the assumption that the site was ‘natural’, and did not account for the extensive existing impervious surfaces on the project site.

Per Kitchell, 90 percent of the site would currently considered ‘impervious surfaces’ and currently contributes runoff directly to the adjacent existing drop inlets and stub on East Monte Vista Avenue (Kitchell 2010). Therefore, revised calculations for the existing condition were calculated using 90 percent of the project as asphalt and concrete pavement,
and 10 percent as open space (for a runoff coefficient of 0.895). The Draft Infrastructure Report provided the developed condition’s runoff coefficient as 0.89.

Utilizing the rainfall intensity of 2.44 inches per hour (consistent with the Draft Infrastructure Report), and a runoff coefficient of 0.895, the existing condition runoff is calculated as 6.3 cubic feet per second. The Draft Infrastructure Report provides the developed condition runoff as 6.3 cubic feet per second. Therefore, development of the project site would not increase runoff from the project site above the existing runoff conditions.

A storm water collection and drainage system would be installed as part of the proposed Project to retain and regulate the release of flows, into the City of Vacaville’s storm drain system which could include the use of bio-swales if determine to be required by County. Stormwater will be collected onsite through systems of curbs, gutters, and drains and will connect to an existing 21-inch storm drain stub on East Monte Vista Avenue. This would ensure stormwater flows from the Project site would not inundate the City’s system and create a flood hazard. These onsite changes would not adversely affect the current drainage patterns in the areas surrounding the site, nor increase the amount of runoff experienced by the project site.

In addition, the proposed Project would be required to obtain a General Permit for Storm Water Discharge for construction activities from the CVRWQCB. The provisions of this permit require that a Stormwater Pollution Prevention Plan (SWPPP) be prepared and implemented. The SWPPP sets forth structural and non-structural BMPs to ensure erosion is properly controlled during construction activities. Therefore, the proposed Project would have a less than significant impact on stormwater drainage.

The Infrastructure Report prepared for the site (Appendix G, Infrastructure Report) indicated that according to the Flood Insurance Rate Map (FIRM) dated May 4, 2009 the site is located within the Zone X (moderate to low risk) flood prone area. Therefore, impacts would be less than significant.

The Project site is not adjacent to any large coastal or inland water bodies, nor is it within any dam or mudflow inundation areas. This condition precludes the possibility of impacts in related to inundation by seiche, tsunami, dam, or mudflow.

4.9.2 - Impact
Less than significant impact.

4.9.3 - Mitigation
No mitigation necessary.
4.9.4 - Verification

Not applicable.
4.10 - Land Use and Planning

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Environmental Issues</th>
<th>Potentially Significant Impact</th>
<th>Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporated</th>
<th>Less Than Significant Impact</th>
<th>No Impact</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| 10. Land Use and Planning  
Would the project:  
a) Physically divide an established community? | ☐ | ☐ | ☒ | ☐ |
| b) Conflict with any applicable land use plan, policy, or regulation of an agency with jurisdiction over the project (including, but not limited to the general plan, specific plan, local coastal program, or zoning ordinance) adopted for the purpose of avoiding or mitigating an environmental effect? | ☐ | ☐ | ☒ | ☐ |
| c) Conflict with any applicable habitat conservation plan or natural communities conservation plan? | ☐ | ☐ | ☐ | ☒ |

4.10.1 - Discussion

Environmental Issues

a  There are no residential uses on the Project site. The proposed Project would not physically separate nearby residences from Monte Vista Avenue, from Brown Avenue or from any portions of the City of Vacaville. Residents of these communities would be able to travel to and from their homes on the roads they currently use. No impacts would occur.

b  As described above in Section 3, the proposed Project is consistent with City and County General Plan and zoning designations. The Project site is designated for General Commercial (CG) by the City and for Urban Commercial by the County. The Project site is zoned as General Commercial (CG) Special Standard Overlay District 4 (SS-4). The proposed public health and other public service departments that would tenant the H&SS building are consistent with uses allowed by the General Plan and zoning designations. The proposed Project would be constructed in accordance to County Standards; however, the County will accommodate the provisions of the Chapter 14.09.084 of the City’s Zoning Code, which sets standards for commercial development as feasible. Mitigation Measures AES-1, AES-2, and AES-3 would ensure a less than significant impact. The SS-Special Standards Overlay District 4 requires a coordinated access between parcels on East Monte Vista Avenue and Brown Street. As shown in Exhibit 3, Site Concept, shared access is planned between the Project site and the planned Vacaville Government Center to the north. Therefore, the proposed Project is consistent with this zoning requirement.
Section 14.09.084.060 of the City Code requires solid masonry walls when a commercial district or use is adjacent to a residential district or use. An exception to this requirement exists when the commercial use is adjacent to a non-conforming use as is the case with the proposed Project. As a County project, this project is not required to conform to the City’s Municipal Code or zoning requirements. However, the County will design and implement the project to conform to the City’s Municipal Code and zoning requirements to the extent feasible. The parcel to the east is zoned for General commercial and contains a mobile home park, which is a non-conforming use of the property. When this occurs, a fence may be substituted for masonry at the discretion of the decision maker, in this case Solano County Department of General Services, Division of Architectural Services. As described in Section 3.2, Project Description, the proposed Project includes a 6-8 foot masonry wall along the eastern border of the Project site. As such, the proposed Project is consistent with Section 14.09.084.060.

In addition, the North County Facilities Master Plan (NCFMP) identifies the Project site as the ideal location for County services, as described in Section 3.2. As such, the proposed Project is consistent with the NCFMP. Impacts would be less than significant.

Finally, the Project site is located within the Nut Tree Airport Compatibility District. As required by Vacaville’s General Plan Policy 6.6-I 2, development proposals within the Nut Tree Airport Compatibility District must be referred to the County Airport Land Use Commission per the Nut Tree Airport Land Use Plan and the Solano County Airport Land Use Compatibility Review Procedures. However, the Project does not contain any features that would affect aviation patterns (e.g., flashing lights or tall buildings). Therefore, impacts would be less than significant.

c The Project site is not located in an area covered by any habitat conservation plan, natural community conservation plan, or other approved local, regional, or state habitat conservation plan. As such, the Project would not impact any conservation plan.

4.10.2 - Impact
Impacts would be less than significant.

4.10.3 - Mitigation
No mitigation is necessary.

4.10.4 - Verification
Not applicable.
4.11 - Mineral Resources

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Environmental Issues</th>
<th>Potentially Significant Impact</th>
<th>Less Than Significant Impact With Mitigation Incorporated</th>
<th>Less Than Significant Impact</th>
<th>No Impact</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>11. Mineral Resources</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>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?</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☑</td>
<td>☒</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>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?</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☑</td>
<td>☒</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

4.11.1 - Discussion

Environmental Issues

a According to the 2007 City of Vacaville General Plan, the Vacaville Planning Area contains limited mineral resources that are being extracted. No policies and land use designations for mineral resources are included in the General Plan as commercial extraction is not expected within the General Plan planning period. Additionally, a review of Figure RS-4 of the Solano County General Plan also shows that the proposed Project site is well outside any areas that may contain mineral deposits. No impacts would occur.

b The proposed Project site is located in an urban built up area, which precludes the possibility of mineral extraction. Furthermore, as discussed in Environmental Issue “a” above, the Project site is not located in an area of known mineral resources. No impacts would occur.

4.11.2 - Impact

No impacts would occur.

4.11.3 - Mitigation

No mitigation would be necessary.

4.11.4 - Verification

Not applicable.
4.12 - Noise

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Environmental Issues</th>
<th>Potentially Significant Impact</th>
<th>Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporated</th>
<th>Less Than Significant Impact</th>
<th>No Impact</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>12. Noise</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Would the project result in:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>a) Exposure of persons to or generation of noise levels in excess of standards established in the local general plan or noise ordinance, or applicable standards of other agencies?</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☒</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>b) Exposure of persons to or generation of excessive groundborne vibration or groundborne noise levels?</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☒</td>
<td>☐</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>c) A substantial permanent increase in ambient noise levels in the project vicinity above levels existing without the project?</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☒</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>d) A substantial temporary or periodic increase in ambient noise levels in the project vicinity above levels existing without the project?</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☒</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>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?</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☒</td>
<td>☐</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>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?</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☒</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

4.12.1 - Discussion

Environmental Setting

The proposed Project is located in the central portion of the City of Vacaville (City), in the County of Solano (County), California. The Project site is bounded by: vacant land intended for the Vacaville Redevelopment Agency Government Center to the north; a mobile home park and commercial retail uses to the east; Monte Vista Avenue and commercial retail uses to the south; and a single-family home used as an office and Brown Street to the west. The proposed Project consists of an approximately 35,000 sq ft two-story public health facility, clinics, office space, and associated site improvements. The health facility, clinics and offices would be operated by the Solano County Health and Social Services Department with operational hours from 7:30 a.m. to 6 p.m. Site improvements would consist of an approximately 175-space parking lot, public plaza(s), public art space, a bus stop, and the relocation and improvement of up to two easements that link the Vacaville Redevelopment Agency-owned parcel to the north with Monte Vista Avenue. The proposed Project
is designed with the intent of being architecturally connected with the Vacaville Redevelopment Agency’s proposed facility through the use of a public plaza, public open spaces, and perhaps common materials.

Sound levels are presented in logarithmic decibels (dB). The dB is a logarithmic unit, which expresses the ratio of the sound pressure level being measured to a standard reference level. A-weighted decibels (dBA) approximate the subjective response of the human ear and are adjusted to reflect only those frequencies that are audible to the human ear. The equivalent sound level ($L_{eq}$) represents a steady-state sound level containing the same total energy as a time varying signal over a given sample period. The peak traffic hour $L_{eq}$ is the noise metric used by Caltrans for all traffic noise impact analysis. The Day-Night Average Level ($L_{dn}$) is the weighted average of the intensity of a sound, with corrections for time of day, and averaged over 24 hours. Community Noise Equivalent Level (CNEL) is similar to the $L_{dn}$, except that it has another addition of 4.77 dB to sound levels during the evening hours between 7 p.m. and 10 p.m.

To determine the existing noise at and adjacent to the Project site, field monitoring was conducted on September 16, 2009. Noise measurements were taken at three locations in the Project study area. Results of the field monitoring indicate that noise within the proposed Project area is generally characterized by vehicular traffic on Monte Vista Avenue and Brown Street. In addition, the Project site is impacted from aircraft over flights originating from Nut Tree Airport, which is located approximately 0.75 mile northeast of the Project site. The results of the short-term noise level measurements are presented in Table 8. The existing noise level measurements ranged from 56.8 to 59.1 dBA $L_{eq}$, with the highest noise measurement at Site 3.

**Table 8: Existing Noise Level Measurements Results**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Site No.</th>
<th>Site Description</th>
<th>Primary Noise Sources</th>
<th>Start Time and Measurement (Minutes)</th>
<th>Noise Levels (dBA $L_{eq}$/$L_{max}$)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Located approximately 10 feet east of the Project site and approximately 10 feet south of the entry fence for the mobile home park.</td>
<td>Traffic noise from Monte Vista Avenue, aircraft noise and from Pinos Recycling.</td>
<td>1:14 p.m. (15:00)</td>
<td>57.7/78.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>Located approximately 110 feet north of the Monte Vista Avenue centerline and approximately 180 feet east of the Brown Street centerline at the approximate location of the southern wall of the proposed structure.</td>
<td>Traffic noise from Monte Vista Avenue.</td>
<td>1:31 p.m. (12:00)</td>
<td>56.8/66.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>Located approximately 40 feet west of the Brown Street centerline on the driveway of the residence at 121 Brown Street.</td>
<td>Traffic noise from Brown Street</td>
<td>1:49 p.m. (11:00)</td>
<td>59.1/77.4</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: Larson-Davis Model 824 Type 1 precision sound level meter programmed in “slow” mode.
Environmental Issues

The County General Plan and Municipal Code contain noise standards for evaluating the compatibility of proposed new development with the existing or anticipated noise environment. For transportation noise sources, the County has established exterior and interior noise standards of 65 L_{dn}, dB and 45 L_{dn}/CNEL, dB, respectively for the nearby residential and office uses. For stationary (non-transportation) noise sources, the County has established hourly and maximum noise level standards for both daytime (7 a.m. to 10 p.m.) and nighttime (10 p.m. to 7 a.m.) hours. Specifically, residential land uses shall not be exposed to stationary noise levels exceeding 55 dB L_{eq} during the daytime hours and 50 dB L_{eq} during the nighttime hours; maximum noise levels exceeding 70 dB L_{max} during the daytime hours and 65 dB L_{max} during the nighttime hours. Office buildings shall not be exposed to stationary noise levels exceeding 55 dB L_{eq} at any time and maximum noise levels exceeding 75 dB L_{max} at any time. If the ambient noise exceeds the above noise level standard, the noise level standards shall be increased by 5 dB above the ambient noise.

The City General Plan and Municipal Code contain noise standards for evaluating the compatibility of proposed new development with the existing or anticipated noise environment. For transportation noise sources, the City has established exterior and interior noise standards of 60 L_{dn}, dB and 45 L_{dn}/CNEL, dB, respectively for the nearby residential uses and no noise standards for office buildings. For stationary (non-transportation) noise sources, the City has established hourly and maximum noise level standards for both daytime and nighttime hours. Specifically, residential land uses shall not be exposed to stationary noise levels exceeding 50 dB L_{eq} during the daytime hours and 45 dB L_{eq} during the nighttime hours; maximum noise levels exceeding 70 dB L_{max} during the daytime hours and 65 dB L_{max} during the nighttime hours, and no noise standards for office buildings. If the ambient noise exceeds the above noise level standards, the noise level standards shall be increased by 3 dB above the ambient noise.

Short-Term Construction Impacts. Short-term noise impacts could occur during construction activities either from (1) the noise impacts created from the transport of workers and movement of construction materials to and from the Project site, or from (2) the noise generated on-site during ground clearing/excavation, grading, and building construction activities. Project construction would temporality increase noise levels to adjacent noise-sensitive land uses (non-conforming residential). However, the construction period is short term, and the equipment with the greatest noise-generating capacity (graders) are anticipated to be used for no more than a week (7-days). Consistent with previously approved projects within the City (Canyon View Estates Residential Subdivision, File No. 06-071) the County will enforce the performance standards of the City Land Use and Development Code, Section 14.093.090, that regulates the hours of construction. Temporary construction noise is exempt from noise standards, provided that work occurs during the specified hours of between 6:00
Operational Noise. The proposed Project may create traffic noise impacts onto the nearby existing sensitive receptors and the exterior and interior noise levels at the proposed residential units may exceed County and City standards.

Offsite Vehicular Noise Impacts. The proposed Project’s offsite traffic noise impacts have been analyzed, consistent with the near term and cumulative (year 2030) conditions identified in the TIA (Appendix E, Noise Data). Each scenario is discussed below in further detail.

For the purposes of this noise impact analysis, a traffic-related noise impact would be considered significant if the proposed Project increases the noise levels for a noise-sensitive land use by:

- 5 dBA $L_{dn}$, where the without project noise level is less than 60 dBA $L_{dn}$;
- 3 dBA $L_{dn}$, where the without project noise level is 60 to 65 dBA $L_{dn}$; or
- 1.5 dBA $L_{dn}$, where the without project noise level is greater than 65 dBA $L_{dn}$.

Near Term Conditions. As shown in Table 9 for the near term conditions, the noise level contributions from the proposed Project to the study area roadways would range from 0.0 to 0.2 dBA $L_{dn}$. A 0.2 dBA noise increase would be below the thresholds of significance discussed above. Therefore, based on the thresholds of significance defined above, no significant near-term offsite noise impacts from Project-related vehicle noise would occur along the study area roadways segments.

Table 9: Near-Term Project Noise Contributions

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Roadway</th>
<th>Segment</th>
<th>$L_{dn}$ at 100 feet</th>
<th>Potential Significant Impact?</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>No Project</td>
<td>With Project</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Markham Avenue</td>
<td>North of Monte Vista Avenue</td>
<td>54.6</td>
<td>54.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Depot Street</td>
<td>South of Monte Vista Avenue</td>
<td>60.2</td>
<td>60.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Brown Street</td>
<td>North of Monte Vista Avenue</td>
<td>52.2</td>
<td>52.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Allison Drive</td>
<td>South of Monte Vista Avenue</td>
<td>62.6</td>
<td>62.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Monte Vista Avenue</td>
<td>West of Depot Street</td>
<td>60.4</td>
<td>60.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Monte Vista Avenue</td>
<td>West of Scoggins Court</td>
<td>60.3</td>
<td>60.4</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table 9 (cont.): Near-Term Project Noise Contributions

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Roadway</th>
<th>Segment</th>
<th>L_{dn} at 100 feet</th>
<th>Project Contribution</th>
<th>Potential Significant Impact</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>No Project</td>
<td>With Project</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Monte Vista Avenue</td>
<td>West of Brown Street</td>
<td>59.8</td>
<td>60.0</td>
<td>0.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Monte Vista Avenue</td>
<td>East of Callen Street</td>
<td>59.3</td>
<td>59.4</td>
<td>0.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Monte Vista Avenue</td>
<td>East of Allison Drive</td>
<td>60.4</td>
<td>60.5</td>
<td>0.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mason Street</td>
<td>West of Depot Street</td>
<td>62.0</td>
<td>62.0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mason Street</td>
<td>East of Depot Street</td>
<td>62.6</td>
<td>62.6</td>
<td>0.0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>


Cumulative Conditions. As shown in Table 10, the noise level contributions from the proposed Project to the study area roadways would range from 0.0 to 0.1 dBA L_{dn}. A 0.1 dBA noise increase would be below the thresholds of significance discussed above. Therefore, based on the thresholds of significance defined above, no significant cumulative offsite noise impacts from Project-related vehicle noise would occur along the study area roadways segments.

Table 10: Cumulative Project Noise Contributions

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Roadway</th>
<th>Segment</th>
<th>L_{dn} at 100 feet</th>
<th>Project Contribution</th>
<th>Potential Significant Impact</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>No Project</td>
<td>With Project</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Markham Avenue</td>
<td>North of Monte Vista</td>
<td>55.7</td>
<td>55.7</td>
<td>0.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Depot Street</td>
<td>South of Monte Vista</td>
<td>60.6</td>
<td>60.7</td>
<td>0.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Brown Street</td>
<td>North of Monte Vista</td>
<td>54.2</td>
<td>54.3</td>
<td>0.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Allison Drive</td>
<td>South of Monte Vista</td>
<td>63.1</td>
<td>63.1</td>
<td>0.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Monte Vista Avenue</td>
<td>West of Depot Street</td>
<td>62.0</td>
<td>62.0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Monte Vista Avenue</td>
<td>West of Scoggins Court</td>
<td>62.2</td>
<td>62.3</td>
<td>0.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Monte Vista Avenue</td>
<td>West of Brown Street</td>
<td>61.9</td>
<td>62.0</td>
<td>0.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Monte Vista Avenue</td>
<td>East of Callen Street</td>
<td>61.7</td>
<td>61.7</td>
<td>0.0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Table 10 (cont.): Cumulative Project Noise Contributions

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Roadway</th>
<th>Segment</th>
<th>L_{dn} at 100 feet</th>
<th>Potential Significant Impact?</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>No Project With Project Contribution</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Monte Vista Avenue</td>
<td>East of Allison Drive</td>
<td>62.0 62.0</td>
<td>0.0  No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mason Street</td>
<td>West of Depot Street</td>
<td>63.2 63.2</td>
<td>0.0  No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mason Street</td>
<td>East of Depot Street</td>
<td>64.0 64.0</td>
<td>0.0  No</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>


**Offsite Stationary Noise Impacts.** Stationary noise impacts associated with the ongoing operations of the proposed Project have been analyzed separately from the offsite vehicular noise impacts, since on-site noise sources may be directly regulated by local jurisdictions and are typically defined by stationary source noise regulations. The proposed Project would result in potential stationary noise impacts to the nearby residences from rooftop HVAC units, parking lot areas, and onsite vehicular traffic.

For the purposes of this noise impact analysis, an operation-related noise impact would be considered significant if it exceeded either the County stationary daytime noise standards of 55 dB $L_{eq}$ and 70 dB $L_{max}$, or the City stationary daytime noise standards of 50 dB $L_{eq}$ and 70 dB $L_{max}$. Based on Noise Measurement Site 1, the ambient noise levels at the nearest mobile homes is currently 57.7 dBA $L_{eq}$ and 78.2 dBA $L_{max}$, which exceeds the County’s and City’s stationary residential and office noise standards. In this case, the County’s standard is increased to 5 dB above ambient noise levels and the City standard is increased to 3 dB above ambient noise levels. Based on the more conservative City standard, this would result in a daytime noise threshold of 60.7 dB $L_{eq}$ and 81.2 dB $L_{max}$ for both residential and office uses. Since the proposed Project’s operational hours would be from 7:30 a.m. to 6 p.m., the stationary noise thresholds for the nighttime hours (10 p.m. to 7 a.m.) would not be applicable to the operations of the proposed Project.

In order to determine the anticipated noise level created by the ongoing operations of the proposed Project, comparative noise measurements were taken at a parking lot of a public facility and of a rooftop air conditioning unit. The noise measurement of the parking lot was taken at the edge of a parking lot at Orange Coast College and recorded noise levels of 55.5 dBA $L_{eq}$ and 74.9 dBA $L_{max}$. During the noise measurement the primary sources of noise was from vehicles in the parking lot and people talking. The noise measurement of a rooftop air conditioning unit was taken at the Highland Avenue Walmart in San Bernardino. The noise measurement was taken 10 feet from an operating unit and recorded a noise level of 59.5 dBA $L_{eq}$ and 60.3 dBA $L_{max}$.
The nearest sensitive receptors to the Project site are the residential mobile home uses located approximately 5 feet east of the Project site, approximately 10 feet from the edge of the parking lot and approximately 220 feet from the proposed structure and air conditioning units. Based on these distances and through the use of an attenuation rate for hard sites of 6 dB per doubling of distance, this would result in a noise level at the nearest mobile home of 53.6 dBA $L_{eq}$ and 73.0 dBA $L_{max}$ from parking lot noise and 32.7 dBA $L_{eq}$ and 33.5 dBA $L_{max}$ from rooftop air conditioning noise. Based on the properties of logarithmic addition, the combined noise levels would be 53.6 dBA $L_{eq}$ and 73.0 dBA $L_{max}$. These noise levels are within the daytime operational noise thresholds of 60.7 dBA $L_{eq}$ and 81.2 dBA $L_{max}$, described above. Therefore, a less than significant stationary noise impact would occur from the operations of the proposed Project.

Groundborne vibrations consist of rapidly fluctuating motions within the ground that have an average motion of zero. The effects of groundborne vibrations typically only cause a nuisance to people, but at extreme vibration levels, damage to buildings may occur. Construction activities can produce vibration that may be felt by adjacent uses. The short-term and long-term groundborne vibration impacts associated with Project construction and operation are discussed separately below.

**Short-Term Construction Impacts.** The construction of the proposed Project would not require the use of equipment such as jackhammers and pile drivers, which are known to generate substantial construction vibration levels. The primary source of vibration during construction would be from a large bulldozer. The ground vibration levels associated with various construction equipment are given in Table 11.

**Table 11: Vibration Source Levels for Construction Equipment**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Equipment</th>
<th>Peak Particle Velocity (inches/second) at 25 feet</th>
<th>Approximate Vibration Level (VdB) at 25 feet</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Pile driver (impact)</td>
<td>1.518 (upper range) 0.644 (typical)</td>
<td>112</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pile driver (sonic)</td>
<td>0.734 upper range 0.170 typical</td>
<td>105</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Clam shovel drop (slurry wall)</td>
<td>0.202</td>
<td>94</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hydromill (slurry wall)</td>
<td>0.008 in soil 0.017 in rock</td>
<td>66</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vibratory Roller</td>
<td>0.210</td>
<td>94</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hoe Ram</td>
<td>0.089</td>
<td>87</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Large bulldozer</td>
<td>0.089</td>
<td>87</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table 11 (cont.): Vibration Source Levels for Construction Equipment

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Equipment</th>
<th>Peak Particle Velocity (inches/second) at 25 feet</th>
<th>Approximate Vibration Level (VdB) at 25 feet</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Caisson drill</td>
<td>0.089</td>
<td>87</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Loaded trucks</td>
<td>0.076</td>
<td>86</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jackhammer</td>
<td>0.035</td>
<td>79</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Small bulldozer</td>
<td>0.003</td>
<td>58</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>


Based on the data provided in Table 11, a large bulldozer would produce a vibration level of 0.089 inch per second peak particle velocity (PPV) at 25 feet. For the purposes of this noise impact analysis, construction-related and operations-related vibration impacts would be considered significant if they involve any construction or ongoing operations activities that would create a vibration in excess of 0.2 inch per second or 94 VdB at the nearby sensitive receptors.

The closest vibration-sensitive land uses are the mobile homes located approximately 5 feet east of the Project site and the office located approximately 5 feet west of the Project site. It is anticipated that the vibration levels caused by a large bulldozer operating on the edge of the Project site at the nearest structures would be approximately 0.52 inches per second PPV. This would exceed the 0.2 inch per second PPV vibration threshold. Therefore, construction-related vibration would create a significant impact. Mitigation Measure NOI-2, provided above would reduce this impact to less than significant. Implementation of Mitigation Measure NOI-2 would restrict the use of any equipment that exceeds 80 horse power from operating within 50 feet of any offsite structure and would reduce the construction-related vibration levels to 0.042 inches per second PPV or less.

**Long-Term Operational Impacts.** The proposed Project would result in the development of an approximately 35,000 sq ft public health facility and clinic for the Solano County Health and Services Department. The ongoing operations of the proposed Project would require truck deliveries to the Project site, which may create vibration impacts. The nearest sensitive receptors to the onsite accessways are the mobile homes located approximately 30 feet east of the easternmost proposed accessway. According to Table 11, a loaded truck would produce a vibration level of 0.076 inch per second PPV at 25 feet. At a distance of 30 feet a loaded truck would produce a vibration level of 0.062 inch per second PPV, which is below the 0.2 inch per second PPV vibration threshold. Therefore, the vibration impacts caused by the ongoing operations of the proposed Project onto the existing nearby mobile homes would be less than significant.
The CEQA Guidelines and the County and City General Plans provide no definition of what constitutes a substantial noise increase; however, Caltrans provides guidance that can be used to define substantial changes in noise levels that may be caused by a project. The thresholds below generally apply to transportation noise that is usually expressed in terms of average noise exposure during a 24-hour period, such as the $L_{dn}$ or CNEL. Project-generated increases in noise levels that exceed those outlined in the thresholds below and that affect existing noise-sensitive land uses (receptors) are considered substantial; therefore, they would constitute a significant noise impact. The proposed Project will create a significant noise-related impact if it would:

- Increase noise levels by 5 dB or more where the without project noise level is less than 60 dB.
- Increase noise levels by 3 dB or more where the without project noise level is 60 to 65 dB.
- Increase noise levels by 1.5 dB or more where the without project noise level is greater than 65 dB.

As discussed in Environmental Issue “a” above, and as shown in Table 9 and Table 10, the long-term operational noise associated with offsite traffic for the near-term and cumulative conditions would not be anticipated to result in a noticeable increase (i.e., 3 dB or greater) in average daily ambient noise levels along any roadway segment in the Project area. Therefore, neither the near-term nor the cumulative long-term operational noise associated with offsite traffic is anticipated to result in a substantial permanent increase in ambient noise levels in the proposed Project area; thus, ambient noise level impacts from increased offsite traffic would be less than significant.

As previously mentioned in Environmental Issue “a” above, noise from the proposed HVAC Units, parking lot areas, and on-site vehicular traffic would result in an increase in ambient noise levels from stationary sources based on the distance to nearby noise-sensitive receptors and associated attenuation of the existing 8-foot wall around the perimeter of the mobile home park. According to the acoustical analysis, the anticipated stationary noise impact created by the operations of the proposed Project at the mobile home uses to the east would be 53.6 dBA $L_{eq}$ and 73.0 dBA $L_{max}$. These noise levels are within the daytime operational noise thresholds of 60.7 dBA $L_{eq}$ and 81.2 dBA $L_{max}$, described above. No stationary noise impacts are anticipated during the nighttime hours (10 p.m. to 7 a.m.) since the operational hours of the proposed Project would be 7:30 a.m. to 6 p.m. Therefore, a less than significant stationary noise impact would occur from the operations of the proposed Project.
equipment produces the highest noise levels. However, Mitigation Measures NOI-1 is provided below to reduce construction noise to less than significant levels. Implementation of Mitigation Measure NOI-1 would restrict the use of construction equipment to the hours between 7:00 a.m. and 6:00 p.m. Therefore, short-term ambient noise would be reduced to less than significant levels.

The Project site is located approximately 0.75 mile southwest of Nut Tree Airport. According to the County General Plan, the eastern portion of the Project site is within the 60 dB CNEL noise contour and according to the City General Plan, none of the Project site is within the 60 dB CNEL contour; however, the entire Project site is located within the 55 dB CNEL noise contour.

The County General Plan restricts office buildings, which is the closest available match to the proposed Project, from being located in areas where the exterior noise exceeds 65 dB L_{dn}. None of the Project site is located within the County’s 65 dB CNEL noise contour for Nut Tree Airport. Therefore, based on the County standards, a less than significant airport noise impact would occur for the proposed Project.

The City General Plan states that office uses are normally acceptable where aircraft noise is less than 60 dBA CNEL. None of the Project site is located within the City’s 60 dB CNEL noise contour for Nut Tree Airport. Therefore, based on the City standards, a less than significant airport noise impact would occur for the proposed Project.

The Project site is not located within the vicinity of a private airstrip. Thus, the proposed Project would not result in the exposure of people residing or working in the Project area to excessive airstrip noise levels. As a result, the proposed Project would have no impact with respect to private airstrip noise.

4.12.2 - Impact
The proposed Project may create potentially construction noise, nighttime operation noise, and short-term ambient noise.

4.12.3 - Mitigation
The following mitigation measures will reduce noise impacts to less than significant.

NOI-1

Hours of noise producing construction shall be from 7:00 a.m. to 6:00 p.m., Monday through Saturday. Construction activities shall conform to the following standards:

- Construction shall not occur on Sundays or Holidays. Exceptions to these time restrictions may be granted by the County’s Department of Resource Management Building Official (Building Official) for one of the following reasons:
- Inclement weather affecting work;
- Emergency work; or
- Other work, if work and equipment will not create noise that may be unreasonably offensive to neighbors so as to constitute a nuisance. The Building Official must be notified and must approve the work in advance.

- All construction equipment shall use noise-reduction features (e.g., mufflers and engine shrouds) that are no less effective than those originally installed by the manufacturer.

- Construction staging and heavy equipment maintenance activities shall be performed a minimum distance of 300 feet from any offsite building, unless safety or technical factors take precedence.

- Stationary combustion equipment such as pumps or generators shall be restricted from operating within 100 feet from any offsite building.

- There shall be no start-up of machines or equipment, no delivery of materials or equipment, no cleaning of machines or equipment and no servicing of equipment except during the permitted hours of construction.

- Radios played at high volume, loud talking and other forms of communication constituting a nuisance shall not be permitted.

4.12.4 - Verification

The County shall conduct on-site inspections to verify noise-measures are being properly implemented and provide the City with documentation.
4.13 - Population and Housing

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Environmental Issues</th>
<th>Potentially Significant Impact</th>
<th>Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporated</th>
<th>Less Than Significant Impact</th>
<th>No Impact</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>13. Population and Housing</td>
<td>Would the project:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>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)?</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>b) Displace substantial numbers of existing housing, necessitating the construction of replacement housing elsewhere?</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>c) Displace substantial numbers of people, necessitating the construction of replacement housing elsewhere?</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

4.13.1 - Discussion

Environmental Issues

a) The proposed Project does not include a residential component, the proposed Project consists of a new approximately 35,000 sq ft two-story County public health facility and clinic. The proposed Project would consolidate health and social service programs serving the North County Area. Existing staff would be relocated to the new H&SS facilities; however, additional staff would be needed to provide services through 2022, creating new employment opportunities that could result in population growth. Anticipated staffing needs were identified in the NCFMP and in a more recent 2008 survey. In addition, the Vacaville General Plan estimates that office uses generate one employee per 275 sq ft. Two data sets were used to estimate jobs generated by the proposed Project. Although existing staff would fill a number of the jobs, it was assumed that all jobs would be new to reflect a worse case scenario for this analysis. According to the 2008 survey using a building square footage of 34,671, the proposed Project would generate new 212 jobs. Using data from the City of Vacaville General Plan, the proposed Project would generate 127 new jobs.

According to the City of Vacaville General Plan Draft Housing Element, the City will have an estimated population of 95,800 by 2010. ABAG projects the City of Vacaville to grow by 37 percent, an increase of 36,000 residents, by the year 2035. This level of growth is consistent with the overall growth rate projected for Solano County. Some existing County employees would be transferred to the new facility; therefore, not all of the jobs would represent a potential new resident. Assuming all jobs represented an additional City of
Vacaville resident, the increase in population would be 0.22 percent using the 2008 survey data and 0.13 percent using Vacaville General Plan data over 2010 population projections. In either case, this represents an insignificant amount of growth. Therefore, the proposed Project would not directly induce substantial population growth.

ABAG forecasts that Solano County will add 26,420 jobs between 2010 and 2020. Between 2010 and 2020, Vacaville is projected to add 5,360 jobs. Therefore, the estimated employment opportunities resulting from the proposed Project would be .03 of Vacaville’s projected total and would be well within forecast employment growth in the Solano subregional area.

The California Department of Employment Development indicates that as of August 2009, approximately 8.7 percent of the City of Vacaville population and 11.5 percent of the Solano County population was unemployed. Given the availability of labor in Vacaville and Solano County, it would be expected that the proposed Project’s new employment opportunities could be readily filled from the local labor force. Therefore, substantial indirect population growth as a result of increased employment opportunities would not occur. Impacts would be less than significant.

b The proposed Project will be located on a vacant lot that previously supported an auto camp. No housing exists on the proposed Project site; therefore, no housing would be displaced. No impacts would occur.

c As discussed in Environmental Issue “b” above, the proposed Project will be located on a vacant lot. No housing exists on the proposed Project site; therefore, no people would be displaced. No impacts would occur.

4.13.2 - Impact
No impacts would be less than significant.

4.13.3 - Mitigation
No Mitigation would be necessary.

4.13.4 - Verification
Not applicable.
4.14 - Public Services

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Environmental Issues</th>
<th>Potentially Significant Impact</th>
<th>Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporated</th>
<th>Less Than Significant Impact</th>
<th>No Impact</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>14. Public Services</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><em>Would the project result in substantial adverse physical impacts associated with the provision of new or physically altered governmental facilities, 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:</em></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>a) Fire protection?</td>
<td>❌</td>
<td>✗</td>
<td>☑</td>
<td>☐</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>b) Police protection?</td>
<td>❌</td>
<td>✗</td>
<td>☑</td>
<td>☐</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>c) Schools?</td>
<td>❌</td>
<td>✗</td>
<td>☑</td>
<td>☐</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>d) Parks?</td>
<td>❌</td>
<td>✗</td>
<td>☑</td>
<td>☐</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>e) Other public facilities?</td>
<td>❌</td>
<td>✗</td>
<td>☑</td>
<td>☐</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

4.14.1 - Discussion

Environmental Issues

a The proposed Project consists of an approximately 35,000 sq ft two-story County public health facility and clinic. The proposed Project would consolidate health and social service programs serving the North County Area. Existing staff would be relocated to the new H&SS facilities; however, additional staff would be needed to provide services through 2022, creating new employment opportunities. As discussed in Section 4.13, Population and Housing, the proposed Project would not directly induce substantial population growth resulting in the need for additional public services such as fire protection, police protection, schools, parks, etc.

The proposed Project would not create any new or unusual fire hazards in the area, nor create the need for increased fire protection. The building would comply with all fire safety regulations and would be compatible with local and state fire codes for the designated zoning. Additionally, the proposed Project would not be subject to the City of Vacaville’s development impact fees. As a County project, this project is not required to conform to the City’s Municipal Code and impact fee program unless there is an identifiable nexus to project specific impacts. The purpose of the public facilities impact fee is to provide for police, fire and general city facilities and equipment to serve the needs of, and address the impacts from new residential, industrial, commercial, office, and other development. The proposed Project site is located in an area that is currently serviced and the proposed use would not adversely impact response times, staffing levels, or other performance standards that would necessitate the construction of new or expanded fire protection facilities that would have a physical impact on the environment. Impacts would be less than significant.
b The proposed Project would not increase the need for police protection in the area. The County would contract with a private security firm to monitor the proposed structure once the Project is complete, as it currently does at other County facilities. The Solano County Sheriff’s Department would provide additional support in emergencies. Additionally, the proposed Project would not be subject to the City of Vacaville’s public facilities impact fee. As a County project, this project is not required to conform to the City’s Municipal Code and impact fee program unless there is an identifiable nexus to project specific impacts; however, the County will negotiate the payment of the City’s impact fees as required to ensure police protection and police facilities building and equipment are adequate. Given that the proposed Project would not demand any police services, the proposed Project would not adversely impact response times, staffing levels, or other performance standards that would necessitate the construction of new or expanded police facilities that would have a physical impact on the environment. Impacts would be less than significant.

c The Project may allow for a nominal amount of employees, approximately 212, of which 25 percent would be new positions. School enrollment could increase due to an increase in County population to fill the additional jobs. However, it is likely that persons filling future jobs positions for County Health and Social Services would already live in the area or commute from outlying areas; in addition, not all employees would have school age children. Therefore, the increase in employees at the proposed Project would not necessitate the construction of new or expanded school facilities that would have a physical impact on the environment. Impacts would be less than significant.

d As discussed in Environmental Issue “c” above, the Project may allow for a nominal amount of new employees beyond current numbers. Park visits could increase due to an increase in County population to fill the additional jobs. However, it is likely that person filling future jobs positions for County Health and Social Services would already live in the area or commute from outlying areas; therefore, the increase in employees at the proposed Project would not necessitate the construction of new or expanded park facilities that would have a physical impact on the environment. Impacts would be less than significant.

e The proposed Project implements the first step of recommendations contained in the Solano - NCFMP by constructing an approximately 35,000 sq ft two-story County public health facility, clinics, and office. The proposed Project will be constructed to address current and future service demands because of population growth in the North County region of Solano County. Existing County facilities cannot fully meet current or future service demands due to: size, lack of expansion potential, functional/programmatic deficiencies, location, parking deficiencies, transportation and access barriers. The proposed Project would alleviate the public service deficiencies identified in the Facilities Master Plan and would not negatively impact other public facilities. The proposed Project is located in an urban, built-up
environment already served by public service providers and would not require the expansion of existing service areas. Impacts would be less than significant.

4.14.2 - Impact
No impacts would occur.

4.14.3 - Mitigation
No mitigation is necessary.

4.14.4 - Verification
Not applicable.
4.15 - Recreation

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Environmental Issues</th>
<th>Potentially Significant Impact</th>
<th>Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporated</th>
<th>Less Than Significant Impact</th>
<th>No Impact</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>15. Recreation</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>a) Would the project 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?</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☑</td>
<td>☐</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>b) Does the project include recreational facilities or require the construction or expansion of recreational facilities, which might have an adverse physical effect on the environment?</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☑</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

4.15.1 - Discussion

Environmental Issues

a) The proposed Project consists of a new approximately 35,000 sq ft two-story County public health facility and clinic. The proposed facility is located within a half-mile of Andrews Park, Trower Park and 0.8 miles from Centennial Park. Although the Project will create space for additional employees, it is likely that persons filling future job positions at the new facility will already live in the area or commute from outlying areas. As a result, the proposed Project would not induce population growth, and therefore, would not increase demand on existing recreational facilities or create a need for new recreational facilities. Impacts would be less than significant.

b) The project includes a public plaza between the Project and the planned Agency Center to the north as an amenity. However, the Project does not include a recreational component. In addition, because the Project does not propose any residential development, conformance with the Quimby Act through parkland dedication or payment of in-lieu fees would not be required. Refer to Environmental Issue “a” above, for a discussion on the need for expanded recreational facilities. Because the Project does not propose recreational facilities or require the construction or expansion of recreational facilities, no Project-level recreational facility-related impacts to the environment would occur.

4.15.2 - Impact

Impacts would be less than significant.

4.15.3 - Mitigation

No mitigation would be necessary.
4.15.4 - Verification

Not applicable.
4.16 - Transportation / Traffic

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Environmental Issues</th>
<th>Potentially Significant Impact</th>
<th>Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporated</th>
<th>Less Than Significant Impact</th>
<th>No Impact</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| 16. Transportation / Traffic
Would the project: | 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)? | ☐ | ☐ | ☑ | ☐ |
|                      | b) Exceed, either individually or cumulatively, a level of service standard established by the county congestion management agency for designated roads or highways? | ☐ | ☐ | ☑ | ☐ |
|                      | 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? | ☐ | ☐ | ☑ | ☐ |
|                      | d) Substantially increase hazards due to a design feature (e.g., sharp curves or dangerous intersections) or incompatible uses (e.g., farm equipment)? | ☐ | ☐ | ☐ | ☑ |
|                      | e) Result in inadequate emergency access? | ☐ | ☐ | ☑ | ☐ |
|                      | f) Result in inadequate parking capacity? | ☐ | ☐ | ☑ | ☐ |
|                      | g) Conflict with adopted policies, plans or programs supporting alternative transportation (e.g. bus turnouts, bicycle racks)? | ☐ | ☐ | ☑ | ☐ |

4.16.1 - Discussion

Environmental Setting

The following discussion is based on the William J. Carroll Government Center Draft Traffic Impact Analysis (TIA) prepared by Kimley-Horn and Associates, Inc. in March 2010, which is available in its entirety in Appendix F, Traffic Impact Analysis. The Draft TIA analyzed project-related traffic and transportation impacts from operation of the originally proposed 35,000 sq ft building. As detailed in the project description, the proposed project would construct a 35,317 sq ft County public health facility. Kimley Horn and Associates prepared a Supplemental Memorandum for Updated Site Plan and Trip Generation (Supplemental Memorandum), which available in Appendix F, Traffic Impact Analysis. The Supplemental Memorandum compares the trip generation of the original site plan to the updates site plan and assesses whether the additional vehicle trips will impact the results of the TIA. The Supplemental Memorandum concludes that the currently proposed project of 35,317...
sq ft would generate eleven additional daily trips to the analysis contained in the TIA, and would not result in any change to the project intersection capacity analysis results or the proposed mitigation from the TIA.

Impacts on existing conditions and cumulative conditions in the year 2030 are analyzed. Given the Project’s location within the City of Vacaville, Solano County has chosen to analyze the traffic impacts in accordance with standards established by the City. The City of Vacaville’s General Plan establishes a level of service (LOS) D as the minimum intersection performance goal. Vacaville has adopted thresholds of significance for traffic impact analyses, identified in Title 14, Land Use and Development Code of the Vacaville Municipal Code. Traffic impacts would be considered significant if:

- Levels of service degrade from acceptable LOS A, B, C, or D to unacceptable LOS E or F due to traffic generated from the proposed Project; or

- The volume to capacity ratio at an intersection operating at LOS E or F in the baseline condition would be increased by 0.02 or greater due to traffic generated from the proposed Project.

The City of Vacaville also administers and enforces City Municipal Code Section 14.13.180 Traffic Impact Mitigation Ordinance, which assesses a Traffic Impact fee to address developments’ cumulative transportation impacts. This program provides intersection and roadway improvements in the Project’s area, including widening of Depot Street/Mason Street and East Monte Vista Avenue/Allison Drive intersections. The project will participate in paying Transportation Impact Fees as determined necessary for impacts documented in Appendix F, Traffic Impact Analysis.

**Existing Conditions**
The Project site is located on the north side of East Monte Vista Avenue, just east of Brown Street. The study area is shown in Exhibit 6. Streets near the Project area and in the surrounding area which may be affected by the Project include:

- Allison Drive is a four- to six-lane roadway classified as an arterial through the study area located to the east of the Project site. Allison Drive provides regional access to the study area via a full interchange at I-80. The posted speed limit is 40 mph north of East Monte Vista Avenue and 35 mph south of East Monte Vista Avenue.

- Brown Street is a two-lane roadway with on-street parking that is classified as an arterial located to the west of the Project site. Brown Street travels north-south through the City between East Monte Vista Avenue and Browns Valley Parkway. The posted speed limit is 25 mph.
• Callen Street is a two-lane roadway classified as a collector with on-street parking south of the site that travels in a circuitous route through the study area and intersects East Monte Vista Avenue at two locations east and west of the site. The posted speed limit is 25 mph.

• Depot Street is a four-lane roadway classified as an arterial between I-80 and East Monte Vista Avenue which provides regional access to the study area via a partial interchange at I-80. There are bike lanes along Depot Street between Mason Street and East Monte Vista Avenue; however, the northbound bike lane striping ends south of the intersection. The posted speed limit is 35 mph.

• East Monte Vista Avenue is a four-lane roadway classified as an arterial located directly to the south of the Project site. East Monte Vista Avenue generally travels east-west through the City and will provide local access to the Project site via two driveways. The posted speed limit is 30 mph.

• Markham Avenue is a two-lane roadway classified as a collector that travels north-south within the study area west of the site. The posted speed limit is 25 mph.

• Mason Street is a four- to six-lane roadway classified as an arterial through the study area west of the site. The posted speed limit is 30 mph west of Depot Street and 35 mph east of Depot Street.

• Scoggins Court is a two-lane local street that provided direct access to residential developments west of the site. The posted speed limit is 25 mph.

To assess the proposed Project’s impacts on intersection performance, the following six intersections near the Project site were analyzed. The City of Vacaville’s General Plan establishes a level of service (LOS) D as the minimum intersection performance goal. As shown in Table 12, one of the six study intersections currently operate at a level of service E or worse during the PM peak hour. Exhibit 7 [TIA Figure 3] shows existing traffic conditions.
Table 12: Existing Conditions - Intersection Level of Service

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Intersection</th>
<th>Intersection Control</th>
<th>LOS</th>
<th>Existing AM Peak V/C</th>
<th>LOS</th>
<th>V/C</th>
<th>LOS</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>East Monte Vista Avenue / Depot Street / Markham Avenue</td>
<td>Signal</td>
<td>D</td>
<td>0.56 A</td>
<td></td>
<td>0.68 B</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Depot Street / Mason Street</td>
<td>Signal</td>
<td>D</td>
<td>0.57 A</td>
<td></td>
<td>0.92 E</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>East Monte Vista Avenue / Callen Street / Scoggins Court</td>
<td>Signal</td>
<td>D</td>
<td>0.37 A</td>
<td>0.42 A</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>East Monte Vista Avenue / Brown Street</td>
<td>Signal</td>
<td>D</td>
<td>0.34 A</td>
<td>0.47 A</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>East Monte Vista Avenue / Callen Street</td>
<td>Signal</td>
<td>D</td>
<td>0.24 A</td>
<td>0.33 A</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>East Monte Vista Avenue / Allison Drive</td>
<td>Signal</td>
<td>D</td>
<td>0.57 A</td>
<td>0.84 D</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: Kimley-Horn and Associates, Inc. 2010

Near Term Conditions

Because traffic conditions will change between the publishing date of this document and the completion date of the proposed Project, Near Term Conditions are established as a baseline against which the Project’s impacts will be evaluated. The Near Term Conditions represent traffic conditions that are projected to exist once development that has been approved is built and occupied. For an explanation of Near Term Conditions calculations, refer to Appendix F, Traffic Impact Analysis. Table 13 illustrates Near Term Conditions without the proposed Project (Exhibit 8 [TIA Figure4]). As shown in the table, two intersections are proposed to operate at unacceptable levels of service when compared to the City’s goal of LOS D. The level of service at the intersection of Depot Street/Mason Street improves during the PM Peak hour when compared to the existing conditions due to the City’s model predicting a decrease in traffic for one of the critical movements.

Table 13: Near-Term No Project - Intersection Level of Service

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Intersection</th>
<th>Intersection Control</th>
<th>LOS</th>
<th>Near-Term AM Peak V/C</th>
<th>LOS</th>
<th>Near-Term PM Peak V/C</th>
<th>LOS</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>East Monte Vista Avenue / Depot Street / Markham Avenue</td>
<td>Signal</td>
<td>D</td>
<td>0.57 A</td>
<td></td>
<td>0.73 C</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Depot Street / Mason Street</td>
<td>Signal</td>
<td>D</td>
<td>0.61 B</td>
<td></td>
<td>0.89 D</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>East Monte Vista Avenue / Callen Street / Scoggins Court</td>
<td>Signal</td>
<td>D</td>
<td>0.38 A</td>
<td></td>
<td>0.44 A</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>East Monte Vista Avenue / Brown Street</td>
<td>Signal</td>
<td>D</td>
<td>0.36 A</td>
<td></td>
<td>0.47 A</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>East Monte Vista Avenue / Callen Street</td>
<td>Signal</td>
<td>D</td>
<td>0.25 A</td>
<td></td>
<td>0.35 A</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>East Monte Vista Avenue / Allison Drive</td>
<td>Signal</td>
<td>D</td>
<td>0.61 B</td>
<td>0.97 E</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: Kimley-Horn and Associates, Inc. 2010
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Environmental Issues

a. Project Trip Generation. The Institute of Transportation Engineers’ (ITE), Trip Generation, 8th Edition, was used to derive the weekday AM and PM peak hour trip generation for the proposed WJC Government Center Project. Several different ITE land use codes (LUC) were researched to estimate a trip generation potential for the proposed Project, including Government Office Building (LUC 730), Clinic (LUC 630), Medical-Dental Office (LUC 720) and General Office (LUC 710). Ultimately, Medical-Dental Office (LUC 720) was determined to best represent potential traffic trip generation by the proposed Project. A detailed discussion and comparison of the ITE land use codes considered is located in Appendix F, Traffic Impact Analysis. Table 14 shows the daily, AM and PM peak hour traffic trips for the proposed Project.

Table 14: Trip Generation

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Land Use</th>
<th>Square Footage</th>
<th>Daily Total</th>
<th>AM Peak</th>
<th>PM Peak</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>In</td>
<td>Out</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Medical-Dental Office (ITE Code 720)</td>
<td>35,000</td>
<td>1,265</td>
<td>64</td>
<td>17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>33</td>
<td>88</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>


The direction of travel (trip distribution) of Project trips is based on existing traffic counts collected at the study area intersections, the roadway network near the study area, and the general location of expected users of the proposed facilities in relation to the Project site. Table 15 summarizes the traffic distribution assumed for this traffic study. Using these distribution percentages, Project traffic is assigned to the adjacent roadway network.

Table 15: Trip Distribution

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Description</th>
<th>Percent Distribution</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Depot Street - South</td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mason Street - West</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mason Street - East</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>East Monte Vista Avenue - West</td>
<td>14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Markham Avenue - North</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Scoggins Court - North</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Callen Street - South</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Brown Street - North</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Brown Street - South</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Callen Street - North</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Callen Street - South</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Allison Drive - North</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Allison Drive - South</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>East Monte Vista Avenue - East</td>
<td>18</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Based on the proposed trip generation and trip distribution, it is anticipated that less than 50 trips during either the AM or PM peak hour will travel along I-80 to access the site. It has been recently documented in a letter to Caltrans that the most recent Congestion Management Network and Level of Service results for I-80 through Vacaville show the freeway operates at LOS C and D. The threshold for specific traffic analysis along the State facility is not met.

**Near Term Plus Project Scenario.** The Near Term Plus Project Scenario was developed by adding the proposed Project’s estimated traffic trips to the Near Term No Project volumes based on the distribution pattern shown in Table 13. Peak hour turning movements for the Near Term Plus Project Scenario are also shown in Exhibit 9 [TIA Figure 5], while intersection level of service is shown in Table 16. The Near Term Plus Project Scenario conditions include traffic expected from all existing development and approved developments as if occupied.

### Table 16: Near Term Plus Project - Intersection Levels of Service

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Intersection</th>
<th>Intersection Control</th>
<th>LOS Control</th>
<th>AM Peak</th>
<th>PM Peak</th>
<th>AM Peak</th>
<th>PM Peak</th>
<th>Project Impact</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>V/C LOS</td>
<td>V/C LOS</td>
<td>V/C LOS</td>
<td>V/C LOS</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>East Monte Vista Avenue / Depot Street / Markham Avenue</td>
<td>Signal</td>
<td>D</td>
<td>0.57 A</td>
<td>0.73 C</td>
<td>0.57 A</td>
<td>0.75 C</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Depot Street / Mason Street</td>
<td>Signal</td>
<td>D</td>
<td>0.61 B</td>
<td>0.89 D</td>
<td>0.61 B</td>
<td>0.89 D</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>East Monte Vista Avenue / Callen Street / Scoggins Court</td>
<td>Signal</td>
<td>D</td>
<td>0.38 A</td>
<td>0.44 A</td>
<td>0.39 A</td>
<td>0.45 A</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>East Monte Vista Avenue / Brown Street</td>
<td>Signal</td>
<td>D</td>
<td>0.36 A</td>
<td>0.47 A</td>
<td>0.37 A</td>
<td>0.49 A</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>East Monte Vista Avenue / Callen Street</td>
<td>Signal</td>
<td>D</td>
<td>0.25 A</td>
<td>0.35 A</td>
<td>0.26 A</td>
<td>0.36 A</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>East Monte Vista Avenue / Allison Drive</td>
<td>Signal</td>
<td>D</td>
<td>0.61 B</td>
<td>0.97 E</td>
<td>0.61 B</td>
<td>0.97 E</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Near-Term Plus Project

#### Peak Hour Intersection Turning Movement Volumes

**Source:** Kimley-Horn and Associates, Inc. (March 2010).

---

#### Exhibit 9

**Near-Term Plus Project**

**Peak Hour Intersection Turning Movement Volumes**

See the attached map and tables for detailed intersection volumes. The map shows the study area, project site, and intersection volumes for AM (PM) peak hours.

---

**Table 1:**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Intersection</th>
<th>AM Volume</th>
<th>PM Volume</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Monte Vista Ave</td>
<td>202(180)</td>
<td>451(551)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>140(191)</td>
<td>198(43)</td>
<td>347(524)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>29(63)</td>
<td>528(226)</td>
<td>40(69)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17(521)</td>
<td>181(191)</td>
<td>2(6)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

---

**Table 2:**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Intersection</th>
<th>AM Volume</th>
<th>PM Volume</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Depot St</td>
<td>88(468)</td>
<td>178(533)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17(521)</td>
<td>92(342)</td>
<td>827(923)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>45(59)</td>
<td>48(99)</td>
<td>14(102)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

---

**Table 3:**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Intersection</th>
<th>AM Volume</th>
<th>PM Volume</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Montegut Ct</td>
<td>13(36)</td>
<td>67(83)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>141(159)</td>
<td>265(838)</td>
<td>6(9)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10(114)</td>
<td>19(390)</td>
<td>157(742)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>51(889)</td>
<td>19(390)</td>
<td>6(9)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

---

**Table 4:**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Intersection</th>
<th>AM Volume</th>
<th>PM Volume</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Brown Ave</td>
<td>14(20)</td>
<td>7(4)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12(27)</td>
<td>34(256)</td>
<td>7(4)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>23(49)</td>
<td>135(39)</td>
<td>135(39)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>157(742)</td>
<td>157(742)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

---

**Table 5:**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Intersection</th>
<th>AM Volume</th>
<th>PM Volume</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Allison Dr</td>
<td>10(114)</td>
<td>19(390)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>51(889)</td>
<td>19(390)</td>
<td>6(9)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

---

**Table 6:**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Intersection</th>
<th>AM Volume</th>
<th>PM Volume</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Brown Ave</td>
<td>14(20)</td>
<td>7(4)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12(27)</td>
<td>34(256)</td>
<td>7(4)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>23(49)</td>
<td>135(39)</td>
<td>135(39)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

---

**Legend:**

- **X** STUDY AREA INTERSECTIONS
- **PROJECT SITE**
- **XX(YY)** AM(PM) PEAK HOUR VOLUMES

---

**Map Notes:**

- **Not To Scale**
- **Source:** Kimley-Horn and Associates, Inc. (March 2010)

---

**Additional Information:**

- **20850015 • 03/2010 | 9_Near-Term+Proj_Vol.ai**
- **INITIAL STUDY / MITIGATED NEGATIVE DECLARATION**
As shown in Table 16, all study intersections operate at acceptable levels of service under Near Term Plus Project conditions, with the exception of the intersection of East Monte Vista Avenue/Allison Drive, which is projected to operate at LOS E. However, based on the City’s thresholds of significance, the addition of the Project trips to these study intersections do not have a significant impact. The volume to capacity ratio at the intersection of East Monte Vista Avenue/Allison Drive, projected to operate at LOS E under near-term condition, does not increase by 0.02 due to traffic generated from the proposed development. Accordingly, traffic impacts to roadway and intersection LOS are less than significant under the Near Term Plus Project scenario.

b  **Long Term (Cumulative Impacts).** Cumulative traffic volumes at the study area intersections were estimated using growth rates derived from the City of Vacaville travel demand forecasting model and account for both general traffic growth and future variations in travel patterns. Note that none of the streets included in the TIA are included in the Solano County Congestion Management System.

Table 17 shows the Cumulative Plus Project Intersection LOS (Exhibit 10 [TIA Figure 7]). Under this scenario, three intersections are proposed to operate at unacceptable levels of service when compared to the City’s goal of LOS D. The Depot Street/Mason Street and East Monte Vista Avenue/Allison Drive intersections are projected to operate at LOS F during the PM peak hour. However, these intersections fail to meet LOS goals in the Cumulative No Project scenario and the addition of Project-generated traffic would not cause a volume to capacity ratio increase of 0.2 or more. Therefore, impacts to these two intersections would be less than significant.

### Table 17: Cumulative Plus Project - Intersection Levels of Service

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Intersection</th>
<th>Intersection Control</th>
<th>LOS Control</th>
<th>AM Peak</th>
<th>PM Peak</th>
<th>AM Peak</th>
<th>PM Peak</th>
<th>Impact</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>East Monte Vista Avenue / Depot Street / Markham Avenue</td>
<td>Signal</td>
<td>D</td>
<td>0.63</td>
<td>B</td>
<td>0.97</td>
<td>E</td>
<td>0.64</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Depot Street / Mason Street</td>
<td>Signal</td>
<td>D</td>
<td>0.79</td>
<td>C</td>
<td>1.03</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>0.79</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>East Monte Vista Avenue / Callen Street / Scoggins Court</td>
<td>Signal</td>
<td>D</td>
<td>0.33</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>0.63</td>
<td>B</td>
<td>0.34</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table 17 (cont.): Cumulative Plus Project - Intersection Levels of Service

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Intersection</th>
<th>Intersection Control</th>
<th>LOS Goal</th>
<th>Cumulative (2030)</th>
<th>Cumulative (2030) + Project</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>AM Peak</td>
<td>PM Peak</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>V/C</td>
<td>LOS</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>East Monte Vista Avenue / Brown Street</td>
<td>Signal</td>
<td>D</td>
<td>0.41</td>
<td>A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>East Monte Vista Avenue / Callen Street</td>
<td>Signal</td>
<td>D</td>
<td>0.25</td>
<td>A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Depot Street / Allison Drive</td>
<td>Signal</td>
<td>D</td>
<td>0.77</td>
<td>C</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>


The Project would, however, have a significant impact at the intersection of East Monte Vista Avenue/Depot Street/Markham Avenue based on an increase in the volume to capacity ratio by 0.2 with the addition of Project-generated traffic. Accordingly, Mitigation Measure TRANS-1 is proposed that would require applicant to pay fair share fees for the reconfiguration or reconstruction of the impacted intersection. Implementation of this mitigation would reduce impacts to a less than significant level.

c The proposed Project is located approximately 0.75 mile southwest of the Nut Tree Airport and within the airport’s Compatibility District boundary. As required by Vacaville’s General Plan Policy 6.6-I 2, development proposals within the Nut Tree Airport Compatibility District must be referred to the County Airport Land Use Commission per the Nut Tree Airport Land Use Plan and the Solano County Airport Land Use Compatibility Review Procedures. However, the Project does not contain any features that would affect aviation patterns (e.g., flashing lights or tall buildings). Therefore, impacts would be less than significant.

d The proposed Project includes two driveways off East Monte Vista Avenue; however, the proposed Project would not alter the design of any existing roadways or construct new roadways that would include dangerous design features or result in incompatible uses. A queue analysis was conducted at the western driveway for the eastbound left turn along East Monte Vista Drive for the AM and PM peak hours. The existing left turn lane provides approximately 70 feet of storage. Results indicate that the 95th percentile queue length for both peak hours will be less than 25 feet. Based on these results, the left turn queues at the site driveway will not affect the operations at the intersection of East Monte Vista Avenue/Brown Street. This analysis assumes that access to the proposed development will not be provided along Brown Street. It is not anticipated that an additional access point along Brown Street will significantly increase the left turn queues along East Monte Vista Avenue.

No impact would occur.
Exhibit 10
Cumulative (2030) Plus Project
Peak Hour Intersection Turning Movement Volumes

e Emergency access would be provided on the site by the two access points on East Monte Vista Avenue. Proposed Project construction activities occurring on the Project site would not change or impair emergency vehicle access in the Project’s vicinity. If any construction were to occur directly adjacent to or within adjacent roadways, standard safety measures, such as construction traffic signs or flag persons, would ensure emergency access in the Project vicinity would not be impaired. Therefore, impacts would be less than significant.

f Title 14, Chapter 14.09.128 of the Vacaville Municipal Code provides standards for the provision of off-street parking spaces for a variety of land uses. The proposed Project would best be analyzed under the Medical Offices and Clinics land use type. The requirements for this land use type is one space for each 200 sq ft of gross floor area. Accordingly, the approximately 35,000 sq ft building would require 175 parking spaces (35,000 ÷ 200 = 175). As shown on Exhibit 3, Site Concept, 175 off-street parking spaces would be provided. Accordingly, impacts to parking capacity would be less than significant.

g City Coach Route 6 operates a fixed route through the study area, operating along East Monte Vista Street, adjacent to the Project site, and Brown Street. There is an existing transit stop along East Monte Vista Avenue in the westbound direction near the entrance to the mobile home park, east of the Project site, and in the eastbound direction near the retail center across the street from the Project site. No modifications to the transit network surrounding the Project site is planned and the Project would not interfere with existing transit service or transit stops. However, the Project would potentially generate transit ridership. Additional passengers generated by the Project would be accommodated by the existing service and impact to transit services would not be considered significant.

The Project would potentially generate pedestrian and bicycle traffic. Sidewalks are present along all immediately surrounding roadways. The City’s General Plan designates bike routes along East Monte Vista Avenue, Brown Street north of East Monte Vista Avenue and Mason Street West of Depot Street. The proposed Project would not permanently obstruct any sidewalks or bike routes. The existing sidewalks and bike route system would be expected to accommodate any additional pedestrian traffic generated by the Project.

Furthermore, the proposed Project would abide by all applicable City of Vacaville alternative transportation requirements. Since no existing alternative transportation facilities would be impacted by the proposed Project, impacts would be less than significant.

4.16.2 - Impact
The intersection of East Monte Vista Avenue/Depot Street/Markham Avenue would operate at a deficient level of service under the Cumulative Plus Project scenario.
4.16.3 - Mitigation

Prior to construction, the Project shall make fair share contributions for one of the following improvements to the East Monte Vista Avenue/Depot Street/Markham Avenue intersection:

Option 1: Reconfigure approach lanes and modify the traffic operations of the signalized intersection. Reconfigure the inside, eastbound through lane to a shared through/left turn lane and the inside westbound through lane to a shared through/left turn lane. Provide split phasing for the eastbound and westbound approaches. This modification results in a volume to capacity ratio of 0.97, LOS E, reducing the Project impact to equal the conditions under the Cumulative No Project scenario. With this mitigation, the impact would be reduced to less-than-significant.

4.16.4 - Verification

The County shall verify that fair share contributions have been made at the time building permits are sought. The City will monitor the impacted intersection and appropriately address mitigation as needed, per the Traffic Impact Fee program, including potentially limiting future development in the Project area that would significantly impact this intersection, and/or establish a plan line and schedule for improvements that would mitigate cumulative impacts.
4.17 - Utilities and Service Systems

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Environmental Issues</th>
<th>Potentially Significant Impact</th>
<th>Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporated</th>
<th>Less Than Significant Impact</th>
<th>No Impact</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>17. Utilities and Service Systems</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Would the project:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>a) Exceed wastewater treatment requirements of the applicable Regional Water Quality Control Board?</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☒</td>
<td>☐</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>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?</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☒</td>
<td>☐</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>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?</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☒</td>
<td>☐</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>d) Have sufficient water supplies available to serve the project from existing entitlements and resources, or are new or expanded entitlements needed?</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☒</td>
<td>☐</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>e) Result in a determination by the wastewater treatment provider which 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?</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☒</td>
<td>☐</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>f) Be served by a landfill with sufficient permitted capacity to accommodate the project’s solid waste disposal needs?</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☒</td>
<td>☐</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>g) Comply with federal, state, and local statutes and regulations related to solid waste?</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☒</td>
<td>☐</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

4.17.1 - Discussion

Environmental Issues

a Wastewater generated by the proposed Project would be treated at the Easterly Wastewater Treatment Plant (WWTP) located approximately 4.5 miles east of central Vacaville and 35 miles southwest of Sacramento. Treated water is released into Alamo Creek where it travels to Cache Slough. Easterly WWTP was designed as a standard secondary treatment facility.

Easterly WWTP is operated under Waste Discharge Orders and NPDES Permits issued by the Central Valley Regional Water Quality Control Board, (CVRWQCB). These permits specify waste discharge and monitoring requirements to protect the water quality of downstream
water bodies. On April 25, 2008, the CVRWQCB issued Waste Discharge Order No. R5-2008-0055, NPDES Permit No. CA007769 to the City of Vacaville, requiring the upgrades to the Easterly plant which will ensure future compliance with ammonia and nitrate limits, as well as eliminating blending of primary effluent with secondary effluent during peak wet weather flow and requiring seasonal filtration and advanced disinfection, consistent with Title 22 reclamation requirements by 2015. The City is currently in the environmental review process for the required upgrades to the City plant. The proposed Project will not interfere with the upgrade process nor will it exacerbate the existing baseline situation identified in the Title 22 reclamation requirements. As such, impacts would be less than significant.

b The utilities that serve surrounding vicinity are sized to accommodate build out of City and County General Plan and zoning designations, of which the proposed Project is consistent. This includes water and wastewater systems. More specifically, the Project would tie directly into the utilities on East Monte Vista Avenue. In addition, the City of Vacaville’s Water and Sewer departments have adequate capacity to accommodate future growth contemplated by the General Plans in their respective service areas (Solano County LAFCo 2004). Impacts would be less than significant.

c Implementation of the proposed Project would create an increase in the volume of storm water runoff. The proposed Project will connect to existing 21-inch storm drain stub on East Monte Vista Avenue and extend a drainage system to collect on-site drainage. As such, the increase in volume and pollutants would not be considered significant because existing facilities would be capable of handling the flows and no improvements would be needed to offsite facilities. Refer to Environmental Issues “c” through “f” in Section 4.9, Hydrology and Water Quality.

d The City of Vacaville’s Urban Water Management Plan (2005) indicates in 2010, the City will have an average daily supply of approximately 35 million gallons per day (mgd). Estimated demands for 2010 are approximately 18 mgd, resulting in a surplus of more than 17 mgd. The amount of potable water that would be needed for the proposed Project and facilities can be readily supplied by existing water lines in the Project area (i.e. East Monte Vista Avenue. Therefore, water supplies are adequate to serve the proposed Project. (Solano County LAFCo 2004). Impacts would be less than significant.

e The Project’s demands are estimated at approximately 21,200 gallons per day (gpd) (estimated based on an office building demand of 100 gallons per day per person and 212 job positions). The Easterly Wastewater Treatment Plant has an average dry weather flow design capacity of 15 mgd. The plant currently treats an annual average flow of 10.0 mgd. This is considered sufficient capacity to accommodate flows anticipated for the General Plan, including from the proposed Project. (Solano County LAFCo 2004).
The existing sewer line and station servicing the project site is experiencing capacity issues; however, the City has stated that the sewer is deep and the additional flow added by the project will not exceed the flow projected by the City for the current zoning of the Project site. In addition, the City will be constructing a new sewer lift station on Brown Street. The Brown Street Sewer Lift Station has been programmed into the City’s Capital Improvement Program. Therefore, Impacts would be less than significant.

f-g The Project site vicinity is primarily served by the Hay Road Landfill near Vacaville. The Hay Road Landfill has 21.8 million cubic yards of capacity remaining and has a projected closure date of 2077 (Solano County LAFCo 2004). Once operational, the facility would comply with all County requirements for waste diversion and recycling. Therefore, potential solid waste impacts would be less than significant.

4.17.2 - Impact
Impacts would be less than significant.

4.17.3 - Mitigation
No mitigation would be necessary.

4.17.4 - Verification
Not applicable.
4.18 - Mandatory Findings of Significance

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Environmental Issues</th>
<th>Potentially Significant Impact</th>
<th>Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporated</th>
<th>Less Than Significant Impact</th>
<th>No Impact</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>18. Mandatory Findings of Significance</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>a) Does the project have the potential to 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 a rare or endangered plant or animal, or eliminate important examples of the major periods of California history or prehistory?</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☒</td>
<td>☐</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>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)?</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☒</td>
<td>☐</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>c) Does the project have environmental effects, which will cause substantial adverse effects on human beings, either directly or indirectly?</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☒</td>
<td>☐</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

4.18.1 - Discussion

Environmental Issues

a The Project site is in an urban built-up area and does not contain any significant biological resources or native habitat. The Project site does not contain any water bodies, important wildlife habitats, or support populations of rare or endangered plant species. Plant communities on the Project site consist mostly of ruderal vegetation and some valley oak trees. Two special-status wildlife species (Cooper’s hawk and white tailed kite raptors) have a low potential of being present on the Project site. Potential impacts to raptors would be reduced to less than significant with Mitigation Measure BIO-1. Mitigation Measures BIO-2, BIO-3, and BIO-4 would reduce potential impacts to valley oak trees to less than significant. Therefore, the proposed Project would not adversely affect fish or wildlife species or plants or plant communities. The Project site does not contain any known prehistoric or historic resources. Mitigation Measures CR-1 and CR-1 are proposed to address the possibility of disturbing or destroying previously undiscovered resources during construction. Therefore, impacts to these resources would be less than significant.
“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.

As discussed previously in Sections 4.1 to 4.18 of this document the proposed Project would not result in any significant, Project-level environmental impacts with the incorporation of proposed mitigation. The proposed Project is consistent with the City of Vacaville’s General Plan land use designation and zoning. Therefore, cumulative effects resulting from the Project site’s development have already been considered under the City of Vacaville’s General Plan. Other past, current or probably future projects in the region may potentially result in cumulative impacts; however, these projects would be required to demonstrate consistency with the General Plan and to mitigate all impacts to a less than significant level. Accordingly, the proposed Project, in combination with other projects in the region would result in substantial cumulative impacts.

All of the proposed Project’s potentially significant impacts that could have an adverse affect on humans are either less than significant or would be mitigated to a level of less than significant Refer to Mitigation Measures AES-1, AES-2, and AES-3; GEO-1, GEO-2, and GEO-3; HAZ-1 and HAZ-2; and NOI-1 and NOI-2. Therefore, adverse impacts on humans would be less than significant.
Environmental Factors Potentially Affected

The environmental factors checked below would be potentially affected by this project, involving at least one impact that is a “Potentially Significant Impact” as indicated by the checklist on the previous pages.

- Aesthetics
- Agriculture Resources
- Air Quality
- Biological Resources
- Cultural Resources
- Geology / Soils
- Greenhouse Gas Emissions
- Hazards / Hazardous Materials
- Hydrology / Water Quality
- Land Use / Planning
- Mineral Resources
- Noise
- Population / Housing
- Public Services
- Recreation
- Transportation / Traffic
- Utilities / Services Systems
- Mandatory Findings of Significance

Environmental 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 measure 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.

Signed [Signature] Date 4-16-2010
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