

Volume 1 – DEIR

NUT TREE AIRPORT MASTER PLAN UPDATE

Draft Environmental Impact Report

Prepared for
Solano County

May 2013



Volume 1 – DEIR

NUT TREE AIRPORT MASTER PLAN UPDATE

Draft Environmental Impact Report

Prepared for
Solano County

May 2013



2600 Capitol Avenue
Suite 200
Sacramento, CA 95816
916.564.4500
www.esassoc.com

Los Angeles

Oakland

Orlando

Palm Springs

Petaluma

Portland

San Diego

San Francisco

Santa Cruz

Seattle

Tampa

Woodland Hills

120526

OUR COMMITMENT TO SUSTAINABILITY | ESA helps a variety of public and private sector clients plan and prepare for climate change and emerging regulations that limit GHG emissions. ESA is a registered assessor with the California Climate Action Registry, a Climate Leader, and founding reporter for the Climate Registry. ESA is also a corporate member of the U.S. Green Building Council and the Business Council on Climate Change (BC3). Internally, ESA has adopted a Sustainability Vision and Policy Statement and a plan to reduce waste and energy within our operations. This document was produced using recycled paper.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

Nut Tree Airport Master Plan Update DEIR

	<u>Page</u>
1. Introduction	1-1
1.1 Project Background	1-1
1.2 The CEQA Process	1-2
1.3 The CEQA Review Process	1-4
1.4 Terminology Used in the EIR	1-7
1.5 EIR Organization	1-8
2. Project Description	2-1
2.1 Introduction	2-1
2.2 Project Location and Setting	2-1
2.3 Existing Airport Operations	2-8
2.4 Proposed Project	2-9
2.5 Objectives of the Proposed Project	2-15
2.6 Approvals	2-15
2.7 Cumulative Projects	2-16
3. Environmental Setting, Impacts, and Mitigation Measures	3.1-1
3.1 Aesthetics	3.1-1
3.2 Air Quality	3.2-1
3.3 Biological Resources	3.3-1
3.4 Cultural Resources	3.4-1
3.5 Geology, Soils, and Seismicity	3.5-1
3.6 Greenhouse Gas Emissions	3.6-1
3.7 Hazards and Hazardous Materials	3.7-1
3.8 Hydrology and Water Quality	3.8-1
3.9 Land Use	3.9-1
3.10 Noise	3.10-1
3.11 Utilities and Service Systems	3.11-1
3.12 Transportation and Circulation	3.12-1
4. Alternatives	4-1
4.1 Introduction	4-1
4.2 Alternatives Selected for Further Consideration	4-3
4.3 Environmental Superior Alternative	4-20
5. Other CEQA Considerations	5-1
5.1 Effects Found Not To Be Significant	5-1
5.2 Cumulative Impacts	5-3
5.3 Growth Inducement	5-3
5.4 Energy Conservation	5-5
5.5 Significant Irreversible Environmental Impacts	5-6
5.6 Significant and Unavoidable Adverse Impacts	5-7
5.7 References	5-7

	<u>Page</u>	
6. List of Preparers	6-1	
6.1 Lead Agency	6-1	
6.2 Principal Preparers	6-1	
7. List of Acronyms	7-1	
Appendices		
A	NOP and Scoping Comments	
B	Air Quality Calculations	
C	Rare and Endangered Species	
D	Wetland Delineation	
E	Biological Database Reports	
F	Staff Report on Burrowing Owl Mitigation	
G	Survey Protocols and Mitigation Guidelines	
H	Cultural Resources Study	
I	EDR Report	
J	Aircraft Noise Modeling Report	
K	LOS Calculation Sheets	
List of Figures		
2-1	Regional Location	2-2
2-2	Aerial Photograph of Nut Tree Airport (11x17)	2-3
2-3	Airport Layout Plan	2-11
2-4	Proposed Project – Phase I, II and III (11x17)	2-13
2-5	Cumulative Project Map (11x17)	2-19
3.1-1	Project Site Photographs (11x17)	3.1-3
3.2-1	Wind Rose for Nut Tree Airport	3.2-3
3.3-1	Existing Habitats in the Project Area	3.3-5
3.3-2	CNDDDB Occurrences in the Vicinity of the Project Study Area	3.3-17
3.3-3a	Phase I Habitat Impacts	3.3-39
3.3-3a	Phase II Habitat Impacts	3.3-40
3.3-3a	Phase III Habitat Impacts	3.3-41
3.5-1	Soils (11x17)	3.5-3
3.5-2	Faults(11x17)	3.5-9
3.8-1	FEMA 100 Year Flood Zones (11x17)	3.8-3
3.9-1	Noise Contours	3.9-5
3.9-2	ALUCP Safety Zones	3.9-6
3.9-3	Airspace Plan	3.9-7
3.9-4	General Plan Land Use Designations in the Vicinity of the Proposed Project	3.9-9
3.9-5	General Plan Land Use with Existing and Generic Safety Zones	3.9-19
3.10-1	Effect of Noise on People	3.10-2
3.10-2	2011 Existing CNEL Contours	3.10-8
3.10-3	Land Use Compatibility for Community Noise Environment	3.10-12
3.10-4	2011 Existing CNEL Contours versus 2017 Phase II CNEL Contours	3.10-25
3.10-5	2011 Existing CNEL Contours versus 2031 Phase III CNEL Contours	3.10-29
3.12-1	Study Intersection Location	3.12-6
3.12-2	Study Intersection Lane Configurations	3.12-7
3.12-3	Existing AM/PM Peak Hour Intersection Volumes	3.12-9
3.12-4	Project Trip Distribution	3.12-19
3.12-5	Project (Phase I) AM/PM Peak Hour Intersection Volumes	3.12-21
3.12-6	Project (All Phases) AM/PM Peak Hour Intersection Volumes	3.12-22

	<u>Page</u>
3.12-7 Existing+Approved Projects AM/PM Peak Hour Intersection Volumes	3.12-24
3.12-8 Existing+Approved Projects+Project (Phase I) AM/PM Peak Hour Intersection Volumes	3.12-25
3.12-9 Existing+Approved Projects+Project (All Phases) AM/PM Peak Hour Intersection Volumes	3.12-29
3.12-10 Cumulative (2035) AM/PM Peak Hour Intersection Volumes	3.12-35
3.12-11 Cumulative+Project AM/PM Peak Hour Intersection Volumes	3.12-36
4-1 2007 Airport Layout Plan	4-5

List of Tables

ES-1 Phase I Master Plan Projects (2013 – 2017)	ES-1
ES-2 Phase II Master Plan Projects (2018 – 2022)	ES-2
ES-3 Phase III Master Plan Projects (2022 – 2031)	ES-2
ES-4 Significant and Unavoidable Impacts	ES-4
ES-5 Summary of Environmental Impacts and Mitigation Measures	ES-5
1-1 Summary of Responses to the Notice of Preparation	1-5
2-1 Current (2011) Nut Tree Airport Operations	2-8
2-2 Existing Nut Tree Instrument Approaches	2-9
2-3 Phase I Master Plan Projects (2013 – 2017)	2-10
2-4 Phase II Master Plan Projects (2018 – 2022)	2-12
2-5 Phase III Master Plan Projects (2022 – 2031)	2-12
2-6 Forecasted Nut Tree Airport Operations	2-15
2-7 Cumulative Project List	2-21
3.2-1 Average High Temperature and Precipitation at Nut Tree Airport	3.2-4
3.2-2 Project Area Air Pollutant Summary, 2007-2011	3.2-6
3.2-3 State and Federal Ambient Air Quality Standards	3.2-10
3.2-4 Consistency of the Proposed Project with AQMP and Air Quality Goals and Policies	3.2-18
3.2-5 Unmitigated Construction Emissions for the Proposed Project	3.2-19
3.2-6 Operational Emissions for the Proposed Project	3.2-20
3.2-7 Unmitigated Construction Emissions for the Proposed Project	3.2-22
3.2-8 Operational Emissions for the Proposed Project	3.2-23
3.2-8 Estimated Project Increment Cancer Risk	3.2-27
3.2-9 Estimated Project Increment Health Impacts	3.2-29
3.3-1 Habitat Types within Study Area	3.3-4
3.3-2 Regionally Occurring Special Status Species	3.3-13
3.3-3 Habitat Types Impacted by Phase I	3.3-37
3.3-4 Habitat Types Impacted by Phase II	3.3-38
3.3-5 Habitat Types Impacted by Phase III	3.3-38
3.4-1 Previous Cultural Resources Investigations Conducted within Half-Mile of the Project Area	3.4-13
3.4-2 Resource Descriptions and Eligibility Determinations	3.4-15
3.5-1 Modified Mercalli Intensity Scale	3.5-6
3.6-1 Estimated Construction-Related GHG Emissions – Phase I	3.6-12
3.6-2 Proposed Project Increment Operational GHG Emissions – Phase I	3.6-13
3.6-3 Aircraft and GSE GHG Emission Factors	3.6-14
3.6-4 Estimated Construction-Related GHG Emissions	3.6-15
3.6-5 Proposed Project Increment Operational GHG Emissions	3.6-15
3.7-1 Regulatory Agency Databases	3.7-2
3.8-1 Beneficial Uses of Project-Effectuated Watershed	3.8-6

	<u>Page</u>
3.9-1 Nut Tree Airport / Land Use Compatibility Plan Noise Policies	3.9-3
3.9-2 Nut Tree Airport / Land Use Compatibility Plan Safety Policies	3.9-4
3.9-3 Location of Proposed Project in 1988 ALUCP Safety Zones*	3.9-14
3.9-4 Comparison of Current and Generic Safety Compatibility Criteria	3.9-18
3.10-1 2011 Existing Operations at Nut Tree Airport	3.10-6
3.10-2 Temporal Distribution of Baseline Aircraft Operations (2011)	3.10-7
3.10-3 Noise and Land Use Compatibility Policy for Transportation Sources	3.10-14
3.10-4 Noise and Land Use Compatibility Policy for Non-transportation Sources	3.10-16
3.10-5 Phase I (2017) Aircraft Operations at Nut Tree Airport	3.10-18
3.10-6 Phase III (2031) Aircraft Operations at Nut Tree Airport	3.10-19
3.10-7 Typical Noise Levels from Demolition/ Construction Equipment Operations	3.10-20
3.10-8 Vibration Source Levels for Construction Equipment	3.10-21
3.10-9 Comparison of CNEL Contour Areas in the Existing Condition and Proposed Project Phase I (2017)	3.10-26
3.10-10 Existing and Projected PM Peak-Hour Traffic Noise Levels along Roadways in the Project Vicinity	3.10-27
3.10-11 Comparison of CNEL Contour Areas in the Existing Condition and Proposed Project Phase III (2031)	3.10-28
3.11-1 Wastewater Generation Calculations for the Proposed Project	3.11-8
3.12-1 Signalized Intersection Level of Service Definitions (Intersection Capacity Utilization Method)	3.12-5
3.12-2 Unsignalized Intersection Level of Service Definitions (HCM Methodology)	3.12-8
3.12-3 Existing Intersection Levels of Service (LOS)	3.12-10
3.12-4 City of Vacaville General Plan Roadway Segment Capacities by Classification	3.12-10
3.12-5 Existing Roadway Segment (Peak Flow Direction) Level of Service (LOS) and Volume to Capacity Ratio (V/C)	3.12-11
3.12-6 Project Trip Generation	3.12-17
3.12-7 Project Trip Distribution and Assignment Patterns	3.12-18
3.12-8 Intersection Level of Service (LOS) – Existing Plus Approved Projects and Existing Plus Approved Projects Plus Project Conditions	3.12-26
3.12-9 Roadway Segment Level of Service – Peak Flow Direction Existing Plus Approved Projects and Existing Plus Approved Projects Plus Project	3.12-27
3.12-10 Intersection Level of Service (LOS) – Cumulative and Cumulative Plus Project Conditions	3.12-35
3.12-11 Roadway Segment Level of Service – Peak Flow Direction Cumulative (2035) and Cumulative Plus Project	3.12-38
4-1 Comparison of Alternatives Ability to Meet County Objectives	4-21
4-2 Comparison of Alternatives for the Cumulative (2031) Scenario	4-21

EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

Introduction

The Master Plan update for Nut Tree Airport establishes guidelines for improving the Airport's facilities over the next 20 years. The Master Plan represents a comprehensive effort to identify the type and extent of facilities that are required to meet forecasted aviation demand and FAA standards for a public use airport designated as a general aviation airport in the National Plan of Integrated Airport Systems (NPIAS). The Proposed Project includes three phases of development that would occur over the next 20 years. These three phases of development represent the preferred alternative, as identified in the current airport layout plan (ALP) for Nut Tree Airport. **Tables ES-1 through ES-3** identify and describe the projects included under Phases I, II, and III.

TABLE ES-1
PHASE I MASTER PLAN PROJECTS (2013 – 2017)

Project	Description
1. Solarized shade hangars	Construct (36,000 square feet (sf)) of solarized shade hangars on existing apron west of the Administration Building.
2. Shift Runway 2/20	Shift Runway 2/20 200-feet north and relocate the associated runway edge light, signs, and markings. Additional pavement will be added to the end of Runway 20.
3. Relocate the Automated Surface Observing System/Automated Weather Observing System (ASOS/AWOS)	The ASOS/AWOS is currently located north of the Administration Building and east of Runway 2/20. The system would be relocated to the west of the Runway.
4. Relocate fencing, light poles, and other obstructions	Light pole and fence located east of Runway 2/20 to be relocated clear of taxiway object free area (65 feet from runway centerline).
5. South corporate hangar	Construction of 100,000 sf of corporate hangars southeast of the existing parking apron.
6. Airfield perimeter fencing and gates	Replacement and construction of fencing along the southeast border of the Airport.
7. South apron expansion	Construction of a 221,000 sf expansion of the existing aircraft parking apron located east of Runway 2/20.
8. Hangars 1-9 refurbishment	Refurbishment of existing hangars located east of Runway 2/20.
9. Apron Lighting and New Rotating Beacon	Light poles located on the east side of the parking apron will be refurbished, and a new rotating beacon will be installed east of the Administration Building.
10. Non-aviation development	Development of three areas on airport property for non-aviation, commercial or light industrial uses. Two areas, one approximately 1.3 acres and the other 5.5 acres in size, are located east of Runway 2/20. The third area, 2.75 acres in size, is located northwest of Runway 2/20.
11. Stabilized Runway 20 safety area	Grading and re-seeding of a 240'x250' area at the end of Runway 20.

**TABLE ES-1
PHASE I MASTER PLAN PROJECTS (2013 – 2017)**

Project	Description
12. Taxiway and Taxiway Rehabilitation	Segments of Taxiway A and G will be strengthened and re-paved.
13. Install new Precision Approach Path Indicators (PAPIs)*	New PAPIs will have to be installed at the end of Runway 02 to replace the ones removed for the Runway shift.
14. Airfield Lights Replacement	Existing lights on the Runway and taxiways will be replaced.
15. Additional taxiway	40'x500' taxiway that would provide potential future access between Runway 20 and adjacent existing industrial facilities.

SOURCE: Nut Tree Airport Master Plan, 2012.

**TABLE ES-2
PHASE II MASTER PLAN PROJECTS (2018 – 2022)**

Project	Description
16. North T-hangar development	Phase I development of utility infrastructure and access road to accommodate T-hangars to be located north of existing hangars, east of Runway 2/20, and south of existing non-aviation buildings.
17. North T-hangar development – Phase II West	Phase II development of north T-hangars includes the construction of 46,500 sf of T-hangar space.
18. East corporate hangars	Construction of 20,000 sf of corporate hangars to be located south of County Airport Road and east of Runway 2/20.
19. North T-hangar development – Phase III Middle	Phase III development of north T-hangars includes the construction of 47,500 sf of T-hangars to the north of existing hangars and east of Runway 2/20.
20. North T-hangar development – Phase IV East	Phase IV development of north T-hangars includes the construction of 33,000 sf of T-hangar space and 56,000 sf of box hangars to the north of existing hangars and east of Runway 2/20.
21. Expand the multi-use arrival/departure facility	Remodel and expansion of the existing administration building to accommodate airport staff, public restrooms, meeting space, public lobby space, aviation retail and offices, a pilots lounge, and a restaurant.
22. Airfield pavement rehabilitation	Replacement or reinforcement of existing airfield pavement.

SOURCE: Nut Tree Airport Master Plan, 2012.

**TABLE ES-3
PHASE III MASTER PLAN PROJECTS (2022 – 2031)**

Project	Description
23. North land acquisition	Acquire 8.2 acres of land north of Runway 20 in order to ensure approach protection.
24. Westside land acquisition	Acquire 82 acres of land immediately west of the Airport.
25. East hangar expansion	Development of 16,000 sf of T-hangars and 100,000 sf of box hangars east of Runway 2/20, and immediately adjacent to East Monte Vista Avenue.
26. Extend Runway 20 to 5,300 feet	Extension of Runway 20 by 600 ft to the northeast.
27. Airfield Pavement Rehabilitation	Replacement or reinforcement of existing airfield pavement.

SOURCE: Nut Tree Airport Master Plan, 2012.

The Master Plan forecasts that by the end of Phase I (2017), Nut Tree Airport will accommodate 109,369 aircraft operations, and 127,329 by Phase III (2031).

Alternatives to the Proposed Project

The purpose of the alternatives analysis in an environmental impact report (EIR) is to describe a range of reasonable alternatives to the Proposed Project that could feasibly attain the objectives of the project, and to evaluate the comparative merits of the alternatives (CEQA Guidelines Section 15126.6(a)).

Additionally, CEQA Guidelines Section 15126.6(b) requires consideration of alternatives that could avoid or substantially lessen any significant adverse environmental effects of the Proposed Project, including alternatives that may be more costly or could otherwise impede the project's objectives.

The CEQA Guidelines recommend that an EIR should briefly describe the rationale for selecting the alternative to be discussed, identify any alternatives that were considered by the lead agency, but were rejected as infeasible, and briefly explain the reasons underlying the lead agency's determination (CEQA Guidelines Section 15126.6(c)).

The following alternatives are discussed in greater detail in Chapter 4, Alternatives:

- Alternative A – No Project Alternative
- Alternative B – No Runway Extension Alternative
- Alternative C – 400-foot Extension Alternative

Alternative B is designated in the EIR as the environmentally superior alternative.

CEQA Process

Solano County is the lead agency for the purposes of complying with the California Environmental Quality Act (CEQA) (Public Resources Code Section 21000 et seq.) of 1970 (as amended), and the *CEQA Guidelines for Implementing the California Environmental Quality Act* (California Code of Regulations, Title 14). Solano County has prepared this Draft EIR in order to provide the public and responsible trustee agencies with information about the potential environmental effects of the Proposed Project and its alternatives.

Pursuant to CEQA Guidelines Section 15082(a), a Notice of Preparation (NOP) of an EIR (see Appendix A) was circulated for a 30-day public review period that began on September 14, 2012, and concluded on October 15, 2012. The NOP was circulated to the public, as well as to interested parties, local, state, and federal agencies. The purpose of the NOP was to inform the interested parties that the Proposed Project could have significant effects on the environment and to solicit their comments. Three comment letters from local and state agencies, as well as other interested parties were received.

This Draft EIR is being circulated to local, state, and federal agencies, and to interested organizations and individuals who may wish to review and comment on the report. Publication of this Draft EIR marks the beginning of a 47-day public review period beginning on May 16, 2013 and ending on July 1, 2013. During this review period, written comments will be received by Solano County at the following address:

Nut Tree Airport
301 County Airport Road, Suite 205
Vacaville, CA 95688

Copies of the Draft EIR will be available for public review at the following location:

Nut Tree Airport	Vacaville Public Library
301 County Airport Road, Suite 205	1 Town Square
Vacaville, CA 95688	Vacaville, CA 95688

The Draft EIR is also available for review online at:

http://www.co.solano.ca.us/depts/genserv/nta/master_plan.asp.

Significant Unavoidable Effects

As required by CEQA Guidelines Section 21100(b) (2), **Table ES-4** identifies the significant unavoidable impacts identified with implementation of the proposed project.

TABLE ES-4
SIGNIFICANT AND UNAVOIDABLE IMPACTS

Impact
Traffic and Transportation The Project, in conjunction with past, present and other reasonably foreseeable future development in the area, would have a significant, cumulative effect on traffic volumes on area roadways and affect levels of service at the local and CMP study intersections and freeways under Cumulative plus Project conditions

Summary of Environmental Impacts

Table ES-5 presents a summary of project impacts and proposed mitigation measures that would further avoid or minimize potential environmental impacts. It also indicates the level of significance of each environmental impact both before and after the application of the recommended mitigation measure(s).

For detailed discussions of all project impacts and mitigation measures, see Chapter 3, Environmental Setting, Impacts, and Mitigation Measures. Furthermore, as explained in greater detail in Chapter 5, Other CEQA Considerations, no significant impacts were found to occur for the following resources: Agricultural Resources, Mineral Resources, Population and Housing, and Recreation.

**TABLE ES-5
SUMMARY OF ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACTS AND MITIGATION MEASURES**

Environmental Impact (Prior to Mitigation)	Level of Significance before Mitigation	Mitigation Measure	Level of Significance after Mitigation
3.1 Aesthetics			
3.1-1: Would the Proposed Project have a substantial adverse effect on a scenic vista?	No Impact	None required	No Impact
3.1-2: Would the Proposed Project substantially damage scenic resources, including, but not limited to, trees, rock outcroppings, and historic buildings within a state scenic highway or local scenic route?	Less than significant	None required	Less than significant
3.1-3: Would the Proposed Project substantially degrade the existing visual character or quality of the site and its surroundings?	No Impact	None required	No Impact
3.1-4: Would the Proposed Project create a new source of substantial light or glare which would adversely affect day or nighttime views in the area?	Less than significant	None required	Less than significant
3.1-5: Could implementation of the Proposed Project result in a cumulatively considerable impact to aesthetics or light and glare?	Less than significant	None required	Less than significant
3.2 Air Quality			
3.2-1: Could implementation of the Proposed Project conflict with or obstruct implementation of an applicable air quality plan?	Less than significant	None required	Less than significant
3.2-2: Could the proposed project violate any air quality standard or contribute substantially to an existing or projected air quality violation?	Less than significant	3.2-2a: The following BMPs will be implemented during the construction process: • All active construction sites shall be watered at least twice daily. Frequency shall be based on the type of operation, soil, and wind exposure and the ability to eliminate visible fugitive dust. • Haul trucks shall maintain at least 2 feet of freeboard. • Cover all trucks hauling dirt, sand, or loose materials. • Between the time of completing construction and the onset of winter rains, reinstate typical agricultural irrigation practices as a means to wet soils so they do not generate dust, as feasible. • Cover inactive storage piles. • Sweep streets if visible soil material is carried out from the construction site. • Treat accesses to a distance of 100 feet from the paved road with a 6-inch layer of gravel. • The simultaneous occurrence of excavation, grading, and ground-disturbing construction activities in the same area at any one time shall be limited.	Less than significant

**TABLE ES-5
SUMMARY OF ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACTS AND MITIGATION MEASURES**

Environmental Impact (Prior to Mitigation)	Level of Significance before Mitigation	Mitigation Measure	Level of Significance after Mitigation
		3.2-2b: The following measures will be implemented during the construction process: • Idling times shall be minimized either by shutting equipment off when not in use or reducing the maximum idling time to 5 minutes (as required by the California airborne toxics control measure Title 13, Section 2485 of California Code of Regulations). Clear signage shall be provided for construction workers at all access points. • All construction equipment shall be maintained and properly tuned in accordance with manufacturer's specifications. All equipment shall be checked by a certified mechanic and determined to be running in proper condition prior to operation.	Less than significant
3.2-3: Could the Proposed Project create objectionable odors?	Less than significant	None required	Less than significant
3.2-4: Could the Proposed Project expose persons to substantial levels of toxic air contaminants, which could lead to an increase in the risk of cancer?	Less than significant	None required	Less than significant
3.2-5: Could the Proposed Project expose persons to substantial levels of toxic air contaminants and substantial increase in acute and chronic health impacts?	Less than significant	None required	Less than significant
3.2-6: Could the Proposed Project result in a cumulatively considerable net increase of any criteria pollutant for which the project is non-attainment under an applicable federal or state ambient air quality standard (including releasing emissions which exceed qualitative thresholds for ozone precursors)?	Less than significant	None required	Less than significant
3.3 Biological Resources			
3.3-1: Could the Proposed Project 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 CDFW or USFWS?	Potentially significant	3.3.1-1: Use of BMPs for stormwater control as part of Project-specific and site-specific SWPPP implementation is expected to reduce the potential for preserved and avoided habitat for vernal pool species to be indirectly affected by sediment-laden discharges from construction sites. The performance and effectiveness of these BMPs would be determined either by visual means, where applicable (i.e., observation of above-normal sediment release), or by actual water sampling in cases where the verification of containment reduction or elimination is required to determine the adequacy of the measures. BMPs to be implemented would include, but are not limited to, the following: • All disturbed surfaces or stockpile areas would be protected with erosion control measures in place during the period of October 1 through April 30. • BMPs for temporary erosion control (such as silt fences, staked straw	Less than significant

**TABLE ES-5
SUMMARY OF ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACTS AND MITIGATION MEASURES**

Environmental Impact (Prior to Mitigation)	Level of Significance before Mitigation	Mitigation Measure	Level of Significance after Mitigation
		bales/wattles, silt/sediment basins and traps, check dams, geofabric, sandbag dikes, and temporary revegetation or other ground cover) would be employed per the product specifications for disturbed areas, stockpiled soil, and along culverts and drainage ditches on active construction sites and in downstream areas that may be affected by construction activities. Requirements for the placement and monitoring of the BMPs would be part of the contractor's project specifications. Performance and adequacy of the measures would be determined visually by site construction management and verified by the County Department of Water Resources and Central Valley Regional Water Quality Control Board as appropriate. • Dirt and debris would be swept from paved areas in construction zones on a daily basis as necessary to remove excessive accumulations of silt, mud or other debris. Sweeping and dust removal would be implemented by the contractor and oversight of these operations the responsibility of the construction site superintendent. • All exposed/disturbed areas, left barren of vegetation due to project related activities, would be stabilized with mulch, tackifier, or other appropriate cover that is compatible with airport safety requirements; hydroseeding is not appropriate as seed may attract birds thereby increasing the risk of bird strikes • If discharges of sediment or hazardous substances to drainage ways are observed, construction would be halted until the source of contamination is identified and remediated. Visual indications of such contamination include an oily sheen or coating on water, and noticeable turbidity (lack of clarity) in the water. 3.3.1-1b: A Worker Environmental Awareness Program (WEAP) training for construction crews and construction forepersons would be conducted before any construction activities begin. The WEAP training would be conducted by a qualified wildlife biologist. The training would include a brief review of the special status species and other sensitive resources that could occur in the study area (including their life history and habitat requirements and where on the study area they may be found) and their legal status and protection. The program would also cover all relevant mitigation measures, permit conditions and BMP plans, such as the Stormwater Pollution Prevention Plan (SWPPP) and/or erosion control and sediment plan. During WEAP training, construction personnel would be informed of the importance of avoiding ground-disturbing activities outside of the designated work area. A designated environmental inspector would be responsible for ensuring that construction personnel adhere to the guidelines and restrictions and that all persons working on site have attended a WEAP training session. WEAP training sessions would be conducted as needed for new personnel brought onto the job throughout the duration of construction.	Less than significant

TABLE ES-5
SUMMARY OF ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACTS AND MITIGATION MEASURES

Environmental Impact (Prior to Mitigation)	Level of Significance before Mitigation	Mitigation Measure	Level of Significance after Mitigation
		3.3.1-1c: The total number of access routes, number and size of staging areas, and the total area of construction activity would be limited to those areas identified in the approved construction drawings and/or plans or as otherwise approved per permit conditions. Access routes and project boundaries would be clearly marked at all times. Access routes for heavy equipment to and from the study area would be restricted to established roadways to minimize habitat disturbance. The storing of construction equipment, vehicles, and supplies would be restricted to the designated construction staging areas outside of designated avoided areas. All fueling, cleaning and maintenance activities of vehicles and other equipment would be performed only in designated areas and at least 250 feet away from avoided/preserved habitats. As part of WEAP training, all workers would be informed of the importance of preventing spills and appropriate measures to take in the event of a spill. All spills would be cleaned up immediately.	Less than significant
		3.3.1-1d: Avoided and preserved habitat, including habitat within designated Preserve and Riparian Buffer areas, would be protected at all times from construction activities. Habitat protection measures would include the following: • A USFWS-approved biologist (monitor) would inspect all construction-related activities at the study area to ensure that no unauthorized take of listed species or destruction of their habitat occurs. The biologist would have the authority to stop any activities that may result in such take or destruction until appropriate corrective measures have been completed. The biologist also would be required to report immediately any unauthorized impacts to the USFWS and the CDFW. • Adequate fencing would be placed and maintained around all avoided (preserved) habitat for vernal pool species to prevent direct impacts from construction.	Less than significant
		3.3.1-2a: Pre-construction surveys for burrowing owls shall be conducted within 30 days prior to the start of any construction activities occurring in suitable habitat (i.e. annual grassland with burrows). The project proponent shall conduct preconstruction surveys in suitable nesting habitat for burrowing owls within 250 feet of project activities prior to construction that will occur between February 1 and August 31 (breeding season), and within 165 feet of project activities that will occur between September 1 and March 31 of any given year (non-breeding season). If construction activities are delayed for more than 30 days after the initial pre-construction surveys, then a new survey shall be required. Surveys shall conform to Appendix C and D of CDFG's <i>Staff Report on Burrowing Owl Mitigation (Appendix G)</i> (CDFG, 2012c) or as otherwise approved by CDFW. If active burrows are recorded within 250 feet of project activities, the following measures will apply: 1. No disturbance should occur within a 250-foot buffer around each active owl burrow during the breeding season and a 165-foot buffer during the non-	Less than significant

**TABLE ES-5
SUMMARY OF ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACTS AND MITIGATION MEASURES**

Environmental Impact (Prior to Mitigation)	Level of Significance before Mitigation	Mitigation Measure	Level of Significance after Mitigation
		breeding season or as otherwise approved by CDFW. Occupied burrows shall not be disturbed during the breeding season (February 1 through August 31) unless a qualified biologist approved by CDFW verifies through noninvasive methods that either: (1) the birds have not begun egg-laying and incubation; or (2) that juveniles from the occupied burrows are foraging independently and are capable of independent survival 2. If owls must be moved away from the disturbance area; passive relocation techniques in accordance with CDFW's Staff Report on Burrowing Owl Mitigation (CDFG, 2012c) shall be used. Passive relocation shall take place outside of the breeding season (February 1 to August 31).	
		3.3.1-2b: Pre-construction surveys for tree-nesting raptors and migratory songbirds shall be conducted within 30 days prior to any construction that will occur between March 15 and September 15 of any given year. Pre-construction surveys shall be conducted by a qualified biologist. All suitable nesting habitat for tree nesting raptors and migratory songbirds shall be surveyed within 0.5-mile radius of the Proposed Project impact area. 1. If active nests are found during pre-construction surveys, a no-disturbance buffer (acceptable in size to CDFW) shall be created around active raptor nests and nests of other special-status birds during the breeding season, or until it is determined that all young have fledged. Typical buffers include 500 feet for raptors and 250 feet for other nesting birds. The size of these buffer zones and types of construction activities restricted in these areas could be further modified during construction in coordination with CDFW and shall be based on existing noise and human disturbance levels in the study area. Input shall also be sought from the Nut Tree Airport Operations Safety Officer concerning the hazards posed by wildlife nesting in proximity to an active airport. 2. If pre-construction surveys indicate that nests are inactive or potential habitat is unoccupied during the construction period, no further mitigation shall be required. Trees and shrubs within the construction footprint determined to be unoccupied by special-status birds, or that are outside the no-disturbance buffer for active nests, could be removed.	Less than significant
		3.3.1-3 and 3.3.1-4: Construction activities under the Proposed Project would result in the loss of annual grassland habitat suitable for foraging by sensitive or special-status bird species, including ferruginous hawk, burrowing owl, northern harrier, and Swainson's hawk. Although grassland habitats are regionally abundant in central California, CDFW has developed mitigation guidance in the <i>Staff Report Regarding Mitigation for Impacts to Swainson's Hawks (Buteo Swainsoni) in the Central Valley of California</i> (CDFG, 1994) (Appendix H, Survey Protocols and Mitigation Guidelines), which recommends a foraging habitat mitigation ratio that is dependent upon the development's distance to the nearest known Swainson's hawk nest site. An appropriate mitigation ratio will be developed in coordination with	Less than significant

**TABLE ES-5
SUMMARY OF ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACTS AND MITIGATION MEASURES**

Environmental Impact (Prior to Mitigation)	Level of Significance before Mitigation	Mitigation Measure	Level of Significance after Mitigation
		CDFW prior to project implementation. A typical mitigation ratio may consist of a ratio ranging from 0.5:1 to 1:1.	
		3.3.1-5: The applicant shall conduct a survey for roosting bats and evidence of historic use of buildings and trees on the study area. The survey shall be conducted by a USFWS-qualified biologist. This survey shall include, at a minimum, a visual inspection of potential bat roosting sites, and may include an evening or night survey using electronic bat detectors. If occupied bat roosts are detected, the applicant shall consult with CDFW regarding suitable measures to avoid impacting roosts. Measures may include, but are not limited to: 1. Maintaining a 100-foot buffer around each roost; no construction activities shall be permitted within this buffer except as described in Mitigation Measure 3.3.1-5 (2). This buffer may be reduced in consultation with CDFW. 2. Exclusion of bats from roosts (ensuring that no bats are trapped in the roost). For maternity roosts, this measure may only be implemented once young have been reared and are able to freely leave the roost (typically before March and after August). Exclusion plans must be approved by CDFW prior to implementation.	Less than significant
		3.3.1-7: Prior to construction, a qualified biologist would conduct a survey for western pond turtles within 24 hours of the start of construction activities within 500 feet of streams, ditches, and other watercourses located within the proposed construction areas. If no individuals are identified then no additional measures are required. If a turtle is found in a proposed construction area, the biologist would move the turtle from the area to suitable habitat within the vicinity.	Less than significant
		3.3.1-8a: Prior to construction, vegetated portions of the study area including wetland habitats would be surveyed by a qualified botanist for special-status plants following established CDFW Protocols for Surveying and Evaluating Impacts to Special-Status Native Plant Populations and Natural Communities (CDFG, 2009) (Appendix H, Survey Protocols and Mitigation Guidelines), which calls for protocol-level surveys during the appropriate flowering/identification period for each potentially affected species.	Less than significant
		3.3.1-8b: If the Proposed Project would directly impact known populations of special-status plants, the project proponent shall compensate for the loss of special status species through the following measures: • Avoid existing, known populations where possible; • Minimize impacts by restricting removal of plants to a few individuals of a population where possible; • Prepare a Mitigation and Monitoring Plan to relocate plants and/or seed banks or reintroduce new populations in suitable habitat and soil types at a CDFW or USFWS-approved off-site location;	Less than significant

TABLE ES-5
SUMMARY OF ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACTS AND MITIGATION MEASURES

Environmental Impact (Prior to Mitigation)	Level of Significance before Mitigation	Mitigation Measure	Level of Significance after Mitigation
		• Monitor affected populations to document potential project-related impacts; • Restore or enhance occupied habitat at another regional location; and • Protect occupied habitat for the species at another regional location.	
		3.3.1-9: The project proponent would purchase habitat creation credits at an USFWS approved mitigation bank and/or restore/enhance habitat within the designated Preserve areas upon USFWS approval to fully compensate for direct and indirect effects to habitat for federally listed vernal pool species. Compensation would be at a 2:1 preservation ratio and 1:1 creation ratio for direct effects to habitat for vernal pool species. Options for habitat compensation are described below. Option 1: Purchase Habitat for Vernal Pool Species Credits. Prior to the initiation of project construction, the project proponent would purchase the required acreage of vernal pool creation and preservation credits at a USACE and USFWS-approved mitigation bank at a 1:1 ratio. The project proponent would provide the USACE proof of the purchase prior to project construction. Option 2: Restore or Enhance Habitat within a Designated Preserve Area. Direct effects to habitat for vernal pool species would be compensated through the restoration and/or enhancement of habitat for vernal pool species within off-site USFWS-approved Preserve areas at a 2:1 ratio. The restoration goal would be to restore and enhance habitat for vernal pool species such that their ultimate functions and services are equal to or greater than the wetland features affected by the implementation of the Preferred Alternative. This effort could include restoring vernal pools and/or other suitable aquatic features that have been damaged by prior activities. The plan would include monitoring requirements to ensure the long term success of restored and enhanced habitats.	Less than significant
3.3-2: Could the Proposed Project have a substantial adverse effect on any riparian habitat or other sensitive natural community identified in local or regional plans, policies, regulations or by the CDFW or USFWS?	Potentially significant	3.3.2a: Implement Mitigation Measures 3.3.1-1a-d and 3.3.3.	Less than significant
3.3-3: Could the Proposed Project 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?	Potentially Significant	3.3.3a: The Proposed Project will impact potential waters of the U.S., including 0.01 acres of stream channel (riverine) and 0.04 acres of seasonal wetland. The project applicant would obtain all required permit approvals from the USACE, RWQCB, CDFW and any other agencies with permitting responsibilities for construction activities within jurisdictional features. Permit approvals and certifications would likely include the following: • <u>Clean Water Act Section 404.</u> Permit approval from the USACE shall be obtained for the placement of dredge or fill material in waters of the U.S. pursuant to Section 404 of the federal Clean Water Act. The Section 404 permit application would require a delineation of wetlands and other waters of the U.S., a jurisdictional determination from the USACE, and preparation of a	Less than significant

**TABLE ES-5
SUMMARY OF ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACTS AND MITIGATION MEASURES**

Environmental Impact (Prior to Mitigation)	Level of Significance before Mitigation	Mitigation Measure	Level of Significance after Mitigation
		Pre-Construction Notification (PCN) and supporting documentation. A PCN outlines project activities, areas of impact, construction techniques, and methods for avoiding and reducing impacts to jurisdictional features. State and federal regulations require that the project applicant avoid or minimize impacts to wetlands and waters and develop appropriate protection for wetlands. Wetlands that cannot be avoided must be compensated to result in "no net loss" of wetlands to ensure that the project would maintain the current functions and values of onsite wetland habitats. • <u>Clean Water Act Section 401 Water Quality Certification/Porter-Cologne Act.</u> Approval of Water Quality Certification (WQC) under the CWA and/or Waste Discharge Requirements (WDRs) under the Porter-Cologne Act shall be obtained from the RWQCB for work within jurisdictional waters. Application for a WQC requires an application and supporting materials, including construction techniques, areas of impact, mitigation measures, project schedule, and proof of CEQA compliance. Application for a WDR requires an application and supporting materials, including a characterization of the discharge which includes but is not limited to: design and actual flows; a list of constituents and the discharge concentration of each constituent; a list of other appropriate waste discharge characteristics; a description and schematic drawing of all treatment process; a description of any BMPs used; and a description of disposal methods. Proof of CEQA compliance is also required. • <u>California Fish and Game Code Section 1602.</u> CDFW requires a Streambed Alteration Agreement for activities that result in alteration of the bed or bank of a stream (typically the top of bank or edge of riparian habitat, whichever is greater), or that adversely impact fish or wildlife resources. The notification package must be submitted by the project proponent to CDFW and shall include supporting materials, including construction techniques, areas of impact, mitigation measures, project schedule, and proof of CEQA compliance. An application fee shall be submitted with the completed application. The project proponent shall comply with all mitigation measures within the Streambed Alteration Agreement with CDFW, including mitigation for any loss of riparian habitat (typically 1:1 ratio).	
3.3-4: Could the Proposed Project interfere substantially with the movement of any native resident or migratory fish or wildlife species or with established native resident or migratory wildlife corridors, or impede the use of native wildlife nursery sites?	Less than significant	None required	Less than significant
3.3-5: Could the Proposed Project conflict with any local policies or ordinances protecting biological resources, such as a tree preservation policy or ordinance?	Potentially significant	3.3.5a: Sensitive tree resources adjacent to construction activities may require protection during the implementation of the Proposed Project. The following measures shall protect trees to be retained onsite during project implementation: • A Tree Protection Zone (TPZ) shall be established around any tree or group of	Less than significant

**TABLE ES-5
SUMMARY OF ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACTS AND MITIGATION MEASURES**

Environmental Impact (Prior to Mitigation)	Level of Significance before Mitigation	Mitigation Measure	Level of Significance after Mitigation
		trees to be retained. The formula typically used is defined as 1.5 times the radius of the dripline or 5 feet from the edge of any grading, whichever is greater. The TPZ may be adjusted on a case-by-case basis after consultation with a certified arborist. • The TPZ of any protected trees shall be marked with permanent fencing (e.g., post and wire or equivalent), which shall remain in place for the duration of construction activities in the area. Post "keep out" signs on all sides of fencing. • Construction-related activities, including grading, trenching, construction, demolition, or other work shall be prohibited within the TPZ. No heavy equipment or machinery shall be operated within the TPZ. No construction materials, equipment, machinery, or other supplies shall be stored within a TPZ. No wires or signs shall be attached to any tree. Any modifications must be approved and monitored by a certified arborist. • Prune selected trees to provide necessary clearance during construction and to remove any defective limbs or other parts that may pose a failure risk. All pruning shall be completed by a certified arborist or tree worker and adhere to the Tree Pruning Guidelines of the International Society of Arboriculture. • The TPZs of protected trees shall be monitored on a weekly basis. • A certified arborist shall monitor the health and condition of the protected trees and, if necessary, recommend additional mitigations and appropriate actions. This shall include the monitoring of trees adjacent to project facilities in order to determine if construction activities (including the removal of nearby trees) would affect protected trees in the future. • Provide supplemental irrigation and other care, such as mulch and fertilizer, as deemed necessary by a certified arborist. Any injuries shall be treated by a certified arborist.	
3.3-6: Could the Proposed Project conflict with the provisions of an adopted Habitat Conservation Plan, Natural Community Conservation Plan, or other approved local, regional, or state habitat conservation plan.	No impact	None required	No impact
3.3-7: Could implementation of the Proposed Project result in a cumulatively considerable impact to biological resources in the vicinity of the City of Vacaville?	Potentially significant	3.3.7: Implement all mitigation measures described under Phases I, II, and III of the Proposed Project.	Less than significant
3.4 Cultural Resources			
3.4-1: Would construction of the Proposed Project components would not cause a substantial adverse change in the significance of a historical resource as defined in §15064.5?	No impact	None required	No impact

**TABLE ES-5
SUMMARY OF ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACTS AND MITIGATION MEASURES**

Environmental Impact (Prior to Mitigation)	Level of Significance before Mitigation	Mitigation Measure	Level of Significance after Mitigation
3.4-2: Would construction activities associated with the Proposed Project cause substantial adverse effects to significant archeological resources?	No impact	None required	No impact
3.4-3: Would construction-related activities associated with the Proposed Project cause a substantial adverse change in the significance of an unknown unique paleontological, geological, or archaeological resource as defined in Section 15064.5?	Potentially significant	3.4-1: Discovery of Archaeological Resources. In the event that previously unidentified archaeological, Native American, or paleontological resources are uncovered during project implementation, all work should cease within 100 feet of the find until it can be evaluated by a qualified archaeologist, as defined as one meeting the Secretary of the Interior's Professional Qualification Standards for archaeology, or paleontologist (U.S. Department of the Interior, 2012). If the find is determined to be potentially significant, the archaeologist, in consultation with the lead agency and appropriate Native American group(s) (if the find is prehistoric or Native American in nature) or paleontologist should develop a treatment plan with an emphasis towards preservation in place. If resources are encountered, avoidance, or preservation in an undisturbed state is the preferable course of action. CEQA §21083.2(b).provides that preservation methods may include: • Planning construction to avoid archaeological sites. • Deeding sites into permanent conservation easements. • Capping or covering sites with a layer of soil before building on the sites. • Planning parks, green space, or other open space to incorporate archaeological sites.	Less than significant
3.4-4: Would construction-related activities associated with the Proposed Project disturb any human remains, including those interred outside of formal cemeteries?	Potentially significant	3.4-2: Accidental Discovery of Human Remains. If human remains are encountered unexpectedly during construction excavation and grading activities, State Health and Safety Code Section 7050.5 requires that no further disturbance shall occur until the County Coroner has made the necessary findings as to origin and disposition pursuant to PRC Section 5097.98. If the remains are determined to be of Native American descent, the coroner has 24 hours to notify the Native American Heritage Commission. The NAHC will then identify the person(s) thought to be the Most Likely Descendent of the deceased Native American, who will then participate in consultation with the landowner to determine the appropriate future disposition of the remains.	Less than significant
3.4-5: Would implementation of the Proposed Project result in a cumulatively considerable impact to cultural resources?	Potentially significant	Implement Measures 3.4-1 and 3.4-2.	Less than significant
3.5 Geology, Soils, and Seismicity			
3.5-1: Would the Proposed Project expose people to injury or structures to damage from potential rupture of a known earthquake fault, strong groundshaking, or seismic-related ground failure?	Less than significant	None required	Less than significant
3.6-2: Would the Proposed Project result in substantial soil erosion or the loss of topsoil?	Less than significant	None required	Less than significant

**TABLE ES-5
SUMMARY OF ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACTS AND MITIGATION MEASURES**

Environmental Impact (Prior to Mitigation)	Level of Significance before Mitigation	Mitigation Measure	Level of Significance after Mitigation
3.6-3: Would the Proposed Project be located on soils that are potentially unstable, or that could become unstable as a result of the Project, and potentially result in on- or off-site landslide, lateral spreading, subsidence, liquefaction, or collapse?	Less than significant	None required	Less than significant
3.6-4: Would the Proposed Project would be located on expansive, corrosive, or other unstable soils creating substantial risks to life or property?	Less than significant	None required	Less than significant
3.5-5: Would development of the Proposed Project in combination with future projects in the City of Vacaville result in cumulative effects associated with geology and soils?	Less than significant	None required	Less than significant
3.6 Greenhouse Gases			
3.6-1: Could the Proposed Project generate GHG emissions, either directly or indirectly, that may have a cumulatively significant impact on the environment?	Less than significant	None required	Less than significant
3.6-2: Could the Proposed Project conflict with the GHG reduction measures identified in CARB's AB 32 Scoping Plan or other applicable Plan or policy for reducing GHG emissions?	Less than significant	None required	Less than significant
3.6-3: Would the Proposed Project cause or contribute to a cumulative impact related to greenhouse gases?	Less than significant	None required	Less than significant
3.7 Hazards and Hazardous Materials			
3.7-1: Would the Proposed Project create a significant hazard to the public or the environment from the transportation, use, or disposal of hazardous materials?	Less than Significant	None required	Less than significant
3.7-2: Would the Proposed Project 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?	Potentially significant	3.7-1: Prior to the start of constructing activities, a Phase I environmental site assessment shall be conducted to determine the presence and extent of lead-based paint. The assessment shall be in accordance with Title 17, Division 1, Chapter 8 of the California Code of Regulations. Should this assessment determine that lead-based paint is present; a lead-based paint abatement plan shall be prepared to remove all lead-based paint prior to demolition activities. A health and safety plan shall be developed by a certified industrial hygienist for potential lead-based paint present during demolition of existing structures. The health and safety plan shall then be implemented by a licensed contractor for all phases of remodeling activities.	Less than significant

**TABLE ES-5
SUMMARY OF ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACTS AND MITIGATION MEASURES**

Environmental Impact (Prior to Mitigation)	Level of Significance before Mitigation	Mitigation Measure	Level of Significance after Mitigation
3.7-3: Would the Proposed Project emit hazardous emissions or handle hazardous or acutely hazardous materials, substances, or waste within one-quarter mile of an existing or proposed school?	Less than significant	None required	Less than significant
3.7-4: Would the Proposed Project be located on a site that is included on a list of hazardous materials sites compiled pursuant to Government Code Section 65962.5 and, as a result, would create a significant hazard to the public or the environment?	No impact	None required	No impact
3.7-5: Would the Proposed Project be 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?	Less than significant	None required	Less than significant
3.7-6: Would the Proposed Project be located within the vicinity of a private airstrip and result in a safety hazard for people residing or working in the project area?	No Impact	None required	No impact
3.7-7: Would the Proposed Project impair implementation of or physically interfere with an adopted emergency response plan or emergency evacuation plan?	Less than significant	None required	Less than significant
3.8-8: Would the Proposed Project 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?	Less than significant	None required	Less than significant
3.7-9: Could implementation of the Proposed Project result in a cumulatively considerable impact to the transportation or use of hazardous materials; the release of hazardous materials; or the creation of hazards to the public?	Less than significant	None required	Less than significant
3.8 Hydrology and Water Quality			
3.8-1: Would the Proposed Project result in a violation of water quality standards or waste discharge requirements?	Less than significant	None required	Less than significant

**TABLE ES-5
SUMMARY OF ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACTS AND MITIGATION MEASURES**

Environmental Impact (Prior to Mitigation)	Level of Significance before Mitigation	Mitigation Measure	Level of Significance after Mitigation
3.8-2: Would the Proposed Project 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?	Less than significant	None required	Less than significant
3.8-3: the Proposed Project substantially alter the existing drainage pattern of the site or area, including through the alteration of the course of a stream or river, in a manner which would result in substantial erosion or siltation on- or off-site?	Potentially significant	3.8-1: In order to reduce potential impacts associated with all phases of development, the Applicant shall prepare and submit a Drainage Plan to the City engineer and the Central Valley Regional Water Quality Control Board for approval. The Drainage Plan shall include design/plan level depiction of all proposed stormwater drainage facilities such as vegetated swales, and/or detention basins. The following measures shall be implemented within the Drainage Plan, based on modeled runoff volumes and flow rates specific to with-Project conditions: • The applicant shall design, implement, and maintain a stormwater retention and/or detention feature(s) such that there would be no net increase in project condition peak flows; and/or, with respect to the additional impervious surface area proposed for the project, the [applicant] shall design and implement volume- and/or flow-based Treatment Control Best Management Practices (BMPs) as defined in Attachment 4 (pages 5-6) of the State Water Resources Control Board (SWRCB) small municipal separate storm sewer systems (MS4s) General Permit (Small MS4 General Permit) (SWRCB Order 2003-0005-DWQ). • Prior to implementation, design drawings and any related documents or specifications with respect to these required mitigation measures shall be submitted to the City of Vacaville and the Central Valley Regional Water Quality Control Board.	Less than significant
3.8-4: Could the Proposed Project substantially alter the existing drainage pattern of the site or area or substantially increase the rate or amount of surface runoff in a manner which would result in flooding on- or off-site?	Potentially significant	Implement Measure 3.8-1.	Less than significant
3.8-5: Could the Proposed Project 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?	Potentially significant	Implement Measure 3.8-1.	Less than significant
3.8-6: Could the Proposed Project otherwise substantially degrade water quality?	Potentially significant	Implement Measure 3.8-1.	Less than significant
3.8-7: Would construction of the Proposed Project result in placement of housing within a 100-year flood zone?	No impact	None required	No impact

**TABLE ES-5
SUMMARY OF ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACTS AND MITIGATION MEASURES**

Environmental Impact (Prior to Mitigation)	Level of Significance before Mitigation	Mitigation Measure	Level of Significance after Mitigation
3.8-8: Would implementation of the Proposed Project impede or redirect flood flows due to placement of new structures?	Less than significant	None required	Less than significant
3.8-9: Would the Proposed Project expose people or structures to significant risk of flooding due to levee or dam failure?	No impact	None required	No impact
3.8-10: Would implementation of the Proposed Project result in increased risk of inundation by seiche, tsunami, or mudflow?	No impact	None required	No impact
3.8-11: Could implementation of the Proposed Project result in a cumulatively considerable impact to hydrology and water quality impacts?	Potentially significant	Implement Measure 3.8-1.	Less than significant
3.9 Land Use and Planning			
3.9-1: Would implementation of the Proposed Project result in the physical division of an established community?	No impact	None required	No impact
3.9-2: Would the Proposed Project conflict with applicable adopted land use plans?	Potentially Significant	3.9-1a: Prior to construction of non-aviation development on Nut Tree Airport property, project details shall be submitted to the ALUC for consistency review. Unless the lead agency overrules the ALUC's determination, only upon issuance of a consistency determination by the ALUC shall the development of proposed non-aviation land uses be allowed.	Less than significant
		3.9-1b: Prior to construction of the remodel and expansion of Nut Tree Airport's multi-use arrival and departure facility, project details shall be submitted to the ALUC for consistency review. Unless the lead agency overrules the ALUC's determination, only upon issuance of a consistency determination by the ALUC shall the remodel and expansion of the multi-use facility be allowed.	Less than significant
3.9-3: Would the Proposed Project conflict with an applicable habitat conservation plan?	No impact	None required	No impact
3.9-4: Could implementation of the Proposed Project result in a cumulatively considerable impact to the land use goals and policies of Solano County and surrounding jurisdictions?	Less than significant	None required	Less than significant
3.10 Noise			
3.10-1: Would the Proposed Project expose persons to noise levels in excess of standards established in the local general plan or noise ordinance, or applicable standards of other agencies?	Potentially significant	3.10-1: Construction noise exposure may be mitigated to comply with the established City of Vacaville Municipal Code requirements with implementation of the following. Confirm that all heavy construction equipment include factory approved/supplied mufflers and other standard noise-reducing engine	Less than significant

**TABLE ES-5
SUMMARY OF ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACTS AND MITIGATION MEASURES**

Environmental Impact (Prior to Mitigation)	Level of Significance before Mitigation	Mitigation Measure	Level of Significance after Mitigation
		devices. - Minimize heavy equipment engine idling whenever possible. - Stage all heavy construction away from noise sensitive uses. - Limit construction operations to between the hours of 7 am and 5 pm, Monday thru Saturday. Construction shall not be conducted on Sundays or federal holidays.	
3.10-2: Would the Proposed Project expose persons and structures to groundborne vibration or groundborne noise levels?	Less than significant	None required	Less than significant
3.10-3: Would activities associated with the Proposed Project permanently or temporarily increase ambient noise levels at nearby land uses?	Potentially significant	Implement Measure 3.10-1.	Less than significant
3.10-4: For a project located within an airport land use plan, would the Proposed Project expose people residing or working in the project area to excessive noise levels?	Less than significant	None required	Less than significant
3.10-5: For a project located within two miles of a private airstrip, would the project expose people residing or working in the project area to excessive noise levels?	No impact	None required	No impact
3.10-6: Would noise associated with the Proposed Project, in combination with other local development, result in cumulatively considerable noise increases?	Potentially significant	Implement Measure 3.10-1.	Less than significant
3.11 Public Services and Utility Service Systems			
3.11-1: Would the Proposed Project result in substantial adverse physical impacts associated with the need for new or physically altered 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?	Less than significant	None required	Less than significant
3.11-2: Would the Proposed Project exceed wastewater treatment requirements of the applicable Regional Water Quality Control Board?	Less than significant	None required	Less than significant

**TABLE ES-5
SUMMARY OF ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACTS AND MITIGATION MEASURES**

Environmental Impact (Prior to Mitigation)	Level of Significance before Mitigation	Mitigation Measure	Level of Significance after Mitigation
3.11-3: Would the Proposed Project require or result in the construction of a new sewer connection or water or wastewater treatment facilities or expansion of existing facilities, the construction of which could cause significant environmental effects or would the wastewater treatment provider which serves or may serve the project have inadequate capacity to serve the project's projected demand in addition to the provider's existing commitments?	Potentially significant	3.11-1: Prior to approval of Phase II development projects, or prior to Master Plan development exceeding 20,000 gpd, the County shall undertake a wastewater study to determine existing and future flows, and identify sewer line improvements required to provide necessary capacity. The study shall be submitted to the City of Vacaville for review and the County will work with the City to amend the Northeast Sector Sewer Master Plan if needed.	Less than significant
3.11-4: Would the Proposed Project require the construction of new storm water drainage facilities or the expansion of existing facilities, the construction of which could cause significant environmental effects?	Potentially significant	Implement Measures 3.3.1-2a, 3.3.1-2b, 3.3.1-7, and 3.3.1-8.	Less than significant
3.11-5: Would the Proposed Project result in insufficient water supplies from existing entitlements or need new or expanded entitlements?	Less than significant	None required	Less than significant
3.11-6: Would the Proposed Project be served by a landfill with insufficient permitted capacity to accommodate the project's solid waste disposal needs?	Less than significant	None required	Less than significant
3.11-7: Would the Proposed Project would comply with federal, state, and local statutes and regulations related to solid waste?	Less than significant	None required	Less than significant
3.11-8: Could implementation of the Proposed Project result in a cumulatively considerable impact to public services and utility systems?	Potentially significant	Implement Measure 3.11-1.	Less than significant
3.12 Transportation			
3.12-1: Could the Proposed Project conflict with an applicable plan, ordinance or policy establishing measures of effectiveness for performance of study intersections and roadways, including those in an applicable congestion management program, under Existing plus Project Conditions?	Less than significant	None required	Less than significant
3.12-2: Could the Proposed Project result in a change in air traffic patterns, including either an increase in traffic levels or a change in location, which would result in substantial safety risks?	Less than significant	None required	Less than significant
3.12-3: Could the Project substantially increase hazards due to a design feature?	Less than significant	None required	Less than significant

TABLE ES-5
SUMMARY OF ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACTS AND MITIGATION MEASURES

Environmental Impact (Prior to Mitigation)	Level of Significance before Mitigation	Mitigation Measure	Level of Significance after Mitigation
3.12-4: Could the Project result in inadequate emergency access?	Less than significant	None required	Less than significant
3.12-5: Could the Project conflict with adopted policies, plans, or programs regarding public transit, bicycle, or pedestrian facilities, or otherwise decrease the performance or safety of such facilities?	Less than significant	None required	Less than significant
3.12-6: Could construction activities associated with the Project result in temporary circulation impacts on the street system?	Less than significant	None required	Less than significant
3.12-7: Would the Project, in conjunction with past, present and other reasonably foreseeable future development in the area, increase traffic volumes on area roadways and affect levels of service at the local and CMP study intersections and freeways under Cumulative plus Project conditions?	Potentially significant	3.12-1: A traffic signal warrant analysis has been completed to determine whether the unsignalized study intersection may require or benefit from the installation of a traffic signal. The term “signal warrant” refers to any of the eight established methods used by Caltrans to quantify the need for a traffic signal at an unsignalized intersection, described in the latest edition of the <i>California Manual on Uniform Traffic Control Devices</i> (MUTCD) (Caltrans, 2012b). The California MUTCD indicates that the installation of a traffic signal should be considered only if one or more of the eight signal warrants are met. Based on MUTCD’s peak-hour Warrant #3 criteria, this intersection would qualify for signalization with the projected Cumulative (Year 2035) and Cumulative plus Project traffic volumes during the p.m. peak hour. The City of Vacaville would continue monitoring operations at this intersection (to determine the timing of the signal installation) and would provide for signalization as part of the Traffic Impact Mitigation portion of Development Impact Fee Program. The City’s Traffic Impact Fee provides for a number of traffic signals that are warranted as a result of cumulative conditions. Per Chapter 11.01 (Development Impact Fees) of the City Municipal Code, the purpose of a Traffic Impact Fee is to provide for costs of street widening and reconstruction, traffic signals, transit facilities, bike paths, bridge widenings, and freeway interchange improvements related to new development in accordance with the development forecast under the General Plan. The demand for the identified transportation improvements has been based on the development forecast and accepted traffic analysis methodology from the previously referenced documents. Without funding-identified capital improvements, there will be an unacceptable level of traffic congestion, delays, accidents and generally reduced public safety throughout the city. Based on the development potential of the General Plan as analyzed through the development forecast, engineering consultants and the city staff have utilized traffic studies including trip generation and intersection analysis models to indicate the impact of new development in terms of roadway capacities, signalization standards, and interchange requirements to develop the transportation capital improvements projects. The projects were refined to apportion the impacts and resulting share of improvements between various land uses in accordance with prior Major Streets and Interchange fee studies. The County would pay a Development Impact Fee or	Significant and unavoidable

**TABLE ES-5
SUMMARY OF ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACTS AND MITIGATION MEASURES**

Environmental Impact (Prior to Mitigation)	Level of Significance before Mitigation	Mitigation Measure	Level of Significance after Mitigation
		a Pro-Rata Share contribution (to be negotiated between the City of Vacaville and the Lead Agency) to mitigate their share of a traffic signal at this intersection. With installation of traffic signal, the intersection would operate at LOS D (acceptable) during the p.m. peak hour. However, installation of a traffic signal at this intersection would require coordination with, and approval by, Caltrans. Because the mitigation measure is not in the control of the City to implement, the cumulative impact is considered to remain significant and unavoidable. However, in the event that Mitigation Measure 3.12-2 could be implemented, the impact would be less than significant.	
		3.12-2: Limit development of office space on 1.3-acre non-aviation use site to no more than 21,000 square feet. By reducing the development capacity of office use to 21,000 square feet, the project (at full build-out) would result in fewer number of weekday and peak hour trips (i.e., 44 fewer daily trips, and eight and seven fewer trips during the a.m. and p.m. peak hours, respectively).	Less than significant