

Executive Summary

The Environmental Impact Report (EIR) analyzes how potential environmental impacts of the adopting and implementing of the goals, policies, actions, and the projected buildout of the Fairfield Forward 2050: City of Fairfield General Plan update and Climate Action Plan (Proposed Project), could potentially impact the environment. The Proposed Project is both a policy document and a tool for implementing the City's General Plan and Climate Action Plan (CAP). It contains goals, policies, and programs to guide future development within the approximately 278-square-mile Planning Area and reduce greenhouse gas emissions in line with state targets. The Proposed Project was developed in response to policy direction provided by the City Council, Planning Commission, and community. This Draft EIR has been prepared on behalf of the City of Fairfield, in accordance with the California Environmental Quality Act (CEQA). The City of Fairfield is the lead agency for this EIR, as defined by the California Environmental Quality Act, Public Resources Code Section 21000, *et seq.* (CEQA).

An EIR is intended to inform decision-makers and the general public of the potential significant environmental impacts of a proposed project. The EIR also considers the availability of mitigation measures to minimize significant impacts and evaluates reasonable alternatives to the Proposed Project that may reduce or avoid one or more significant environmental effects. Based on the alternatives analysis, an environmentally superior alternative is identified.

This EIR is a program EIR that examines the potential effects resulting from implementing designated land uses and policies in the Proposed Project. The impact assessment evaluates the Proposed Project as a whole and identifies the broad, regional effects that may occur with its implementation. As a programmatic document, this EIR does not assess project-specific impacts that may result from developments pursuant to the Proposed Project. To the extent that any future development project made possible by the Proposed Project may have individual, site-specific impacts not addressed in this program EIR, such projects would be subject to separate, project-level environmental review, as required by State law. Projects consistent with the Proposed Project and the findings of this EIR may also be eligible for streamlined environmental review as permitted under CEQA. This EIR represents the City's best effort to evaluate the implementation and buildout of the Proposed Project through its horizon year of 2050. While it is anticipated that conditions may change, the assumptions used are the best available at the time of preparation and reflect existing knowledge of patterns of development.

Proposed Project

The Proposed Project is an update to the City's 2002 General Plan and would guide future land use decisions in the City of Fairfield, providing a long-term vision for the city and, through its policies

and implementing actions, indicating how that vision would be achieved over the planning horizon year of 2050. Together with the Zoning Ordinance and related sections of the Municipal Code, the Proposed Project would serve as the basis for planning-related decisions made by City staff, the Planning Commission, and the City Council.

The Climate Action Plan is a comprehensive plan for addressing the community's greenhouse gas (GHG) emissions. The proposed CAP was developed concurrently with the Proposed Project, reflecting the City's proposed land use and transportation strategy and GHG implications of various Proposed Project's goals and policies. The proposed CAP is intended to reinforce the City's commitment to reducing GHG emissions and demonstrate how the City will comply with State GHG emission reduction targets. As a Qualified GHG Reduction Strategy, the CAP will also enable streamlined environmental review of future development projects, in accordance with CEQA.

The General Plan update was initiated to comprehensively examine the existing conditions in the city and to create a vision for the city's future. Although the Proposed Project does not specify or anticipate when the buildout of the city will occur, a horizon of year 2050 is assumed for planning purposes. The purpose and objectives of the Proposed Project, included below, underpin the policies and implementing actions of the Proposed Project. A full project description is included in Chapter 2 of this Draft EIR.

Planning Area

The Planning Area encompasses 278 square miles including the City of Fairfield (approximately 41 square miles) and its Sphere of Influence (SOI) (approximately 11 square miles). The SOI is generally coterminous with the city boundary but includes a handful of areas surrounding the city limits, with the largest section located in the northeast area of the city limits, adjacent to Travis Air Force Base. The Planning Area also includes the surrounding unincorporated areas in Green Valley and Suisun Valley, as in the current General Plan, and the Suisun Marsh Protection Plan area (225 square miles). Although the City of Fairfield does not have jurisdiction in areas outside of its city limits, what happens in those areas bears a relation to the City's planning and must be considered in the General Plan, per California Government Code Section 65300.

Purpose

California Government Code Section 65300 requires each city and county in California to adopt a general plan "for the physical development of the county or city, and any land outside its boundaries which...bears relation to its planning." The Fairfield General Plan can be considered the City's development constitution, containing both a statement of the community's vision of its long-term development as well as the policies to support that vision by guiding the physical growth of the city. The Proposed Project contains policies to guide decision-making related to development, housing, transportation, environmental quality, public services, parks, and open spaces.

The Proposed Project would replace the existing 2002 General Plan in all elements, with the exception of the Housing Element, which was adopted and certified by the California Department of Housing and Community Development (HCD) in 2023. The existing 2002 General Plan has a horizon year of 2020. The Proposed Project would establish a planning and policy framework that

would extend to horizon year 2050. The CAP establishes greenhouse gas emissions reductions targets that demonstrate compliance with statewide targets for 2030 and 2045.

Objectives

As required under CEQA Section 15124, the following specific objectives have been established for the Proposed Project:

1. Foster Fairfield as a community of vibrant, diverse, connected neighborhoods, with easy access to shopping, entertainment, and recreation.
2. Improve Fairfield's transportation network with safe and connected walking and biking facilities, accessible and reliable public transit, and new transportation technology.
3. Achieve a resilient, dynamic, and competitive local economy that offers opportunities across the economic spectrum.
4. Promote housing and support a diverse array of housing types to meet the needs of all segments of the population.
5. Preserve Fairfield's status as a distinctive community surrounded by and connected to open space and agriculture.
6. Emphasize environmental sustainability.
7. Achieve a healthy and safe community for all.
8. Foster revitalization in the city's core and along key corridors, building on the momentum of recent planning efforts, including the Heart of Fairfield and Train Station specific plans.
9. Create community cohesion and sense of place by celebrating and showcasing Fairfield's diversity.

Estimated Buildout of the Proposed General Plan

Buildout refers to the estimated amount of new development and corresponding growth in housing, population and employment resulting from nonresidential development that is likely to take place under the Proposed Project through the horizon year of 2050 based on the proposed land use designations. Buildout estimates should not be considered a prediction for growth, as the actual amount of development that will occur through 2050 is based on many factors outside of the City's control, including changes in regional real estate and labor markets and the decisions of individual property owners. Additionally, the designation of a site for a specific land use in the Proposed Project does not guarantee that a site will be developed or redeveloped at the assumed density during the planning period, as future development will rely primarily on each property owner's initiative. Outside of city limits and the SOI, lands remain under the development control of Solano County unless annexed.

As shown in Table ES-1, buildout of the Proposed Project is projected to result in the development of approximately 13,500 new homes and nearly 9.8 million square feet of nonresidential development within the city's Urban Limit Line.

Table ES-I. Development Summary- Projected Buildout within Urban Limit Line

Existing		Pipeline/Planned Development				Proposed Project		
		Pipeline ¹	Specific Plans ²	Housing Element ³	ADUs	Additional Development ⁴	Net Development (Additional plus Pipeline/Planned)	Buildout, 2050
Residential (units)								
Single Family	29,840	990	1,850	20	140	1,950	4,950	34,800
Multifamily	12,560	2,110	3,970	790		1,680	8,540	21,110
TOTAL	42,400	3,100	5,820	810	140	3,630	13,500	55,900
Population	120,340	-	-	-	-	-	33,350 ⁵	153,690
Nonresidential (sq ft)⁶								
Retail	5,801,860	113,000	70,000	-	-	974,610	1,157,610	6,959,480
Office	2,705,520	23,000	70,000	-	-	1,443,000	1,536,000	4,241,510
Industrial	15,595,780	1,311,000	1,000,000			4,780,130	7,091,130	22,686,900
TOTAL	24,103,160	1,447,000	1,140,000	-	-	7,197,730	9,784,730	33,887,890

Notes:

Estimates are rounded to the nearest ten. Numbers may not sum due to rounding.

1. " Pipeline" refers to major development projects that are currently under construction, approved, or under review by the City.
2. Represents development capacity remaining in specific plans.
3. Reflects Housing Element sites not already included in Pipeline and Specific Plan remaining capacity estimations
4. Additional development includes new development on vacant and underutilized opportunity sites as well as redevelopment of existing buildings on these sites.
5. Assumes 5 percent vacancy rate, 2 percent group quarters. 2.4 persons per household assumed for multifamily; 3.1 persons per household assumed for single family, adjusted from 2024 Department of Finance Estimates.
6. Existing nonresidential square footage derived 2021 Existing Conditions, Trends, and Opportunities Analysis.

Source: Department of Finance, 2024; CoStar, 2020; City of Fairfield, 2024; Dyett & Bhatia, 2024

Alternatives to the Proposed Project

This section is provided consistent with CEQA Guidelines which state that the EIR needs to examine in detail only a reasonable range of alternatives that the lead agency determines could feasibly attain most of the basic objectives of the project. Further, the EIR should identify any alternatives that were considered by the lead agency but were rejected and briefly explain the reasons underlying the lead agency's determination. Among factors used to eliminate alternatives from detailed consideration in the EIR includes the alternative's failure to meet most of the basic project objectives or inability to avoid significant environmental effects (CEQA Guidelines 15126.6(c)).

Prior to and during the development of alternative plans, community members and stakeholders were invited to provide ideas in a number of ways, including public workshops, Planning Commission and City Council meetings, and interviews with stakeholders. Feedback obtained during these outreach efforts helped City staff conceptualize and prioritize land uses in the alternative plans and bracket the range of choices that have the broadest support from the community. The alternatives described in this EIR include two of the substantial proposals (Alternative 1: New Neighborhoods and Connections; and Alternative 2: Transformed Corridors and Transit Oriented Development) considered by the City of Fairfield during the alternatives stage of the planning process. The third conceptual alternative, Alternative 3: Community Centers: was the closest alternative to what became the Preferred Plan and the proposed land use plan analyzed in this EIR.

NO PROJECT ALTERNATIVE

Consistent with Section 15126.6(e)(2) of the CEQA Guidelines, the No Project Alternative represents what would be reasonably expected to occur in the foreseeable future if the Proposed Project were not adopted and the City's current General Plan was left unchanged and in use. There would be no changes to the current General Plan Land Use map (see Figure 4.1) and no consolidation of land use designations; the new Business Flex, Fairfield-Suisun Valley Gateway Mixed Use, Solano Town Center Mixed Use, and North Texas Corridor Mixed Use land use designations would not be applied. The separate I-680/I-80/SR-12 interchange project would also occur, though improvements to the Linear Trail would not. The No Project Alternative would also not include the Climate Action Plan.

ALTERNATIVE 1: NEW NEIGHBORHOODS AND CONNECTIONS

Alternative 1 proposes expanding City boundaries between Cordelia and central Fairfield, both north and south of I-80. The plan includes developing lower density neighborhoods with single-family homes, a 20-acre community park, a new high school, and neighborhood-oriented shops, connected by a Linear Park Trail linking the Transportation Center to Solano Community College. It also emphasizes Fairfield as an affordable enclave with diverse housing options and adds new neighborhoods in Rancho Solano. The plan focuses on Solano College as a "knowledge hub" with higher density student housing and an expanded medical and advanced manufacturing sector along Business Center Drive. Additionally, it envisions residential development and a special park in Nelson Hill, with mixed-use developments supporting community needs to the west. Finally, Alternative 1 includes substantial new industrial and manufacturing

job opportunities, particularly south of I-80, to capitalize on the demand for warehousing and advanced manufacturing.

INFILL DEVELOPMENT ALTERNATIVE

Alternative 2 centers new housing and jobs along key corridors like North Texas, Pennsylvania Avenue, and West Texas Street, emphasizing transit-oriented development and public realm improvements. It focuses on higher density housing near transit locations such as the Fairfield-Suisun Train Station and proposes a new SMART Rail Station neighborhood in Cordelia. This new neighborhood would feature diverse housing, a school, a community park, and commercial areas with good access to nearby industrial jobs. Pennsylvania Avenue will transform into a mixed-use node, while North Texas Street will develop mixed-use areas enhanced with urban design improvements. The Texas Street “elbow” will feature neighborhood-serving retail and gateway improvements. This plan promotes a balance of single-family and multifamily housing but the least total housing development among the alternatives. Additionally, I-80 and Business Park Drive will become “jobs corridors” with expanded industrial and flexible office uses, while Nelson Hill will be developed as a city park with hiking trails and connections to the new community park.

ENVIRONMENTALLY SUPERIOR ALTERNATIVE

The No Project Alternative reduces the greatest number of environmental impacts. Since the CEQA guidelines require another environmentally superior alternative other than the No Project Alternative to be identified, Alternative 2 would be the environmentally superior alternative. This is because it avoids the Proposed Project’s significant and unavoidable impacts pertaining to mineral resources and reduces the severity of the significant and unavoidable impact related to VMT. However, Alternative 2 would in turn result in significant and unavoidable impacts for scenic vistas, public views, and land use plan conflicts which are less than significant impacts under the Proposed Project. Given that the Proposed Project would be more successful in achieving the objectives of the Project and is found to be environmentally superior in more cases, the Proposed Project is determined to be the environmentally superior alternative.

Areas of Known Controversy

Section 15123 of the State CEQA Guidelines states that an EIR shall identify areas of controversy known to the lead agency, including issues raised by the agency and the public during the scoping process. The issues listed below have been identified for the Project and may be controversial:

- Loss of Prime Farmland;
- Active transportation and GHG;
- Wildfire evacuation routes; and
- Growth inducement.

In addition, the lead agency received comment letters from public agencies during the 30-day public review period in response to the Recirculated NOP. In general, the comment letters recommended that the proposed General Plan update take into consideration potential impacts to the following environmental

resources: traffic impacts and transportation planning; impacts to the Suisun Marsh and consistency with the Delta Marsh Plan; requirements of a “qualified CAP” for GHG planning; consistency with the Travis Air Force Base Land Use Compatibility Plan; consistency with Solano County LAFCO standards and procedures; proximity to hazardous materials; and requirements of tribal consultation.

Significant and Unavoidable Impacts

State CEQA Guidelines Section 15126 requires that an EIR describe any significant impacts that cannot be avoided, even with implementation of feasible mitigation measures. As indicated in Chapter 3, Environmental Setting, Impacts, and Mitigation Measures, of this Draft EIR, the Project would result in significant unavoidable impacts associated with agricultural resources, mineral resources, transportation, and noise. The significant and unavoidable impacts are listed below and summarized in Chapter 5, Other CEQA Considerations:

AGRICULTURAL RESOURCES

- Impact 3.2-1:** Implementation of the Proposed Project would convert Prime Farmland, Unique Farmland, or Farmland of Statewide Importance
- Impact 3.2-2:** Implementation of the Proposed Project would conflict with existing zoning for agricultural use or a Williamson Act contract

MINERAL RESOURCES

- Impact 3.11-1:** Implementation of the Proposed Project would result in the loss of availability of a known mineral resource that would be a value to the region and the residents of the state.

NOISE

- Impact 3.12-1:** Implementation of the Proposed Project would not result in generation of a substantial temporary or permanent increase in ambient noise levels in the vicinity of the project in excess of standards established in the local general plan or noise ordinance, or applicable standards of other agencies.

TRANSPORTATION

- Impact 3.15-2:** Implementation of the Proposed Project would conflict or be inconsistent with CEQA Guidelines section 15064.3, subdivision (b).

Impacts Summary

Table ES-2: Summary of Impacts and Mitigation Measures presents the summary of the significant impacts of the Proposed Project identified in the EIR and the Proposed Project mitigation measures that reduce these impacts. Detailed discussions of the impacts and proposed policies that would reduce impacts are in Chapter 3.

Table ES-2: Summary of Impacts and Mitigation Measures

Impact	Mitigation Measures	Significance before Mitigation	Significance after Mitigation
3.1 Aesthetics			
3.1-1 Implementation of the Proposed Project would not have a substantial adverse effect on scenic vistas.	MM-AE-1: Scenic Vista Plan Update. Revise the 1999 Scenic Vistas Plan to ensure consistency with the General Plan, potentially through one of the following methods: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Removing the Hale Ranch area from the map of Scenic Vista Areas, p. 8; ▪ Clarifying that the Scenic Vista policies do not apply to sites proposed in the General Plan within the city’s Urban Limit Line; or ▪ Removing industrial land use as an unacceptable use, or expanding the list of land uses to include industrial use (Site Design Guidelines, (I) Land Use). 	Less than Significant with Mitigation Incorporated	Less than Significant

Table ES-2: Summary of Impacts and Mitigation Measures

<i>Impact</i>	<i>Mitigation Measures</i>	<i>Significance before Mitigation</i>	<i>Significance after Mitigation</i>
3.1-2 Implementation of the Proposed Project would not substantially damage scenic resources, including, but not limited to trees, rock outcroppings, and historic buildings within a state scenic highway.	None Required	No Impact	No Impact
3.1-3 Implementation of the Proposed Project would not substantially degrade the existing visual character or quality of public views of the site and its surroundings in a non-urbanized area or conflict with applicable zoning and other regulations governing scenic quality in an urbanized area.	None Required	Less than Significant	N/A
3.1-4 Implementation of the Proposed Project would not create new sources of substantial light or glare that could adversely affect day or nighttime views in the area.	None Required	Less than Significant	N/A
3.2 Agricultural Resources			
3.2-1: Implementation of the Proposed Project would convert Prime Farmland, Unique Farmland, or Farmland of Statewide Importance	None Available	Significant and Unavoidable	Significant and Unavoidable
3.2-2: Implementation of the Proposed Project would conflict with existing zoning for agricultural use or a Williamson Act contract	None Available	Significant and Unavoidable	Significant and Unavoidable
3.2-3: Implementation of the Proposed Project would involve other changes in the existing environment which, due to their location or nature, could result in conversion of Farmland to non-agricultural use	None Required	Less than Significant	N/A

Table ES-2: Summary of Impacts and Mitigation Measures

<i>Impact</i>	<i>Mitigation Measures</i>	<i>Significance before Mitigation</i>	<i>Significance after Mitigation</i>
3.3 Air Quality			
3.3-1 Development under the Proposed Project would not conflict with or obstruct the implementation of the applicable air quality plan.	None Required	Less than Significant	N/A
3.3-2 Implementation of the Proposed Project would not result in a cumulatively considerable net increase of criteria pollutants for which the Project region is nonattainment under an applicable federal or State ambient air quality standard	<p>MM-AQ-1: Implement BAAQMD Basic Construction Mitigation Measures. The City shall require new project development projects to implement the BAAQMD's Basic Control Mitigation Measures to address fugitive dust emissions that would occur during earthmoving activities associated with project construction. These measures include:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> a) All exposed surfaces (e.g., parking areas, staging areas, soil piles, graded areas, and unpaved access roads) shall be watered two times per day. b) All haul trucks transporting soil, sand, or other loose material off-site shall be covered. c) All visible mud or dirt track-out onto adjacent public roads shall be removed using wet power vacuum street sweepers at least once per day. The use of dry power sweeping is prohibited. d) All vehicle speeds on unpaved roads shall be limited to 15 mph. 	Less than Significant with Mitigation Incorporated	Less than Significant

Table ES-2: Summary of Impacts and Mitigation Measures

<i>Impact</i>	<i>Mitigation Measures</i>	<i>Significance before Mitigation</i>	<i>Significance after Mitigation</i>
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> e) All roadways, driveways, and sidewalks to be paved shall be completed as soon as possible. Building pads shall be laid as soon as possible after grading unless seeding or soil binders are used. f) Idling times shall be minimized either by shutting equipment off when not in use or reducing the maximum idling time to five minutes (as required by the California airborne toxics control measure Title 13, Section 2485 of California Code of Regulations [CCR]). Clear signage shall be provided for construction workers at all access points. g) All construction equipment shall be maintained and properly tuned in accordance with the manufacturer’s specifications. All equipment shall be checked by a certified mechanic and determined to be running in proper condition prior to operation. h) Post a publicly visible sign with the telephone number and person to contact at the City regarding dust complaints. This person shall respond and take corrective action within 48 hours. The Air District’s phone number shall also be visible to ensure compliance with applicable regulations. 		

Table ES-2: Summary of Impacts and Mitigation Measures

<i>Impact</i>	<i>Mitigation Measures</i>	<i>Significance before Mitigation</i>	<i>Significance after Mitigation</i>
	<p>MM-AQ-2: Prepare Project-level Construction Emissions Assessment. The City shall require new development projects to submit a quantitative project-level construction criteria air pollutant and toxic air contaminant emissions analysis prior to the start of construction activities that shows project construction activities would not exceed BAAQMD project-level thresholds of significance. The analysis may rely on BAAQMD construction screening criteria to demonstrate that a detailed assessment of criteria air pollutant and toxic air contaminant construction emissions is not required for the project. If the project does not satisfy all BAAQMD construction screening criteria, the analysis shall estimate and compare construction criteria air pollutant and toxic air contaminant emissions against the project-level thresholds of significance maintained by BAAQMD and, if emissions are shown to be above BAAQMD thresholds, then the project must implement measures to reduce emissions below BAAQMD thresholds. Mitigation measures to reduce emissions could include, but are not limited to:</p> <p>a) Watering exposed surfaces at a frequency adequate to maintain a minimum soil moisture content of 12</p>		

Table ES-2: Summary of Impacts and Mitigation Measures

<i>Impact</i>	<i>Mitigation Measures</i>	<i>Significance before Mitigation</i>	<i>Significance after Mitigation</i>
	<p>percent, as verified by moisture probe or lab sampling;</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> b) Suspending excavation, grading, and/or demolition activities when average wind speeds exceed 20 miles per hour; c) Selection of specific construction equipment (e.g., specialized pieces of equipment with smaller engines or equipment that will be more efficient and reduce engine runtime); d) Installing wind breaks that have a maximum 50 percent air porosity; e) Restoring disturbed areas with vegetative ground cover as soon as soon as possible; f) Limiting simultaneous ground-disturbing activities in the same area at any one time (e.g., excavation and grading); g) Scheduling/phasing activities to reduce the amount of disturbed surface area at any one time; h) Installing wheel washers to wash truck and equipment tires prior to leaving the site; i) Minimizing idling time of diesel-powered construction equipment to no more than two minutes or the 		

Table ES-2: Summary of Impacts and Mitigation Measures

<i>Impact</i>	<i>Mitigation Measures</i>	<i>Significance before Mitigation</i>	<i>Significance after Mitigation</i>
	<p>shortest time interval permitted by manufacturer’s specifications and specific working conditions;</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> j) Requiring equipment to use alternative fuel sources (e.g., electric-powered and liquefied or compressed natural gas), meet cleaner emission standards (e.g., U.S. EPA Tier IV Final emissions standards for equipment greater than 50-horsepower), and/or utilizing added exhaust devices (e.g., Level 3 Diesel Particular Filter); k) Requiring that all construction equipment, diesel trucks, and generators be equipped with Best Available Control Technology for emission reductions of NOx and PM; l) Requiring all contractors use equipment that meets CARB’s most recent certification standard for off-road heavy-duty diesel engines; and m) Applying coatings with a volatile organic compound (VOC) that exceeds the current regulatory requirements set forth in BAAQMD regulation 8, Rule 3 (Architectural Coatings). 		

Table ES-2: Summary of Impacts and Mitigation Measures

<i>Impact</i>	<i>Mitigation Measures</i>	<i>Significance before Mitigation</i>	<i>Significance after Mitigation</i>
<p>3.3-3 Implementation of the Proposed Project would not expose sensitive receptors to substantial pollutant concentrations.</p>	<p>MM-AQ-1: Implement BAAQMD Basic Construction Mitigation Measures</p> <p>MM-AQ-2: Prepare Project-level Construction Emissions Assessment</p> <p>MM-AQ-3: Review Air Quality Risks to New Housing Sites. The City shall require new project residential development projects to review and identify, using the BAAQMD’s publicly available Stationary Source Screening Map or another standard methodology (e.g., BAAQMD public records request), permitted stationary sources within 1,000 feet of the project that may result in risks and hazards to new receptors. If screening-level information indicates potential stationary source risks and hazards would exceed the BAAQMD’s thresholds, the project applicant shall: 1) incorporate site and building design measures into the project that reduce exposure to pollutants; or 2) conduct refined, site-specific modeling, using the latest information and guidance from the BAAQMD, demonstrating sources risks and hazards would not exceed BAAQMD thresholds for new receptors. Site and building design measures that may reduce potential exposure to pollutants would include, but are not limited to, buffering/increasing the distance</p>	<p>Less than Significant with Mitigation Incorporated</p>	<p>Less than Significant</p>

Table ES-2: Summary of Impacts and Mitigation Measures

Impact	Mitigation Measures	Significance before Mitigation	Significance after Mitigation
	<p>between sources and receptors, designing the site to limit exposure to the highest pollutant concentrations, and incorporating enhanced filter systems into heating, ventilation, and air conditioning equipment.</p> <p>MM-AQ-4: Exposure to Air Pollution (Toxic Air Contaminants).</p> <p>Mitigation Measure AQ-4 would apply if the project involves any of the following sensitive land uses:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Residential uses (new dwelling units, excluding secondary units); or • New or expanded schools, daycare centers, parks, nursing homes, or medical facilities; and <p>The project is located within 500 feet (or other distance as specified below) or one or more of the following sources of air pollution:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Freeway; • Roadway with significant traffic (at 		

Table ES-2: Summary of Impacts and Mitigation Measures

<i>Impact</i>	<i>Mitigation Measures</i>	<i>Significance before Mitigation</i>	<i>Significance after Mitigation</i>
	<p>least 10,000 vehicles per day);</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Railyards or rail lines using diesel locomotives; and <p>The project exceeds the health risk screening criteria after a screening analysis is conducted in accordance with the Bay Area Air Quality Management District (BAAQMD) CEQA Guidelines. If so, the following reduction measures are required.</p> <p>a) <i>Health Risk Reduction Measures</i></p> <p>Requirement: The Project applicant shall incorporate appropriate measures into the project design in order to reduce the potential health risk due to exposure of toxic air contaminants. The project applicant shall choose one of the following methods:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> i. The project applicant shall retain a qualified air quality consultant to prepare a Health 		

Table ES-2: Summary of Impacts and Mitigation Measures

<i>Impact</i>	<i>Mitigation Measures</i>	<i>Significance before Mitigation</i>	<i>Significance after Mitigation</i>
	<p>Risk Assessment (HRA) in accordance with California Air Resources Board (CARB) and Office of Environmental Health and Hazard Assessment requirements to determine the health risk of exposure of project residents/occupants/users to air pollutants. The HRA shall be submitted to the City for review and approval. If the HRA concludes that the health risk is at or below acceptable levels, then health risk reduction measures are not required. If the HRA concludes that the health risk exceeds acceptable levels, health risk reduction measures shall be identified to reduce the health risk to acceptable levels.</p>		

Table ES-2: Summary of Impacts and Mitigation Measures

<i>Impact</i>	<i>Mitigation Measures</i>	<i>Significance before Mitigation</i>	<i>Significance after Mitigation</i>
	<p data-bbox="800 902 863 927">-OR-</p> <p data-bbox="1083 358 1377 886">Identified risk reduction measures shall be submitted to the City for review and approval and be included on the project drawings submitted for the construction-related permit or on other documentation submitted to the City. The approved risk reduction measures shall be implemented during construction and/or operations as applicable.</p> <p data-bbox="1016 951 1377 1349">ii. The project applicant shall incorporate the following health risk reduction measures into the project. These features shall be submitted to the City for review and approval and be included on the project drawings submitted for the construction-related permit or on</p>		

Table ES-2: Summary of Impacts and Mitigation Measures

<i>Impact</i>	<i>Mitigation Measures</i>	<i>Significance before Mitigation</i>	<i>Significance after Mitigation</i>
	<p>other documentation submitted to the City:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li data-bbox="1010 435 1377 1024">iii. Installation of air filtration to reduce cancer risks and Particulate Matter (PM) exposure for residents and other sensitive populations in the project that are in close proximity to sources of air pollution. Air filter devices shall be rated MERV-13 or higher. As part of implementing this measure, an ongoing maintenance plan for the building's HVAC air filtration system shall be required. <li data-bbox="1010 1045 1377 1230">iv. Where appropriate, install passive electrostatic filtering systems, especially those with low air velocities (i.e., 1 mph). <li data-bbox="1010 1252 1377 1370">v. Phasing of residential developments when proposed within 500 feet of freeways such 		

Table ES-2: Summary of Impacts and Mitigation Measures

<i>Impact</i>	<i>Mitigation Measures</i>	<i>Significance before Mitigation</i>	<i>Significance after Mitigation</i>
	<p>that homes nearest the freeway are built last, if feasible.</p> <p>vi. The project shall be designed to locate sensitive receptors as far away as feasible from the source(s) of air pollution. Operable windows, balconies, and building air intakes shall be located as far away from these sources as feasible.</p> <p>vii. Sensitive receptors shall be located on the upper-floors of buildings, if feasible.</p> <p>viii. Planting trees and/or vegetation between sensitive receptors and pollution source, if feasible. Trees that are best suited to trapping PM shall be planted, including one or more of the following: Pine (<i>Pinus nigra</i> var. <i>maritima</i>), Cypress (X <i>Cupressocyparis leylandii</i>), Hybrid</p>		

Table ES-2: Summary of Impacts and Mitigation Measures

Impact	Mitigation Measures	Significance before Mitigation	Significance after Mitigation
	<p>poplar (Populus deltoids X trichocarpa), and Redwood (Sequoia sempervirens).</p> <p>ix. Sensitive receptors shall be located as far away from truck activity areas, such as loading docks and delivery areas, as feasible.</p> <p>x. Existing and new diesel generators shall meet CARB’s Tier 4 emission standards, if feasible.</p> <p>xi. Emissions from diesel trucks shall be reduced through implementing the following measures, if feasible:</p> <p>xii. Installing electrical hook-ups for diesel trucks at loading docks.</p> <p>xiii. Requiring trucks to use Transportation Refrigeration Units</p>		

Table ES-2: Summary of Impacts and Mitigation Measures

Impact	Mitigation Measures	Significance before Mitigation	Significance after Mitigation
	<p>(TRUs) that meet Tier 4 emission standards.</p> <p>xiv. Requiring truck-intensive projects to use advanced exhaust technology (e.g., hybrid) or alternative fuels.</p> <p>xv. Prohibiting trucks from idling for more than two minutes.</p> <p>xvi. Establishing truck routes to avoid sensitive receptors in the project. A truck route program, along with truck calming, parking, and delivery restrictions, shall be implemented.</p> <p>b) <i>Maintenance of Health Risk Reduction Measures</i></p> <p>Requirement: The project applicant shall maintain, repair, and/or replace installed health risk reduction measures, including but not limited to the HVAC system (if applicable), on an ongoing and as-needed basis. Prior to</p>		

Table ES-2: Summary of Impacts and Mitigation Measures

Impact	Mitigation Measures	Significance before Mitigation	Significance after Mitigation
	<p>occupancy, the project applicant shall prepare and then distribute to the building manager/operator an operation and maintenance manual for the HVAC system and filter including the maintenance and replacement schedule for the filter.</p>		
<p>3.3-4 Development under the Proposed Project would not result in other emissions (such as those leading to odors) adversely affecting a substantial number of people.</p>	<p>None Required</p>	<p>Less than Significant</p>	<p>N/A</p>
<p>3.4 Biological Resources</p>			
<p>3.4-1 Implementation of the Proposed Project would have a substantial adverse effect, either directly or through habitat modifications, on 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.</p>	<p>None Required</p>	<p>Less than Significant</p>	<p>N/A</p>
<p>3.4-2 Implementation of the Proposed Project would 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 California Department of Fish and Game or US Fish and Wildlife Service.</p>	<p>None Required</p>	<p>Less than Significant</p>	<p>N/A</p>

Table ES-2: Summary of Impacts and Mitigation Measures

<i>Impact</i>	<i>Mitigation Measures</i>	<i>Significance before Mitigation</i>	<i>Significance after Mitigation</i>
3.4-3 Implementation of the Proposed Project would 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.	None Required	Less than Significant	N/A
3.4-4 Implementation of the Proposed Project would not interfere substantially with the movement of any native resident or migratory fish or wildlife species or with established native resident or migratory wildlife corridors, or impede the use of native wildlife nursery sites.	None Required	Less than Significant	N/A
3.4-5 Implementation of the Proposed Project would not conflict with any local policies or ordinances protecting biological resources, such as a tree preservation policy or ordinance.	None Required	Less than Significant	N/A
3.4-6 Implementation of the Proposed Project would not conflict with the provisions of an adopted Habitat Conservation Plan, Natural Community Conservation Plan, or other approved local, regional, or state habitat conservation plan.	None Required	Less than Significant	N/A
3.5 Cultural and Tribal Cultural Resources			
3.5-1 Implementation of the Proposed Project would not cause a substantial adverse change in the significance of a historical resource, as defined as physical demolition, destruction,	MM-CUL-1: Avoidance or Minimization of Effects on Identified Historic Resources. For any individual discretionary project within the Planning	Less than Significant with Mitigation Incorporated	Less than Significant

Table ES-2: Summary of Impacts and Mitigation Measures

<i>Impact</i>	<i>Mitigation Measures</i>	<i>Significance before Mitigation</i>	<i>Significance after Mitigation</i>
<p>relocation, or alteration of the resource or its immediate surroundings such that the significance of a historic resource would be materially impaired (Guidelines Section 15064.5).</p>	<p>Area that the City determines may involve a property that contains a potentially significant historic resource, the resource shall be assessed by a professional who meets the Secretary of the Interior's Professional Qualifications Standards to determine whether the property is a significant historic resource and whether or not the project may have a potentially significant adverse effect on the historic resource. If, based on the recommendation of the qualified professional, the City determines that the project may have a potentially significant effect, the City shall require the applicant to seek to reduce the effect on historic resource(s) to a less-than-significant level pursuant to CEQA Guidelines Section 15364. Projects that conform to the Secretary of the Interior's Standards for the Treatment of Historic Properties are considered to have a less-than-significant effect on historic architectural resources.</p> <p>MM-CUL-2: Evaluate Age-Eligible Properties That Have Not Previously Been Evaluated Prior to Development Projects to Identify Historic Resources. As a condition of project approval for a development project proposed on a parcel within the Planning Area that includes a building, structure, or landscape more than 50 years old (typical age threshold applied by the California</p>		

Table ES-2: Summary of Impacts and Mitigation Measures

<i>Impact</i>	<i>Mitigation Measures</i>	<i>Significance before Mitigation</i>	<i>Significance after Mitigation</i>
	<p>Office of Historic Preservation) and that has not previously been evaluated for potential historic significance, the City shall require the project applicant shall retain a professional who meets the Secretary of the of the Interior's Professional Qualifications Standards for architectural history or history (as appropriate), to conduct an evaluation of historic significance and eligibility for listing on local, State, or national registers.</p> <p>The evaluation shall include an Intensive Survey, which is comprised of a field survey, archival research, and preparation of a historic resource evaluation report. The report shall include documentation of methodology and the findings of the historic evaluation, including a determination of historic significance and eligibility for listing on local, State, or national registers. Based on this evaluation, if it is determined that the subject property contains an historic resource, Mitigation Measure CUL-1 shall be implemented.</p>		
<p>3.5-2 Implementation of the Proposed Project would not cause an adverse change in the significance of an archaeological resource pursuant to CEQA Guidelines Section 15064.5.</p>	<p>MM-CUL-3: Conduct Cultural Resources Awareness Training. Prior to the start of any ground disturbance or construction activities, developers of projects within 50 feet of a creek or within 50 feet of recorded archaeological resources or tribal cultural resources in the Planning Area shall retain a qualified professional archaeologist</p>	<p>Less than Significant with Mitigation Incorporated</p>	<p>Less than Significant</p>

Table ES-2: Summary of Impacts and Mitigation Measures

Impact	Mitigation Measures	Significance before Mitigation	Significance after Mitigation
	to conduct cultural resource awareness training for construction personnel. This training shall include an overview of what cultural resources are and why they are important, archaeological terms (such as site, feature, deposit), project site history, types of cultural resources likely to be uncovered during excavation, laws that protect cultural resources, and the unanticipated discovery protocol per the PRC Section 21083.		
3.5-3 Development allowed by the Proposed Project would not have the potential to disturb human remains, including those interred outside of formal cemeteries.	MM-CUL-3: Conduct Cultural Resources Awareness Training	Less than Significant with Mitigation Incorporated	Less than Significant
3.5-4 Implementation of the Proposed Project could cause an adverse change in the significance of a tribal cultural resource, defined in Public Resources Code Section 21074 as either a site, feature, place, cultural landscape that is geographically defined in terms of the size and scope of the landscape, sacred place, or object with cultural value to a California Native American Tribe, and that is: (a) Listed or eligible for listing in the California Register of Historical Resources, or in a local register of historical resources as defined in Public Resources Code Section 5020.1(k), or (b) A resource determined by the lead agency, in its discretion and supported by	MM-CUL-3: Conduct Cultural Resources Awareness Training	Less than Significant with Mitigation Incorporated	Less than Significant

Table ES-2: Summary of Impacts and Mitigation Measures

<i>Impact</i>	<i>Mitigation Measures</i>	<i>Significance before Mitigation</i>	<i>Significance after Mitigation</i>
<p>substantial evidence, to be significant pursuant to criteria set forth in subdivision (c) of Public Resources Code Section 5024.1. In applying the criteria set forth in subdivision (c) of Public Resources Code Section 5024.1, the lead agency shall consider the significance of the resource to a California Native American tribe.</p>			
3.6 3.6 Energy, Climate Change, and Greenhouse Gas Emissions			
<p>3.6-1 Development under the Proposed Project would not generate greenhouse gas emissions, either directly or indirectly, that may have a significant impact on the environment.</p>	<p>• MM-GHG-1: Construction Best Management Practices to Minimize GHGs. All applicants within the Planning Area shall require their contractors, as a condition of contract, to reduce construction-related GHG emissions by implementing recommended best management practices, including (but not limited to) the following measures (based on the Bay Area Air Quality Management District’s 2022 CEQA Air Quality Guidelines):</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Ensure alternative fueled (e.g., biodiesel, electric) construction vehicles/equipment make up at least 15 percent of the fleet. • Minimize idling time either by shutting equipment off when not in use or reducing the time of idling to no more than two minutes (A five-minute limit is required by the state airborne toxics control measure 	<p>Less than Significant with Mitigation Incorporated</p>	<p>Less than Significant</p>

Table ES-2: Summary of Impacts and Mitigation Measures

<i>Impact</i>	<i>Mitigation Measures</i>	<i>Significance before Mitigation</i>	<i>Significance after Mitigation</i>
	<p>[CCR, Title 13, Sections 2449(d)(3) and 2485]). Provide clear signage that posts this requirement for workers at the entrances to the site and develop an enforceable mechanism to monitor idling time to ensure compliance with this measure.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Prohibit off-road diesel-powered equipment from being in the “on” position for more than 10 hours per day. • Require all construction equipment is maintained and properly tuned in accordance with manufacturer’s specifications. Equipment should be checked by a certified mechanic and determined to be running in proper condition prior to operation. • Where grid power is available, prohibit portable diesel engines and provide electrical hook ups for electric construction tools, such as saws, drills and compressors, and using electric tools whenever feasible. • Recycle or salvage nonhazardous construction and demolition debris, with a goal of recycling at least 15 percent more by weight than the diversion requirement in Title 24. 		

Table ES-2: Summary of Impacts and Mitigation Measures

<i>Impact</i>	<i>Mitigation Measures</i>	<i>Significance before Mitigation</i>	<i>Significance after Mitigation</i>
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Use locally sourced (within 100 miles of the Planning Area) or recycled materials for construction materials (goal of at least 10 percent based on costs for building materials and based on volume for roadway, parking lot, sidewalk and curb materials). Wood products used should be certified through a sustainable forestry program. • Develop a plan to efficiently use water for adequate dust control since substantial amounts of energy can be consumed during the pumping of water. 		
3.6-2 Development under the Proposed Project would not conflict with an applicable plan, policy, or regulation adopted for the purpose of reducing the emissions of greenhouse gases.	None Required	Less than Significant	N/A
3.6-3 Development under the Proposed Project would not cause wasteful, inefficient, and unnecessary consumption of energy during project construction, operation, and/or maintenance.	None Required	Less than Significant	N/A
3.6-4 Implementation of the Proposed Project would not conflict with or obstruct a State or local plan for renewable energy or energy efficiency.	None Required	Less than Significant	N/A

Table ES-2: Summary of Impacts and Mitigation Measures

<i>Impact</i>	<i>Mitigation Measures</i>	<i>Significance before Mitigation</i>	<i>Significance after Mitigation</i>
3.7 Geology and Soils			
3.7-1 Implementation of the Proposed Project would not directly or indirectly cause potential substantial adverse effects, including the risk of loss, injury, or death involving rupture of a known earthquake fault; strong seismic ground shaking; seismically related ground failure, including liquefaction; or landslides.	None Required	Less than Significant	N/A
3.7-2 Implementation of the Proposed Project would not result in substantial soil erosion or the loss of topsoil.	None Required	Less than Significant	N/A
3.7-3 Implementation of the Proposed Project would not locate structures on expansive soils or on a geologic unit or soil that is unstable, or that would become unstable as a result of new development under the Proposed Project, and potentially result in on- or off-site landslide, lateral spreading, subsidence, liquefaction or collapse.	None Required	Less than Significant	N/A
3.7-4 Implementation of the Proposed Project would not be located on expansive soil, as defined in Table 18 I B of the Uniform Building Code (1994), creating substantial direct or indirect risks to life or property.	None Required	Less than Significant	N/A
3.7-5 Implementation of the Proposed Project would not 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.	None Required	Less than Significant	N/A

Table ES-2: Summary of Impacts and Mitigation Measures

<i>Impact</i>	<i>Mitigation Measures</i>	<i>Significance before Mitigation</i>	<i>Significance after Mitigation</i>
<p>3.7-6 Implementation of the Proposed Project would not directly or indirectly destroy a unique paleontological resource or site or unique geologic feature.</p>	<p>MM-GEO-1: Worker Awareness Training. Prior to commencing construction, and ongoing throughout ground-disturbing activities (e.g., excavation, utility installation, the applicants proposing development of projects within the Planning Area and/or their designee shall ensure that all project construction workers are trained on the contents of a paleontological resources alert sheet, as provided by the the Fairfield Building Safety Division. The paleontological resources alert sheet shall be prominently displayed at the construction site during ground-disturbing activities for reference regarding potential paleontological resources. In addition, the project applicant shall inform the contractor and construction personnel of the immediate stop work procedures and other procedures to be followed if bones or other potential fossils are unearthed at the project site. Should new workers who will be involved in ground-disturbing construction activities begin employment after the initial training has occurred, the construction supervisor shall ensure that they receive the worker awareness training as described above.</p> <p>The applicant shall complete a standard form/affidavit confirming the timing of the worker awareness training to the City.</p>	<p>Less than Significant with Mitigation Incorporated</p>	<p>Less than Significant</p>

Table ES-2: Summary of Impacts and Mitigation Measures

<i>Impact</i>	<i>Mitigation Measures</i>	<i>Significance before Mitigation</i>	<i>Significance after Mitigation</i>
	<p>The affidavit shall confirm the project’s location, the date of training, the location of the informational handout display, and the number of participants. The affidavit shall be transmitted to the City within five business days of conducting the training.</p> <p>MM GEO-2: Halt Construction, Maintenance, or Landscaping Activity in Case of Finding Paleontological Resources, Evaluate Find, and Excavate Find. In the event that previously unidentified paleontological resources are uncovered during site preparation, excavation, or other ground-disturbing activity, applicants proposing development of projects within the Planning Area shall cease all such activity within 25 feet of the discovery or ensure that all such activity within 25 feet of the discovery ceases until the resources have been evaluated by a qualified professional and specific measures can be implemented to protect these resources in accordance with Public Resources Code Section 5097.5. If the qualified paleontologist determines the find is potentially significant, the project applicant shall ensure a qualified paleontologist shall excavate the find in compliance with state law, document the find, and arrange for curation at a depository, keeping project delays to a minimum. If the qualified paleontologist determines the find is not</p>		

Table ES-2: Summary of Impacts and Mitigation Measures

<i>Impact</i>	<i>Mitigation Measures</i>	<i>Significance before Mitigation</i>	<i>Significance after Mitigation</i>
	significant, then the project will continue without delay.		
3.8 Hazards and Hazardous Materials			
3.8-1 Implementation of the Proposed Project would not create a significant hazard to the public or the environment through the routine transport, use, or disposal of hazardous materials.	None Required	Less than Significant	N/A
3.8-2 Implementation of the Proposed Project would not 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.	None Required	Less than Significant	N/A
3.8-3 Implementation of the Proposed Project would not emit hazardous emissions or handle hazardous or acutely hazardous materials, substances, or waste within one-quarter mile of an existing or proposed school.	None Required	Less than Significant	N/A
3.8-4 Implementation of the Proposed Project would not result in development 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 create a significant hazard to the public or the environment.	None Required	Less than Significant	N/A
3.8-5 Implementation of the Proposed Project would not result in development located within an airport land use plan or, where such a plan has not been adopted, within two	None Required	Less than Significant	N/A

Table ES-2: Summary of Impacts and Mitigation Measures

<i>Impact</i>	<i>Mitigation Measures</i>	<i>Significance before Mitigation</i>	<i>Significance after Mitigation</i>
miles of a public airport or public uses airport, and would result in a safety hazard or excessive noise for people residing or working in the project area.			
3.8-6 Implementation of the Proposed Project would not impair implementation of or physically interfere with an adopted emergency response plan or emergency evacuation plan.	None Required	Less than Significant	N/A
3.8-7 Implementation of the Proposed Project would not expose people or structures, either directly or indirectly, to a significant risk of loss, injury or death involving wildland fires.	None Required	Less than Significant	N/A
3.9 Hydrology and Water Quality			
3.9-1 Development under the Proposed Project would not violate any water quality standards or waste discharge requirements or otherwise substantially degrade surface or ground water quality.	None Required	Less than Significant	N/A
3.9-2 Development under the Proposed Project would not substantially decrease groundwater supplies or interfere substantially with groundwater recharge such that the project may impede sustainable groundwater management of the basin.	None Required	Less than Significant	N/A
3.9-3 Development under the Proposed Project would not substantially alter the existing drainage pattern of the City of Fairfield, including through the alteration of the course of a stream or river or through the	None Required	Less than Significant	N/A

Table ES-2: Summary of Impacts and Mitigation Measures

<i>Impact</i>	<i>Mitigation Measures</i>	<i>Significance before Mitigation</i>	<i>Significance after Mitigation</i>
addition of impervious surfaces, in a manner which would result in substantial erosion or siltation on- or off-site.			
3.9-4 Development under the Proposed Project would not substantially alter the existing drainage pattern of the site or area, including through the alteration of the course of a stream or river or through the addition of impervious surfaces, in a manner which would create or contribute runoff water that would exceed the capacity of existing or planned storm water drainage systems or provide substantial additional sources of polluted runoff.	None Required	Less than Significant	N/A
3.9-5 Development under the Proposed Project would not substantially alter the existing drainage pattern of the site or area, including through the alteration of the course of a stream or river or through the addition of impervious surfaces, in a manner which would result in flooding on- or off-site or impede or redirect flood flows.	None Required	Less than Significant	N/A
3.9-6 Implementation of the Proposed Project would not risk release of pollutants due to project inundation in flood hazard, tsunami, or seiche zones.	None Required	Less than Significant	N/A
3.9-7 The Proposed Project would not conflict with or obstruct implementation of a water quality control plan or sustainable groundwater management plan.	None Required	Less than Significant	N/A

Table ES-2: Summary of Impacts and Mitigation Measures

<i>Impact</i>	<i>Mitigation Measures</i>	<i>Significance before Mitigation</i>	<i>Significance after Mitigation</i>
3.10 Land Use and Planning			
3.10-1 Implementation of the Proposed Project would not physically divide an established community.	None Required	Less than Significant	N/A
3.10-2 Implementation of the Proposed Project would not cause a significant environmental impact due to a conflict with any land use plan, policy, or regulation adopted for the purpose of avoiding or mitigating an environmental effect.	None Required	Less than Significant	N/A
3.11 Mineral Resources			
3.11-1 Implementation of the Proposed Project would result in the loss of availability of a known mineral resource that would be a value to the region and the residents of the state.	None Available	Significant and Unavoidable	Significant and Unavoidable
3.11-2 Implementation of the Proposed Project would not 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.	None Required	Less than Significant	N/A
3.12 Noise and Vibration			
3.12-1 Implementation of the Proposed Project would not result in generation of a substantial temporary or permanent increase in ambient noise levels in the vicinity of the project in excess of standards established in the local general plan or noise ordinance, or applicable standards of other agencies.	None Available	Significant and Unavoidable	Significant and Unavoidable

Table ES-2: Summary of Impacts and Mitigation Measures

Impact	Mitigation Measures	Significance before Mitigation	Significance after Mitigation
<p>3.12-2 Implementation of the Proposed Project would not result in generation of excessive ground-borne vibration or ground-borne noise levels.</p>	<p>MM-NOI-1: Ground-borne Vibration during Construction and Demolition Periods. Reduce ground-borne vibration levels during individual, site specific project demolition and construction periods by requiring applicant incorporation of conditions in project demolition and construction contractor agreements that stipulate the following ground-borne vibration abatement measures, subject to City review and approval:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Restrict vibration-generating activity to between the hours of 7:00 AM and 5:00 PM, Monday through Friday. Prohibit such activity on weekends and holidays. • Notify occupants of land uses located within 200 feet of proposed pile-driving activities of the project construction schedule in writing. • Investigate in consultation with City staff possible pre-drilling of pile holes as a means of minimizing the number of percussions required to seat the pile. • Conduct a pre-construction site survey documenting the condition of any historic structure eligible per CEQA, (PRC § 5024.1, 14 CCR § 4850) located within 200 feet of proposed pile driving activities and 	<p>Less than Significant with Mitigation</p>	<p>Less than Significant</p>

Table ES-2: Summary of Impacts and Mitigation Measures

Impact	Mitigation Measures	Significance before Mitigation	Significance after Mitigation
	<p>recommending an appropriate pile driving vibration level threshold.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Monitor pile driving vibration levels to ensure that vibration does not exceed the appropriate threshold for potentially affected buildings (e.g., 5 mm/sec or 0.2 inches/sec ppv for structurally sound buildings). If the performance threshold is exceeded, require adjustments or replacements to pile driving equipment to meet the threshold. <p>MM-NOI-2: Rail Vibration Study for Residential Development. Prior to any City approval of new habitable buildings within 100 feet of the centerline of the railroad tracks, completion of a detailed site-specific vibration study shall be required, demonstrating to City satisfaction that ground-borne vibrations associated with rail operations either (1) would not exceed applicable FTA ground-borne vibration impact assessment criteria (see Table 3.12-3 of this EIR), or (2) can be reduced to below the applicable FTA criteria thresholds through building design and construction measures (e.g., stiffened floors, modified foundations).</p>		
3.12-3 Implementation of the Proposed Project would not result in development located within the vicinity of a private airstrip or an	None Required	Less than Significant	N/A

Table ES-2: Summary of Impacts and Mitigation Measures

<i>Impact</i>	<i>Mitigation Measures</i>	<i>Significance before Mitigation</i>	<i>Significance after Mitigation</i>
airport land use plan or, where such a plan has not been adopted, within two miles of a public airport or public use airport, and could expose people residing or working in the project area to excessive noise levels.			
3.13 Population and Housing			
3.13-1 Development under the Proposed Project would not 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).	None Required	Less than Significant	N/A
3.13-2 Development under the Proposed Project would not displace substantial numbers of existing people or housing, necessitating the construction of replacement housing elsewhere.	None Required	Less than Significant	N/A
3.14 Public Services and Recreation			
3.14-1 Implementation of the Proposed Project would not 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: fire protection, police	None Required	Less than Significant	N/A

Table ES-2: Summary of Impacts and Mitigation Measures

<i>Impact</i>	<i>Mitigation Measures</i>	<i>Significance before Mitigation</i>	<i>Significance after Mitigation</i>
protection, schools, parks, or other public facilities.			
3.14-2 Development under the Proposed Project would not 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.	None Required	Less than Significant	N/A
3.14-3 Development under the Proposed Project would not require the construction or expansion of recreational facilities which might have an adverse physical effect on the environment.	None Required	Less than Significant	N/A
3.15 Transportation			
3.15-1 Implementation of the Proposed Project would not conflict with a program, plan, ordinance, or policy addressing the circulation system, including transit, roadway, and bicycle and pedestrian facilities.	None Required	Less than Significant	N/A
3.15-2 Implementation of the Proposed Project would conflict or be inconsistent with CEQA Guidelines section 15064.3, subdivision (b).	MM-VMT-1: Implement VMT Reduction Measures. Individual project development proposals that do not screen out from VMT impact analysis shall provide a quantitative VMT analysis using the methods applied in this EIR, with modifications if appropriate, based on future changes to the City of Fairfield practices and VMT analysis methodology guidelines. Projects which result in a significant impact shall include travel demand management measures and physical	Significant and Unavoidable	Significant and Unavoidable

Table ES-2: Summary of Impacts and Mitigation Measures

Impact	Mitigation Measures	Significance before Mitigation	Significance after Mitigation
	<p>measures to reduce VMT. Potential strategies are listed below; the first two apply to development projects, and the third applies at a Citywide scale.</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li data-bbox="953 526 1346 857">1. A project applicant shall modify the project’s characteristics to reduce VMT generated by the project prior to issuance of an occupancy permit. This might involve changing the density or mixture of land uses on the project site, or changing the project’s location to one that is more accessible by transit or other travel modes. <li data-bbox="953 883 1373 1307">2. A project applicant shall implement transportation demand management (TDM), physical design measures, or participate in a VMT impact reduction program to reduce VMT generated by the project prior to issuance of an occupancy permit. A description of trip reduction strategies is included in <i>Handbook for Analyzing Greenhouse Gas Emission Reductions, Assessing Climate Vulnerabilities, and Advancing Health and Equity</i> by the California Air 		

Table ES-2: Summary of Impacts and Mitigation Measures

<i>Impact</i>	<i>Mitigation Measures</i>	<i>Significance before Mitigation</i>	<i>Significance after Mitigation</i>
	Pollution Control Officers Association (CAPCOA). 3. The City shall participate in a VMT impact fee program and/or VMT exchange/banking program if the City or Solano Transportation Authority (or other responsible agency) chooses to create one.		
3.15-3 Implementation of the Proposed Project would not substantially increase hazards due to a geometric design feature (e.g., sharp curves or dangerous intersections) or incompatible uses (e.g., farm equipment).	None Required	Less than Significant	N/A
3.15-4 Implementation of the Proposed Project would not result in inadequate emergency access.	None Required	Less than Significant	N/A
3.16 Utilities and Service Systems			
3.16-1 Implementation of the Proposed Project would not require or result in the relocation or construction of new or expanded water, wastewater treatment, storm water drainage, electric power, natural gas, or telecommunications facilities, the construction or relocation of which could cause significant environmental effects.	None Required	Less than Significant	N/A
3.16-2 Implementation of the Proposed Project would have sufficient water supplies available to serve the project and reasonably foreseeable future development during normal, dry, and multiple dry years.	None Required	Less than Significant	N/A

Table ES-2: Summary of Impacts and Mitigation Measures

<i>Impact</i>	<i>Mitigation Measures</i>	<i>Significance before Mitigation</i>	<i>Significance after Mitigation</i>
3.16-3 Implementation of the Proposed Project would not result in a determination by the wastewater treatment provider that serves or may serve the project that it does not have adequate capacity to serve the project's projected demand in addition to the provider's existing commitments.	None Required	Less than Significant	N/A
3.16-4 Implementation of the Proposed Project would not generate solid waste in excess of State or local standards, or in excess of the capacity of local infrastructure, or otherwise impair the attainment of solid waste reduction goals.	None Required	Less than Significant	N/A
3.16-5 Implementation of the Proposed Project would comply with federal, State, and local management and reduction statutes and regulations related to solid waste.	None Required	Less than Significant	N/A
3.17 Wildfire			
3.17-1. Implementation of the Proposed Project would not substantially impair an adopted emergency response plan or emergency evacuation plan.	None Required	Less than Significant	N/A
3.17-2 Implementation of the Proposed Project would not exacerbate wildfire risks due to slope, prevailing winds, and other factors, and thereby expose project occupants to pollutant concentrations from a wildfire or the uncontrolled spread of a wildfire.	None Required	Less than Significant	N/A
3.17-3. Implementation of the Proposed Project would not require the installation or maintenance of associated infrastructure	None Required	Less than Significant	N/A

Table ES-2: Summary of Impacts and Mitigation Measures

<i>Impact</i>	<i>Mitigation Measures</i>	<i>Significance before Mitigation</i>	<i>Significance after Mitigation</i>
(such as roads, fuel breaks, emergency water sources, power lines or other utilities) that may exacerbate fire risk or that may result in temporary or ongoing impacts to the environment.			
3.17-4. Implementation of the Proposed Project would not expose people or structures to significant risks, including downslope or downstream flooding or landslides, as a result of runoff, post-fire slope instability, or drainage changes.	None Required	Less than Significant	N/A

This page intentionally left blank.