

City of Suisun City

2035 General Plan



Volume III
Environmental Impact Report

City of Suisun City

2035 General Plan



City of Suisun City
Community Development Department
Suzanne Bragdon, City Manager
Jason Garben, Economic Development Director
Dan Kasperson, Building and Public Works Director
John Kearns, Associate Planner

General Plan Consultation

AECOM
2020 L Street, Suite 400
Sacramento, CA 95811

Contact:
J. Matthew Gerken, AICP
916/414-5892
matthew.gerken@aecom.com

TABLE OF CONTENTS

Section	Page
EXECUTIVE SUMMARY	ES-1
ES.1 Introduction	ES-1
ES.2 Purpose and Intended Uses of the EIR	ES-1
ES.3 EIR Scope and Content	ES-3
ES.4 Project Purpose and Objectives	ES-4
ES.5 Summary of Project Description	ES-6
ES.6 Project Alternatives	ES-7
ES.7 Summary of Known Controversial Issues	ES-8
ES.8 Summary of Environmental Impacts And Mitigation Measures	ES-11
1 INTRODUCTION.....	1-1
1.1 Type of EIR	1-1
1.2 Purpose and Intended Uses of the EIR	1-3
1.3 Scope of the EIR.....	1-4
1.4 Environmental Review Process	1-5
1.5 Notice of Preparation.....	1-6
1.6 Native American Consultation	1-9
1.7 Organization of the EIR	1-9
1.8 Relationship to Other Plans and Regulations	1-10
1.9 Subsequent Actions Required	1-14
1.10 Mitigation Measures	1-14
1.11 Availability of the EIR	1-15
2 PROJECT DESCRIPTION	2-1
2.1 Project Location	2-1
2.2 Project Objectives.....	2-1
2.3 Project Summary	2-7
2.4 Development Estimates.....	2-14
2.5 Relationship to Other Agencies and Plans	2-17
3 ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACT ANALYSIS.....	3-1
3.0 Approach to the Environmental Impact Analysis	3-1
3.1 Agricultural Resources	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 Greenhouse Gas Emissions	3.5-1
3.6 Energy	3.6-1
3.7 Geology, Soils, Minerals, and Paleontological Resources	3.7-1
3.8 Hazards and Hazardous Materials	3.8-1
3.9 Hydrology and Water Quality	3.9-1
3.10 Land Use and Planning.....	3.10-1
3.11 Noise and Vibration.....	3.11-1
3.12 Population, Employment, and Housing.....	3.12-1
3.13 Utilities and Service Systems, Public Services, and Recreation	3.13-1
3.14 Traffic and Transportation.....	3.14-1
3.15 Visual Resources	3.15-1

TABLE OF CONTENTS

Section		Page
4	ALTERNATIVES	4-1
4.1	Introduction	4-1
4.2	Project Objectives.....	4-1
4.3	General Plan Update Alternatives	4-5
4.4	General Plan EIR Alternatives	4-5
4.5	Alternatives Rejected for Further Evaluation.....	4-6
4.6	Alternatives Evaluation	4-6
4.7	Summary of Comparative Effects of the Alternatives.....	4-23
4.8	Environmentally Superior Alternative	4-24
5	OTHER CEQA CONSIDERATIONS	5-1
5.1	Cumulative Impacts.....	5-1
5.2	Growth-Inducing Impacts.....	5-26
5.3	Significant Irreversible Environmental Changes.....	5-28
5.4	Significant and Unavoidable Adverse Impacts	5-29
6	REFERENCES	6-1
7	LIST OF PREPARERS.....	7-1

Appendices

A	Notice of Preparation and Responses
B	Agricultural Resources Setting
C	Air Quality and Greenhouse Gas Emissions Modeling
D	Habitat Conservation Plan Conservation Strategy
E	Noise and Vibration Modeling
F	Traffic Forecasts
G	Draft 2035 General Plan
H	Technical Background Reports

Exhibits

Exhibit 2-1	Planning Area	2-3
Exhibit 2-2	Land Use Diagram.....	2-15
Exhibit 3.1-1	Important Farmland	3.1-2
Exhibit 3.1-2	Williamson Act Lands.....	3.1-4
Exhibit 3.8-1	Travis Land Use Compatibility Zones	3.8-13
Exhibit 3.8-2	Fire Hazard Severity Zones for Local Responsibility Areas.....	3.8-17
Exhibit 3.11-1	Future Traffic Noise Contours	3.11-5
Exhibit 4-1	Alternative 1, No Project Alternative (1992 General Plan).....	4-7
Exhibit 4-2	Alternative 2	4-9
Exhibit 4-3	Alternative 3	4-11

Tables

Table ES-1	Summary of Impacts and Mitigation Measures.....	ES-12
Table 1-1	Analyses Required by the State CEQA Guidelines.....	1-6
Table 3.2-1	Operational Criteria Air Pollutant and Precursor Emissions—New Development Accommodated under the 2035 General Plan	3.2-4
Table 3.2-2	Construction-Related Criteria Air Pollutant and Precursor Emissions—New Development under the 2035 General Plan (2015).....	3.2-12
Table 3.5-1	Summary of Modeled Emissions of Greenhouse Gases.....	3.5-7
Table 3.5-2	2035 General Plan Policies Designed to Reduce Greenhouse Gas Emissions in Suisun City ..	3.5-8
Table 3.6-1	New Electrical and Natural Gas Demand from 2035 General Plan	3.6-1
Table 3.11-1	2035 General Plan 60 dBA, 65 dBA and 70 dBA Ldn Traffic Noise Contours.....	3.11-2
Table 3.11-2	Increases in Traffic Noise under the 2035 General Plan Relative to Existing and No Project Conditions at 50 feet from the Centerline	3.11-3
Table 3.11-3	Typical Construction Equipment Noise Levels.....	3.11-4
Table 3.11-4	Noise Level Performance Standards for New Projects Affected by, or Including, Non- Transportation Noise Sources	3.11-7
Table 3.11-5	Noise Level Performance Standards for Non-Transportation Noise Sources	3.11-8
Table 3.11-6	Maximum Allowable Noise Exposure from Transportation Noise Sources at Noise- Sensitive Land Uses	3.11-13
Table 3.11-7	Typical Vibration Levels for Construction Equipment	3.11-15
Table 3.13-1	SSWA Existing and Projected Water Supplies (afy).....	3.13-3
Table 3.13-2	Suisun-Solano Water Authority Comparison of Water Supply and Demand, 2015–2035	3.13-4
Table 3.13-3	FSSD Pump Stations and Existing Pumping Capacity.....	3.13-9
Table 4-1	General Plan Alternatives: Dwelling Units, Population, and Local Jobs at Buildout	4-5
Table 4-2	Comparison of Environmental Impacts of Alternatives to the 2035 General Plan	4-23
Table 5-1	Households and Employment 2010 and 2040	5-3

ACRONYMS AND OTHER ABBREVIATIONS

2035 General Plan	City of Suisun City 2035 General Plan
AB	Assembly Bill
ABAG	Association of Bay Area Governments
ACM	asbestos-containing material
ADT	average daily trips
AFB	Air Force Base
afy	acre-feet per year
AICUZ	Air Installation Compatible Use Zone
ALUC	Airport Land Use Commission
ALUCP	Airport Land Use Compatibility Plan
ARB	California Air Resources Board
ATCM	Airborne Toxic Control Measures
ATHS	Air Toxics Hot Spots
BAAQMD	Bay Area Air Quality Management District
Basin Plan	Water Quality Control Plan for the San Francisco Bay Basin
BCDC	San Francisco Bay Conservation and Development Commission
bhp	brake horsepower
BMP	best management practice
BNSF	Burlington Northern Santa Fe Railroad
CAAQS	California Ambient Air Quality Standards
CAC	Certified Asbestos Consultant
CalARP	California Accidental Release Prevention
CalEEMod	California Emissions Estimator Model
CALFIRE	California Department of Forestry and Fire Protection
Cal-OSHA	California Occupational Safety and Health Administration
CalRecycle	California Department of Resources Recycling and Recovery
Caltrans	California Department of Transportation
CAP	Comprehensive Annexation Plan
CBC	California Building Standards Code
CCR	California Code of Regulations
CDFW	California Department of Fish and Wildlife
CEQA	California Environmental Quality Act
CESA	California Endangered Species Act
CGS	California Geological Survey
CH ₄	methane

CMA	Congestion Management Agency
CMP	Congestion Management Program
CNDDB	California Natural Diversity Database
CNEL	community noise equivalent level
CNPS	California Native Plant Society
CO ₂	carbon dioxide
CO ₂ e	CO ₂ equivalent
COG	council of governments
CPUC	California Public Utilities Commission
dB	decibel
dba	A-weighted decibel
DEIR	draft environmental impact report
Delta	Sacramento–San Joaquin Delta
DOD	U.S. Department of Defense
DOT	U.S. Department of Transportation
DSOD	California Department of Water Resources' Division of Safety of Dams
DTSC	Department of Toxic Substances Control
DWR	California Department of Water Resources
DWSP	Downtown Waterfront Specific Plan
EIR	Environmental Impact Report
EPA	U.S. Environmental Protection Agency
ESA	Federal Endangered Species Act
FEIR	Final Environmental Impact Report
FEMA	Federal Emergency Management Agency
FHWA	Federal Highway Administration
FIRM	flood insurance rate map
FRA	Federal Railroad Administration
FSSD	Fairfield-Suisun Sewer District
FSURMP	Fairfield-Suisun Urban Runoff Management Program
F-SUSD	Fairfield-Suisun Unified School District
FTA	Federal Transit Administration
GHG	greenhouse gas
GIS	Geographic Information Systems
GPU	General Plan Update
HDT	heavy duty truck
HHDT	heavy heavy duty truck

HMBP	Hazardous Materials Business Plan
hp	horsepower
I-80	Interstate 80
in/sec	inches per second
kWh	kilowatt hours
kWh/yr	kilowatt-hours per year
LAFCO	Local Agency Formation Commission
lbs/day	pounds per day
LCFS	Low Carbon Fuel Standard
LED	light-emitting diode
L_{eq}	equivalent noise level
LHDT	light heavy duty truck
LHMP	Local Hazard Mitigation Plan
LID	low impact development
L_{max}	maximum instantaneous noise level
LOS	level of service
LUCP	Land Use Compatibility Plan
L_v	the velocity level in decibels referenced to 1 microinch per second and based on the root mean square velocity amplitude
MEI	Maximally Exposed Individual
mgd	million gallons per day
MHDT	medium heavy duty trucks
MPH	miles per hour
MPO	Metropolitan Planning Organization
MSA	municipal service area
MT/yr	metric tons per year
MTC	Metropolitan Transportation Commission
N_2O	nitrous oxide
NAAQS	National Ambient Air Quality Standards
NAHC	Native American Heritage Commission
NFIP	National Flood Insurance Program
NOP	Notice of Preparation
NO_x	oxides of nitrogen
NPDES	National Pollutant Discharge Elimination System
NRCS	Natural Resources Conservation Service
NRHP	National Register of Historic Places

NWIC	Northwest Information Center
OES	Office of Emergency Services
OU	Operable Unit
OWTS	on-site wastewater treatment systems
PDA	Priority Development Area
PG&E	Pacific Gas & Electric
PHMSA	Pipeline and Hazardous Materials Safety Administration
PM	particulate matter
PM ₁₀	particulate matter less than or equal to 10 microns in diameter
PM _{2.5}	particulate matter less than or equal to 2.5 microns in diameter
PPV	peak particle velocity
PRC	Public Resources Code
RCRA	Resource Conservation and Recovery Act
ROG	reactive organic gas
RPS	Renewable Portfolio Standard
RTIP	Regional Transportation Improvement Plan
RTP	Regional Transportation Plan
RWQCB	Regional Water Quality Control Board
SCS	Sustainable Communities Strategy
SFBAAB	San Francisco Bay Area Air Basin
SID	Solano Irrigation District
SIP	State Implementation Plan
SMHCP	Solano Multispecies Habitat Conservation Plan
SMP	Suisun Marsh Habitat Management, Preservation, and Restoration Plan
SOI	Sphere of Influence
SP	service population
SR	State Route
SRCD	Suisun Resource Conservation District
SSWA	Suisun-Solano Water Authority
STA	Solano Transportation Authority
SWP	State Water Project
SWPPP	Stormwater Pollution Prevention Plan
T-BACT	best available control technology for TACs
tpd	tons per day
tpy	tons per year
TRU	transportation refrigeration unit

UCMP	U.C. Berkeley Museum of Paleontology
UPRR	Union Pacific Railroad
USBR	U.S. Bureau of Reclamation
USFWS	U.S. Fish & Wildlife Service
UWMP	Urban Water Management Plan
VMT	vehicle miles traveled
VOC	volatile organic compound
WDR	waste discharge requirements
WWTP	Wastewater Treatment Plant

EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

ES.1 INTRODUCTION

This summary provides an overview of the Environmental Impact Report (EIR) for the City of Suisun City 2035 General Plan (2035 General Plan) and Draft Climate Action Plan.

The 2035 General Plan and Draft Climate Action Plan are summarized here (with more detail in Section 2, “Project Description”), along with alternatives to the project, which are described in detail in Section 4, “Alternatives.” Table ES-1, at the end of this section, summarizes the environmental impacts identified for the 2035 General Plan in each of the environmental issue sections of this EIR. These impacts are described in detail throughout Section 3, “Environmental Impact Analysis.” The summary table at the end of this section outlines environmental impacts, the significance without mitigation, proposed mitigation measure(s), and the significance of the impact with implementation of identified mitigation measures.

ES.2 PURPOSE AND INTENDED USES OF THE EIR

This EIR was prepared in compliance with the CEQA of 1970 (Public Resources Code Section 21000 et seq.) and the State CEQA Guidelines (California Code of Regulations Section 15000 et seq.). This EIR evaluates the environmental impacts that could result from implementation of the 2035 General Plan and Draft Climate Action Plan.

The purpose of an EIR is neither to recommend approval nor denial of a project. An EIR is an informational document used in the planning and decision-making process by the lead agency and responsible and trustee agencies. An EIR describes the significant environmental impacts of a project, potentially feasible measures to mitigate significant impacts are identified, and potentially feasible alternatives to the project that can reduce or avoid significant environmental effects. CEQA requires decision-makers to balance the benefits of a project against its unavoidable environmental effects in deciding whether to carry out a project.

The 2035 General Plan EIR is a program EIR, as described under the California Environmental Quality Act (CEQA) and the State CEQA Guidelines (California Code of Regulations, Title 14, Sections 15000 et seq. [14 CCR 15000 et seq.]). The analysis in this EIR is considered the first tier of environmental review and creates the foundation upon which future, project-specific CEQA documents can build. Tiering refers to the concept of a multi-level approach to preparing environmental documents set forth in the Public Resources Code Section 21083.3 and the State CEQA Guidelines Section 15152.

Project-level environmental analysis can be streamlined to limit the scope of site-specific approvals following the preparation of an EIR for a general plan. This streamlining provision applies to site-specific approvals for projects that are consistent with the general plan. This program EIR will, in practice, help determine the need for subsequent environmental documentation, as well as dictate the scope of project level CEQA review.

A program EIR can be incorporated by reference into subsequently prepared environmental documents to address cumulative impacts and growth-inducing impacts, allowing the subsequent documents to focus on new or site-specific impacts (State CEQA Guidelines Section 15168[d]).

While many general plan program EIRs include only generalized analysis of conceptual land use change estimates, the City elected to include an enhanced level of analysis for this General Plan and EIR. The 2035 General Plan included detailed land use programming, with a focus on vacant and underutilized properties that would be appropriate for development between present and 2035. This EIR includes a comprehensive analysis of land use change anticipated under the 2035 General Plan, with additional detail in the analysis focused on these development opportunity sites. This EIR includes quantified estimates in certain impact areas, such as transportation, air quality, greenhouse gas emissions, noise, and other topics, based on reasonable assumptions as to the amount, type, and character of land use change under the 2035 General Plan. In addition, this EIR makes reference to 2035 General Plan policies and programs that will serve as mitigation for projects accommodated under the Plan. This enhanced level of analysis and mitigation guidance will serve to streamline and expedite later projects that are consistent with, and implement the policies and programs of the 2035 General Plan.

This program EIR also addresses the adverse physical environmental effects associated with the City's Draft Climate Action Plan. The reduction measures in the Draft Climate Action Plan implement policies in the 2035 General Plan and to a great extent analysis of the 2035 General Plan would simultaneously address impacts associated with the Draft Climate Action Plan.

The City intends to use the 2035 General Plan EIR to streamline environmental review and approval of private and public projects that are consistent with the 2035 General Plan. The City will make full use of existing streamlining provided by CEQA, and will make full use of emerging streamlining techniques, as appropriate.

The material provided under Public Resources Code 21083.3 and CEQA Guidelines 15183 is sometimes called the "partial exemption." Under this provision, CEQA only applies to issues "peculiar to the site." Lead agencies can use programmatic EIRs for the general plan to analyze impacts of projects that could be accommodated under the plan, and greatly limit later project-level analysis to site-specific issues. CEQA Guidelines Section 15183 (f) establishes that impacts are not peculiar to the project if uniformly applied development policies or standards substantially mitigate that environmental effect. The determination of whether or not uniformly applied development policies or standards would substantially mitigate each environmental effect shall be based on substantial evidence, but not necessarily presented in an EIR.

In order to maximize the value of the General Plan EIR to future projects that promote the 2035 General Plan's objectives, the City has strategically integrated the General Plan and the environmental review. The policy development process has been used to vet potential mitigation strategies. The General Plan Update process was used to investigate policies and programs that can serve as uniformly applied standards and substantially limit the scope of analysis for projects consistent with the 2035 General Plan.

Section 15152 of the CEQA Guidelines provides that where a first-tier EIR has "adequately addressed" the subject of cumulative impacts, such impacts need not be revisited in second- and/or third-tier documents. According to Section 15152(f)(3), significant effects identified in a first-tier EIR are adequately addressed, for purposes of later approvals, if the lead agency determines that such effects have been "mitigated or avoided as a result of the prior [EIR] and findings adopted in connection with that prior [EIR]" or "examined at a sufficient level of detail in the prior [EIR] to enable those effects to be mitigated or avoided by site-specific revisions, the imposition of conditions, or by other means in connection with the approval of the later project."

The Public Resources Code provides streamlining coverage to the City and other public agencies that have authority to implement General Plan EIR mitigation measures. Public agencies can use uniformly applied policies or standards to mitigate effects of future projects, avoiding the need to analyze these effects, unless new information arises that changes the impact analysis (Public Resources Code Section 21083.3 (d)). For this reason, this EIR includes references to General Plan policies and programs, where appropriate, to address environmental impacts. Future CEQA documents can reference the same General Plan policies and programs, where appropriate, to demonstrate less-than-significant impacts and that later project-level issues are not “peculiar to the parcel” if they have been substantially mitigated by General Plan policies and programs (uniformly applied development policies).

ES.3 EIR SCOPE AND CONTENT

This EIR was prepared in compliance with the CEQA of 1970 (Public Resources Code Section 21000 et seq.) and the State CEQA Guidelines (California Code of Regulations Section 15000 et seq.). This EIR evaluates the environmental impacts that could result from implementation of the 2035 General Plan and Draft Climate Action Plan.

The geographic scope that could be affected by a proposed project varies depending on the issue topic. The geographic area associated with different environmental effects was used to define the area considered for impact analysis. The geographic scope for air pollutant impact analysis, such as those related to emissions of ozone precursors, is very broad, encompassing large areas within the same air basin. The geographic scope for stationary source noise impacts, on the other end of the spectrum, is relatively narrow, since noise attenuates substantially with distance, making impacts more localized. The environmental impact analysis throughout this EIR describes the environmental impacts of implementing the 2035 General Plan throughout the City’s Planning Area.

This EIR analyzes impacts of the 2035 General Plan relative to current conditions.

Environmental review in compliance with CEQA (Public Resources Code Sections 21000 et seq.) is required as part of the City’s consideration of the 2035 General Plan and Draft Climate Action Plan. The EIR has been prepared in accordance with CEQA, including the CEQA statutes (Public Resources Code Sections 21000–21178.1), CEQA Guidelines (California Code of Regulations, Title 14, Sections 15000–15387), and relevant court decisions. This EIR includes an evaluation of all required environmental topic areas, as well as other CEQA-mandated sections, including:

- ▶ 3.1 Agricultural Resources
- ▶ 3.2 Air Quality
- ▶ 3.3 Biological Resources
- ▶ 3.4 Cultural Resources
- ▶ 3.5 Greenhouse Gas Emissions
- ▶ 3.6 Energy
- ▶ 3.7 Geology, Soils, Minerals, and Paleontological Resources
- ▶ 3.8 Hazards and Hazardous Materials
- ▶ 3.9 Hydrology and Water Quality
- ▶ 3.10 Land Use and Planning
- ▶ 3.11 Noise and Vibration

- ▶ 3.12 Population, Employment, and Housing
- ▶ 3.13 Utilities and Service Systems, Public Services, and Recreation
- ▶ 3.14 Traffic and Transportation
- ▶ 3.15 Visual Resources
- ▶ 4 Alternatives
- ▶ 5 Other CEQA Considerations

Section 4 includes an analysis of alternatives to the proposed 2035 General Plan, as required by Section 15126.6 of the CEQA Guidelines. Other CEQA-mandated issues discussed within the context of this EIR are cumulative impacts, growth-inducing impacts, and significant and unavoidable adverse impacts (Section 5). Section 6 lists the preparers of the EIR and Section 7 identifies the references and citations used in drafting the EIR.

ES.4 PROJECT PURPOSE AND OBJECTIVES

The City’s intent for development and conservation is outlined throughout the Elements of the 2035 General Plan. These key policy issues were developed based on direction from the City Council in the 2035 General Plan Guiding Principles. The City’s Guiding Principles were developed to set a framework for the 2035 General Plan. They allow the City to measure future actions to ensure that the City grows consistent with its values. The Guiding Principles are referenced throughout the General Plan Elements to set the stage for goals, objectives, policies, and programs. The Guiding Principles also serve as the Project Objectives for this EIR. They include the following:

- ▶ Strive to enhance the City's authentic, local identity as a vibrant waterfront community.
- ▶ Preserve and restore historic resources and use design review to ensure compatibility with existing development.
- ▶ Focus higher-density development and mixed-use projects in areas adjacent to the train station.
- ▶ Provide regional leadership by working cooperatively to improve the economy and the quality of life in Solano County.
- ▶ Encourage the development of uses and protection of resources that attract visitors, enhancing the community as a tourism destination.
- ▶ Promote a vibrant Downtown that provides both daytime and nighttime activities to attract visitors.
- ▶ Protect and enhance the Suisun Marsh as a natural scenic recreational resource.
- ▶ Provide a variety of high-quality passive and active recreation and leisure activities.
- ▶ Promote arts and culture in the community, including theaters, galleries, museums, music venues, and other activities.
- ▶ Provide conference and meeting facilities.

- ▶ Continue to develop the Downtown as a vibrant, pedestrian-scaled commercial and entertainment center that reflects our community's unique waterfront character.
- ▶ Develop the Downtown as the social and cultural heart of the community.
- ▶ Provide convenient linkages from the train station and other regional connectors to bring patrons to the Downtown.
- ▶ Ensure safe and efficient walking, biking, driving, and parking in the Downtown.
- ▶ Strategically develop the Priority Development Area to provide convenient, attractive housing, shopping, services, and employment in the Downtown neighborhood.
- ▶ Strive for economic vitality, providing jobs, services, revenues, and opportunities.
- ▶ Maintain an economic base that is fiscally balanced and provides a wide range of job opportunities.
- ▶ Encourage a mix of uses that sustains a tax base that will allow the City to provide public services to the residents, businesses, and visitors of the community.
- ▶ Strategically develop vacant, underutilized, and infill land throughout the City, and especially in the Downtown.
- ▶ Retain and attract new businesses to support the tax base and provide jobs and services for the community.
- ▶ Provide quality community services and sound infrastructure.
- ▶ Deliver public facilities and services in a timely and cost-effective manner.
- ▶ Ensure availability of water and sewer services to accommodate the City's continued growth and prosperity.
- ▶ Plan for the design and cost of future infrastructure to serve the community as it grows.
- ▶ Ensure that neighborhoods maintain their character and vitality.
- ▶ Maintain complete, well-designed, and walkable neighborhoods, with places to gather, nearby services, and multi-modal access to jobs, recreation, and other community and regional services.
- ▶ Create policies and programs to maintain the character and vitality of neighborhoods.
- ▶ Foster transit-oriented development around the train station.
- ▶ Strive to protect the community and minimize vulnerability to disasters.
- ▶ Foster neighborhood safety through sensitive community planning practices, fire safety measures, building codes/seismic requirements, and effective code enforcement.

- ▶ Protect life and property through reliable law enforcement and fire protection, as well as active, sensitive service to members of the community in need.
- ▶ Minimize the City's vulnerability to natural and man-made disasters and strengthen the City's emergency response systems.
- ▶ Suisun City will foster an inclusive, multigenerational community that is economically and ethnically diverse.
- ▶ Foster volunteerism and encourage and recognize our service, non-profit, and faith-based organizations and their impact on the community.
- ▶ Encourage our community to live, work, and play locally, while supporting social and cultural activities, facilities and programs.
- ▶ Provide a full-spectrum of activities and services to meet the needs of the entire community, including youth and seniors.
- ▶ Suisun City will practice economically, fiscally and environmentally responsible municipal decision-making to avoid shifting today's costs to future generations.
- ▶ Utilize sustainable development and land use practices that provide for today's residents and businesses while preserving choices for the community in the future.
- ▶ Encourage a healthy living environment.
- ▶ Preserve and enhance natural resources and minimize negative environmental impacts.
- ▶ Suisun City will provide choices for attractive, convenient transportation.
- ▶ Maintain and construct roadway infrastructure as needed.
- ▶ Design for active pedestrian and bicycle-friendly paths and streets and public spaces.
- ▶ Provide transportation alternatives to the automobile, especially capitalizing on the location of the train station.

The objective of the Draft Climate Action Plan is to implement the 2035 General Plan.

ES.5 SUMMARY OF PROJECT DESCRIPTION

The General Plan is the City's overarching policy and planning document. The General Plan indicates the City's long-range objectives for physical development and conservation. The General Plan provides decision makers, City staff, other public agency staff, property owners, interested property developers and builders, and the public-at-large with the City's policy direction for managing land use change.

The General Plan is comprehensive in scope, addressing land use, transportation, community design, housing, conservation of resources, economic development, public facilities and infrastructure, public safety, and open space, among many other subjects.

The Draft Climate Action Plan identifies measures that implement the 2035 General Plan, while also contributing to the state's climate protection efforts and complying with applicable Bay Area Air Quality District standards. In addition, the Draft Climate Action Plan measures increase community resilience and efficiency of human / economic activities that consume resources which, in turn, lead to greenhouse gas emission (e.g., increasing local energy independence, reducing transportation-related emissions, improving building energy and water efficiency, and extending the life of area landfills). The Draft Climate Action Plan also supports regional collaborations among local jurisdictions on climate change issues. General Plan chapters include:

- ▶ Introduction
- ▶ Setting and Central Issues
- ▶ Community Character and Design Element
- ▶ Land Use Element
- ▶ Transportation Element
- ▶ Economic Development Element
- ▶ Housing Element
- ▶ Open Space and Conservation Element
- ▶ Community Facilities Element
- ▶ Public Health and Safety Element

The Elements of the General Plan present background and context to help the reader understand the focus and content of goals, objectives, policies, and programs. Goals are a description of a future desired state. Objectives are interim steps toward achieving a goal (normally measurable). Policies are a decision-making guide. Programs are proactive measures that will be undertaken, as necessary, to implement General Plan policies and ultimately achieve General Plan goals. Policies and programs are also used to mitigate environmental impacts associated with buildout of the 2035 General Plan.

Chapters of the Draft Climate Action Plan include:

- ▶ Introduction: Planning for Climate Change
- ▶ Emissions Inventory, Forecasts, and Targets
- ▶ Emissions Reduction Measures
- ▶ Benchmarks and Implementation

The 2035 General Plan could accommodate a total population of approximately 32,400, 11,300 dwelling units, 10,900 local jobs, and 5.8 million square feet of non-residential development at buildout of the Land Use Designations depicted in the City's Land Use Diagram. In addition, the 2035 General Plan accommodates additional parks and recreational facilities, school facilities and expansions, open space for conservation and for passive recreational use, open space buffers, drainage areas and non-vehicular trails, public infrastructure, and other improvements.

ES.6 PROJECT ALTERNATIVES

The focus for alternatives analysis in this EIR is whether different locations, amounts, or design of development would reduce potentially significant impacts attributable to the project. The City has considered a range of alternatives designed to reduce one or more potentially significant impacts associated with General Plan implementation.

- ▶ **Alternative 1. No Project: Buildout of the 1992 General Plan.** This alternative assumes that the 2035 General Plan would not be implemented and instead the City would build out as provided in the 1992 General Plan, as it has been amended in the time since adoption.
- ▶ **Alternative 2.** This alternative would avoid development in sensitive natural areas outside City limits to the west and would increase flexibility in allowable land use by increasing the amount of mixed-use development allowed in certain development opportunity areas throughout the City. This alternative would facilitate a greater number of professional office jobs by increasing the amount of this type of development and reducing slightly the amount of service sector jobs compared to the 2035 General Plan. This alternative would still allow for all local retail and service needs to be met, however.
- ▶ **Alternative 3.** This alternative would avoid development in sensitive natural areas outside City limits to the west and would also avoid development of properties outside City limits to the east. Alternative 3 also increases the number of compact residential development opportunities in areas with good transportation access. Alternative 3 would provide roughly 1/3rd of dwelling units in a higher-density residential category compared to approximately 1/5th in the 2035 General Plan. This alternative also is designed to ensure adequate capacity to serve local retail and service needs.

Each of the alternatives, overall, would reduce potential environmental effects compared to that which is anticipated to occur under the 2035 General Plan. Just one impact area – exposure to transportation noise – could potentially be increased by an alternative (Alternative 3). For the purposes of this EIR, Alternative 2 is environmentally superior. Please refer to Section 4 of this EIR for more detail.

ES.7 SUMMARY OF KNOWN CONTROVERSIAL ISSUES

To assist the City in determining the focus and scope of analysis for this EIR, the City circulated a Notice of Preparation (NOP) dated October 24th, 2011 to government agencies, special service districts, organizations, and individuals with an interest in or jurisdiction over the project. This step ensured early consultation on the scope of the EIR. The City held a public scoping meeting for the project on November 14th, 2013. The City developed and confirmed the preferred alternative for the General Plan and circulated an additional NOP dated October 24th, 2013 and an additional public scoping meeting on November 6th, 2013. Please see Appendix A for the NOP and responses to the NOP.

The NOP is a brief notice sent by the lead agency to inform responsible agencies, trustee agencies, and potentially affected federal, state, and local agencies that the lead agency plans to prepare an EIR. The NOP also seeks comments regarding the scope and content of the EIR. The NOP and comments received on the NOP are included as Appendix A to this EIR. The City received NOP comment letters from:

- ▶ California Emergency Management Agency
- ▶ California Department of Transportation (Caltrans) District 4
- ▶ Caltrans Division of Aeronautics
- ▶ Delta Stewardship Council
- ▶ Solano Local Agency Formation Commission (LAFCO)
- ▶ Native American Heritage Commission (NAHC)
- ▶ California Public Utilities Commission (CPUC)
- ▶ Solano Irrigation District (SID)

- ▶ Suisun-Solano Water Authority (SSWA)
- ▶ Hoffman Land Development Company (Robert Schwartz)
- ▶ United States Air Force (Travis Air Force Base)
- ▶ The City received verbal comments during the scoping meeting from:
 - ▶ Gary Laski
 - ▶ Ted Aksnes
 - ▶ City of Fairfield

The NOP comment letters and comments at the scoping meeting suggest that the following topics related to adverse physical environmental impacts are particular areas of focus for the City’s environmental analysis:

- ▶ State planning low provisions for hazards issues
- ▶ Operational impacts to State Route (SR) 12 and Interstate 80 (I-80)
- ▶ Traffic safety impacts related to traffic backing up on off-ramps
- ▶ Pedestrian and bicycle safety impacts related to increased vehicular travel demand
- ▶ Reliable water supply
- ▶ Protecting, restoring, and enhancing the Delta ecosystem
- ▶ Protect and enhance unique cultural, recreational, and agricultural values of the Delta
- ▶ Airport-related noise and safety impacts
- ▶ Hazardous wildlife populations near Travis Air Force Base
- ▶ Impacts to Important Farmland and Williamson Act properties
- ▶ Cultural resources impacts
- ▶ Vehicular and pedestrian safety impacts related to railroad crossings and the rail corridor
- ▶ Consideration of the 2010 Urban Water Management Plan and Gentry Project Water Supply Assessment
- ▶ Connectivity with Fairfield, in particular, the area near Union Avenue and Main Street
- ▶ Impacts to adjacent communities
- ▶ Impacts related to planning for a large amount of commercial development that may adversely affect existing commercial operations
- ▶ Traffic impacts along Walters Road, East Tabor Avenue, and Airbase Parkway
- ▶ Wetlands impacts, especially in the area south of Travis Air Force Base

- ▶ Impacts on special-status species and vernal pools
- ▶ Impacts related to consistency with agricultural zoning
- ▶ Water supply and treatment capacity
- ▶ Ideas for mitigation of potential adverse physical environmental impacts include:
 - ▶ Traffic mitigation should consider highway and non-highway improvements
 - ▶ Special attention should be given to solutions to travel demand impacts that do not involve highway construction
 - ▶ Pedestrian and bicycle safety measures needed to maintain and improve access to transit facilities, reduce vehicle trips, and therefore reduce traffic impacts on state highways
 - ▶ Monitor ground-disturbing activities for potential discovery of archeological resources
 - ▶ Consultation with Native Americans regarding any discovery of artifacts and human remains
 - ▶ Installation of grade separations at crossings, i.e., physically separating roads and railroad track by constructing overpasses or underpasses
 - ▶ Improvements to warning devices at existing highway-rail crossings
 - ▶ Installation of additional warning devices
 - ▶ Improvements to traffic signaling at intersections adjacent to crossings, e.g., traffic preemption
 - ▶ Installation of median separation to prevent vehicles from driving around railroad crossing gates
 - ▶ Prohibition of parking within 100 feet of crossings to improve the visibility of warning devices and approaching trains
 - ▶ Installation of pedestrian-specific warning devices, channelization, and sidewalks
 - ▶ Construction of pull-out lanes for buses and vehicles transporting hazardous materials
 - ▶ Installation of vandal-resistant fencing or walls to limit the access of pedestrians onto the railroad right-of-way
 - ▶ Elimination of driveways near crossings
 - ▶ Increased enforcement of traffic laws at crossings
 - ▶ Rail safety awareness programs to educate the public about the hazards of highway-rail grade crossings

- ▶ Avoid locating wetlands mitigation areas, stormwater management facilities, and other facilities that are known hazardous wildlife attractants in areas that would substantially contribute to an increase in aircraft-wildlife strikes at Travis Air Force Base
- ▶ Mitigation banking in the Travis Reserve

ES.8 SUMMARY OF ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACTS AND MITIGATION MEASURES

Information in Table ES-1, “Summary of Environmental Impacts and Mitigation Measures,” has been organized to correspond with the environmental issues discussed in Section 3, “Environmental Impact Analysis,” of this document. The summary table is arranged in four columns: Impacts; Level of Significance before Mitigation; Mitigation Measures; and Level of Significance after Mitigation.

This EIR also provides an analysis of cumulative impacts of the General Plan, taken together with other past, present, and probable future projects producing related impacts, as required by Section 15130 of the California Environmental Quality Act Guidelines (State CEQA Guidelines).

Cumulative impacts are described in detail in Section 5 of this EIR. The 2035 would have a cumulatively considerable contribution to significant cumulative impacts related to aesthetics, construction-related air pollutant emissions, operational air pollutant emissions, toxic air contaminants along regional roadways, toxic air contaminants along regional railroad lines, impacts of climate change on Suisun City, construction of new energy infrastructure, flooding, Fairfield’s level of service policy, roadway capacity of Caltrans routes, and water supply.

Table E0-1 Summary of Impacts and Mitigation Measures			
Impacts	Significance before Mitigation	Mitigation Measures	Significance after Mitigation
3.1 Agricultural Resources			
3.1-1: Conversion of Important Farmland to Non-Agricultural Uses. Implementation of the 2035 General Plan would not convert Important Farmland to non-agricultural use. The Planning Area and surrounding lands is Urban and Built-Up Land and Grazing Land. These farmland designations are not considered Important Farmland. There is no impact .	NI	No mitigation is required.	NI
3.1-2: Conflict with Existing Zoning for Agricultural Use or a Williamson Act Contract. The 2035 General Plan could accommodate new developments on parcels currently under Williamson Act contracts. Cancellation of one or more of these Williamson Act contracts could be required if development of land uses were to occur before the expiration of these contracts. In addition, implementation of the 2035 General Plan could accommodate land use change to a non-agricultural use for parcels with Solano County agricultural zoning designations. This impact is considered potentially significant .	PS	Because the 2035 General Plan could accommodate land use change to a non-agricultural use for parcels with current Solano County agricultural zoning designations, no feasible mitigation measures are available to reduce the potential for conflicts with existing zoning for agricultural uses.	SU
3.1-3: Land Use Conflicts with Existing Agricultural Uses. Implementation of the 2035 General Plan would not conflict with existing agricultural uses, which are currently ongoing grazing activities. Grazing lands are not generally associated with dust, noise, spraying, and other activities that would result in compatibility issues and these types of land uses are not known to create indirect pressure to convert grazing lands to urban uses or conflict with ongoing gazing operations. This impact would be less than significant .	LTS	No mitigation is required.	LTS
3.1-4: Conflict with Existing Zoning for Forest Land or Timberland or Result in the Conversion of Forest Land to Non-Forest Use. Implementation of the 2035 General Plan would not result in conflicts with existing zoning for forest land or timberland or result in the conversion of forest land to non-forest uses. The Planning Area is not zoned as forestland, timberland, or a Timberland Production Zone and does not contain forestry resources. There would be no impact .	NI	No mitigation is required.	NI

Table E0-1 Summary of Impacts and Mitigation Measures			
Impacts	Significance before Mitigation	Mitigation Measures	Significance after Mitigation
3.2 Air Quality			
3.2-1: Generation of Long-Term Operational, Regional Emissions of Criteria Air Pollutants and Precursors and Consistency with Air Quality Planning Efforts. Future development in Suisun City would generate emissions of criteria air pollutants (PM ₁₀ and PM _{2.5}) and ozone precursors, both of which adversely affect regional air quality. The 2035 General Plan would accommodate additional population and employment development, which would lead to operational (mobile-source and area-source) emissions. This impact is considered potentially significant .	PS	Implementation of 2035 General Plan policies and Draft Climate Action Plan reduction measures would reduce air pollutant emissions that affect both Suisun City and the region. However, the 2035 General Plan would still result in operational emissions in excess of threshold assumptions used by BAAQMD for relevant clean air plans. There are no additional feasible policies or programs that would reduce long-term impacts associated with operational air pollutants within Suisun City below relevant thresholds.	SU
3.2-2: Generation of Short-Term Construction-Related Emissions of Criteria Air Pollutants and Precursors. Criteria air pollutants and precursors resulting from construction activities accommodated under the 2035 General Plan would exceed BAAQMD's significance thresholds of 54 lb/day for ROG and NO _x . Policies in the 2035 General Plan would support compliance with BAAQMD-recommended standard construction mitigation practices. This would substantially reduce construction-generated air pollutant emissions attributable to projects accommodated under the 2035 General Plan. However, due to the large amount of total development proposed over the buildout period, construction-generated emissions of criteria air pollutants and precursors is considered substantial, and could violate an ambient air quality standard, contribute substantially to an existing or predicted air quality violation, and/or expose sensitive receptors to substantial pollutant concentrations. As a result, this impact is considered potentially significant .	PS	The General Plan provides policies intended to reduce construction related emissions, including the requirement that new development incorporate applicable emission control measures recommended by BAAQMD for construction, grading, excavation, and demolition. The City cannot demonstrate at this time that these measures would reduce impacts to a less-than-significant level. It is possible that construction-related emissions of criteria air pollutants and precursors could still exceed significance thresholds. There are no additional feasible mitigation measures available to address this significant impact.	SU
3.2-3: Generation of Long-Term, Operational, Local Mobile-Source Emissions of CO. Local mobile-source emissions of CO would not be expected to substantially contribute to emissions concentrations that would exceed the 1-hour ambient air quality standard of 20 ppm or the 8-hour standard of 9 ppm. As a result, this impact would be less than significant .	LTS	No mitigation is required.	LTS

NI = No Impact CC = Cumulatively Considerable LTS = Less than Significant S = Significant PS = Potentially Significant SU = Significant and Unavoidable
LCC = Less than Cumulatively Considerable

Table E0-1 Summary of Impacts and Mitigation Measures			
Impacts	Significance before Mitigation	Mitigation Measures	Significance after Mitigation
3.2-4: Exposure of Sensitive Receptors to Emissions of Toxic Air Contaminants. Implementation of the 2035 General Plan would reduce the potential for exposure of sensitive land uses to substantial concentrations of TACs. This impact is considered less than significant .	PS	The General Plan includes policies that would require buffers between sensitive land uses and sources of TACs, site-specific analysis for sensitive receptors that are proposed in areas where there could be potentially significant TAC-related impacts, a menu of effective mitigation, and specific performance standards that would substantially reduce impacts and avoid significant impacts. The City has provided for the review and conditioning of projects, including buffering and other measures to promote compatibility of adjacent land uses. Implementation of the 2035 General Plan policies would substantially reduce TAC emissions from construction and operational activities.	LTS
3.2-5: Exposure of Sensitive Receptors to Emissions of Odors. The City does not anticipate major sources of odors as a part of implementation of the 2035 General Plan. The impact is considered less than significant .	LTS	No mitigation is required.	LTS
3.3 Biological Resources			
3.3-1: Loss and Degradation of Special-status Plant Habitat and Potential Loss of Special-status Plants Implementing the 2035 General Plan would allow conversion of habitat for special-status plant species, which could result in loss of special-status plants either through direct removal or through habitat degradation. This impact would be potentially significant .	PS	Successful implementation of the policies and programs of the 2035 General Plan would avoid, minimize, or compensate for potential impacts on special-status plants and their habitat because it would require new developments to identify and avoid special-status plant populations and their habitats to the extent feasible and to mitigate unavoidable impacts in coordination with state and federal agencies, which use standards and protocols designed to mitigate special-status plant impacts to less-than-significant levels through preservation and enhancement of existing populations, creation of new populations through seed collection or transplantation, and/or restoring or creating suitable habitat in sufficient quantities to offset the loss of occupied habitat and individuals.	LTS

**Table E0-1
Summary of Impacts and Mitigation Measures**

Impacts	Significance before Mitigation	Mitigation Measures	Significance after Mitigation
<p>3.3-2: Loss and Degradation of Habitat for Special-status Wildlife Species and Potential Direct Take of Individuals Implementing the 2035 General Plan would allow conversion of undeveloped land that currently supports known occupied and potential habitat for special-status wildlife species to residential, commercial, and other developed land uses. Therefore, buildout of the 2035 General Plan would result in loss and degradation of suitable habitat for several special-status wildlife species and could result in take of state and federally listed wildlife species and loss or displacement of special-status wildlife populations. This impact would be potentially significant.</p>	PS	<p>Successful implementation of the policies and programs of the 2035 General Plan would avoid, minimize, or compensate for potential impacts on special-status wildlife and their habitat because it would require new developments to identify and avoid special-status wildlife and their habitats to the extent feasible and to mitigate unavoidable impacts in coordination with the appropriate state or federal agency charged with the protection of the subject species, including take authorization where applicable, and compliance with all conditions of the take authorization.</p>	LTS
<p>3.3-3: Loss and Degradation of Riparian Habitats or other Sensitive Natural Communities. Implementing the 2035 General Plan would result in conversion of undeveloped land that currently supports a limited amount of riparian habitat. (All other sensitive natural communities, including marsh and vernal pool habitats found in the planning area are addressed under impacts on federally protected wetlands and impacts on special-status species and are not discussed here.) Therefore, buildout of the 2035 General Plan could result in loss and degradation of riparian habitat. This impact would be potentially significant.</p>	PS	<p>Successful implementation of the General Plan policies and programs is expected to reduce potentially significant impacts on riparian habitat to a less-than-significant level by requiring delineation and avoidance of these habitats to the maximum extent feasible, establishment of riparian habitat buffers, and by providing compensation for unavoidable impacts in a manner that would ensure no net loss of overall riparian habitat functions.</p>	LTS
<p>3.3-4: Loss and Degradation of Federally Protected Wetlands Implementing the 2035 General Plan would result in conversion of undeveloped land that currently supports wetlands and other waters protected under Section 404 of the CWA. Therefore, buildout of the 2035 General Plan could result in loss and degradation of federally protected wetlands. This impact would be potentially significant.</p>	PS	<p>Successful implementation of the General Plan policies and programs is expected to reduce significant impacts on wetlands and other waters of the United States, and waters of the state, to a less-than-significant level by requiring delineation and avoidance of these habitats to the maximum extent feasible, establishment of wetland habitat buffers, and by providing compensation for unavoidable impacts in a manner that would ensure no net loss of overall wetland habitat functions and values, in accordance with USACE and San Francisco Bay RWQCB standards.</p>	LTS
<p>3.3-5: Interference with Wildlife Movement Corridors Implementing the 2035 General Plan would accommodate development within and adjacent to the Jepson Prairie-Suisun Marsh Corridor. Therefore, buildout of the 2035 General Plan could result in interference with a key wildlife movement corridor. This impact would be significant.</p>	PS	<p>Successful implementation of the policies and programs of the 2035 General Plan would avoid and minimize potential interference with wildlife movement corridors because it would require new developments to identify and evaluate movement corridors, avoid impacts to wildlife movement, and</p>	LTS

NI = No Impact CC = Cumulatively Considerable LTS = Less than Significant S = Significant PS = Potentially Significant SU = Significant and Unavoidable
LCC = Less than Cumulatively Considerable

Table E0-1 Summary of Impacts and Mitigation Measures			
Impacts	Significance before Mitigation	Mitigation Measures	Significance after Mitigation
		to preserve movement corridors through design and planning to the extent feasible. The policies require that land use changes in the vicinity of the Jepson Prairie-Suisun Marsh corridor are compatible with wildlife movement through the area. The programs and policies also require consistency with the SMHCP, which will provide that plan participants shall maintain corridors and limit incompatible uses in corridors that provide habitat connectivity. With the implementation of the above mentioned policies and programs, along with policy diagrams in the 2035 General Plan, the impact is considered less than significant.	
3.3-6: Conflict with an Adopted Habitat Conservation Plan or Local Plans Protecting Biological Resources. Implementing the 2035 General Plan could allow development that would conflict with the conservation goals of the SMHCP and other local plans protecting biological resources, such as the Suisun Marsh Protection Plan. This impact would be potentially significant .	PS	Successful implementation of the policies and programs of the 2035 General Plan would avoid and minimize potential conflicts with the SMHCP, the Suisun Marsh protection Plan, and other local plans because they specifically require compliance and consistency with the SMHCP and coordination with the Suisun Marsh Protection Plan, Bay Delta Conservation Plan, Delta Plan, and agencies implementing local policies.	LTS
3.4 Cultural Resources			
3.4-1: Potential Impacts to Historic Resources of Suisun City. Land use change accommodated under the 2035 General Plan could result in changes that could affect historic structures, historic districts, and the historic character of Suisun City when new development would require demolition of historically significant building or structures. This impact is potentially significant .	PS	The policies and programs in the 2035 General Plan help preserve and enhance Suisun City’s Historic Downtown by maintaining an inventory of historic and potentially-historic structures and resources in the Downtown Waterfront Specific Plan Area; encouraging preservation of buildings, building features, and other elements that have historical or architectural value; encouraging design and placement of development to be compatible with adjacent historical buildings and features; exploring tax and financial programs to encourage preservation of historical resources; and requiring documentation of historical resources when preservation is not feasible. While these policies and programs would encourage and enhance preservation of significant historical resources, it possible that new development could require demolition of historically significant resources. While documentation of resources prior to demolition would reduce	SU

Table E0-1 Summary of Impacts and Mitigation Measures			
Impacts	Significance before Mitigation	Mitigation Measures	Significance after Mitigation
		the magnitude of the impact, the loss of the historical resource would result in a significant impact. The policies and programs of the 2035 General Plan and compliance with other relevant requirements represent all feasible mitigation.	
3.4-2: Destruction or Damage to Archaeological Resources, Paleontological Resources, or Human Remains. Land use change contemplated under the 2035 General Plan would involve grading, excavation, and potentially other ground-disturbing activities that could disturb or damage any previously unidentified archaeological resources or human remains. This impact is potentially significant .	PS	The policies and programs of the 2035 General Plan and compliance with other relevant requirements represent all feasible mitigation. Because it is possible that all significant archaeological and paleontological resources will not be feasibly preserved, and because there is not additional feasible mitigation, the impact would be significant and unavoidable .	SU
3.5 Greenhouse Gas Emissions			
3.5-1: Increase in Greenhouse Gas Emissions. The 2035 General Plan would accommodate land use change that would increase GHG emissions at a rate higher than what is required statewide to achieve California’s statewide mandate under AB 32. Climate change attributable to human-caused GHG emissions is a significant cumulative impact. The impact is cumulatively considerable .	CC	No mitigation is required.	LCC
3.5-2: Impacts of Climate Change on Suisun City. Climate change is expected to result in a variety of effects that could potentially impact Suisun City: changes to terrestrial and aquatic ecosystems; increased energy demand; decreased water supply; increased risk of flooding; and increased frequency and intensity of wildfire. Substantial negative effects on residents, resources, structures, and the economy could result. This impact would be potentially significant .	PS	Implementation of the policies and programs in the 2035 General Plan would reduce the extent and severity of climate change–associated impacts by proactively planning for changes in climate and conditions, and providing methods for adapting to these changes. Projections for the above discussed potential impacts of climate change on Suisun City occur over a time span beyond buildout of the 2035 General Plan. The 2035 General Plan proposes feasible mitigation to respond and adapt to foreseeable impacts of climate change in the form of General Plan policies and programs, but the efficacy of the City’s policy approach for dealing with the local effects of climate change is unknowable at this time. For the purposes of this EIR, the impact is considered significant and unavoidable .	SU

NI = No Impact CC = Cumulatively Considerable LTS = Less than Significant S = Significant PS = Potentially Significant SU = Significant and Unavoidable
LCC = Less than Cumulatively Considerable

Table E0-1 Summary of Impacts and Mitigation Measures			
Impacts	Significance before Mitigation	Mitigation Measures	Significance after Mitigation
3.6 Energy			
3.6-1: Energy Efficiency Impacts. Land use change accommodated under the 2035 General Plan would increase local energy demand and would require that additional energy resources be delivered to residents and business within the Planning Area. Implementation of policies and programs in the 2035 General Plan, compliance with Building Energy Efficiency Standards (Title 24 of the California Code of Regulations) and other applicable regulations, and incorporation of strategies that reduce vehicular travel demand would ensure the Planning Area is developed using efficient land use and circulation patterns and energy conservation methods, thereby preventing the wasteful, inefficient, excessive, and unnecessary consumption of energy. This impact is considered less than significant .	LTS	No mitigation is required.	LTS
3.6-2: Increased Energy Demands and Need for Energy-Related Infrastructure. Implementation of the 2035 General Plan would increase demand for electrical and natural gas supplies and require the expansion and extension of utility infrastructure to deliver services to individual land uses within Suisun City. The electrical and natural gas supplies and size, location, and types of facilities required to serve individual development projects pursuant to the General Plan is not known at this time. The City has, therefore, conservatively determined that these impacts would be potentially significant .	PS	No mitigation beyond compliance with State and federal regulations and incorporation of 2035 General Plan policies and actions is available. The City has included throughout the 2035 General Plan all feasible measures available to mitigate such impacts. The impact is considered significant and unavoidable .	SU
3.7 Geology, Soils, Minerals, And Paleontological Resources			
3.7-1: Seismic Hazards Related to Surface Fault Rupture, Strong Seismic Ground Shaking, and Liquefaction. Development and land use changes consistent with the 2035 General Plan could subject people and structures to hazards associated with surface fault rupture (along the Vaca-Kirby Hills Fault), strong seismic ground shaking, and liquefaction. Implementation of the policies and programs in the 2035 General Plan, combined with other relevant regulations and programs, would reduce this impact to a less-than-significant level.	LTS	No mitigation is required.	LTS

**Table E0-1
Summary of Impacts and Mitigation Measures**

Impacts	Significance before Mitigation	Mitigation Measures	Significance after Mitigation
<p>3.7-2: Soil Erosion. Land use change accommodated under the 2035 General Plan would result in substantial grading, excavation, and movement of earth associated with site preparation activities. These activities would increase soil erosion, especially from wind and water, and the potential for siltation of local drainages. Implementation of the policies and programs in the 2035 General Plan, combined with other relevant regulations and programs, would reduce the potential for soil erosion to a less-than-significant level.</p>	LTS	No mitigation is required.	LTS
<p>3.7-3: Geologic Hazards Related to Unstable Soils, Expansive Soils, and Soil Unsuitable for Septic Systems. Land use change accommodated under the 2035 General Plan would result in the placement of buildings and infrastructure in areas of unstable soils, soils with high a shrink-swell potential, and in locations where the soil is not appropriate for use with septic systems. The impact is considered potentially significant.</p>	PS	With adoption and implementation of the proposed goals, policies, and programs in the 2035 General Plan, combined with current construction regulations, this impact is considered less than significant . The City’s finding is based on the requirement for site-specific geotechnical reports that identify specific methods to reduce hazards from construction in unstable and expansive soils, and because installation of septic systems would not be allowed.	LTS
<p>3.7-4: Loss or Damage to Paleontological Resources During Earth-Moving Activities. Paleontological resources could occur in Pleistocene-age sediments that underlie portions of the Planning Area. Construction activities in these areas could result in damage to, or destruction of unknown subsurface paleontological resources. Disturbance of unique paleontological resources would be a potentially significant impact.</p>	PS	With adoption and implementation of the proposed goals, policies, and programs in the 2035 General Plan, this impact would be less than significant because earth-moving activities in paleontologically-sensitive rock formations would be subject to requirements consisting of construction worker personnel education, halting of work in the vicinity of any fossil specimen(s) uncovered, and preparation of a recovery plan for said specimen(s).	LTS
<p>3.8 Hazards and Hazardous Materials</p>			
<p>3.8-1: Routine Transport, Use, or Disposal of Hazardous Materials. Land use change accommodated under the 2035 General Plan would result in an increase in the routine transport, use, and/or disposal of hazardous materials, which could result in exposure of such materials to the public through either routine use or accidental release. Implementation of 2035 General Plan policies and programs, as well as the implementation of the Local Hazard Mitigation Plan in combination with existing state and federal regulations, would reduce impacts related to the routine transportation of hazardous materials. This impact is considered less than significant.</p>	LTS	No mitigation is required.	LTS

NI = No Impact CC = Cumulatively Considerable LTS = Less than Significant S = Significant PS = Potentially Significant SU = Significant and Unavoidable
LCC = Less than Cumulatively Considerable

Table E0-1 Summary of Impacts and Mitigation Measures			
Impacts	Significance before Mitigation	Mitigation Measures	Significance after Mitigation
<p>3.8-2: Potential Human Health Hazards from Exposure to Existing Hazardous Materials. Land uses accommodated under the 2035 General Plan could result in exposure to existing hazardous materials. Implementation of policies and programs in the 2035 General Plan would ensure that hazardous materials or waste is remediated in conformance with applicable federal and state standards. Demolition or renovation of existing older structures or replacement of infrastructure could potential exposure of humans and the environment to ACMs and materials containing lead. However, policies and programs in the 2035 require actions to address asbestos and lead-based paint, as well, and the impact is considered less than significant.</p>	PS	No mitigation is required beyond the policies and programs of the 2035 General Plan.	LTS
<p>3.8-3: Public Health Hazards from Project Development on a Known Hazardous Materials Site Compiled Pursuant to Government Code Section 65962.5. Travis AFB is identified as a Superfund site and is undergoing investigation and remediation under the direction of EPA and DTSC. 2035 General Plan policies and programs would ensure that contaminated soils and groundwater on Travis AFB do not pose human health risks by using existing facility information to identify areas of hazardous materials use and cleanup hazards and requiring consultation with Travis AFB to discuss land use issues. This impact is considered less than significant.</p>	PS	No mitigation is required beyond existing regulations and the policies and programs of the 2035 General Plan.	LTS
<p>3.8-4: Emission or Handling of Hazardous or Acutely Hazardous Materials, Substances, or Waste within One-Quarter Mile of an Existing or Proposed School. Implementation of the 2035 General Plan would not result in development of uses that would emit or handle hazardous waste within ¼ mile of an existing school. Population growth from new land uses accommodate under the 2035 General Plan could result in the need for new schools. Enforcement of California Department of Education school siting regulations, permitting requirements for individual hazardous material handlers and emitters, and enforcement of Public Resources Code Section 21151 during project-level environmental review would prevent future conflicts between hazardous materials handling and emissions and schools. This impact is considered less than significant.</p>	LTS	No mitigation is required.	LTS

**Table E0-1
Summary of Impacts and Mitigation Measures**

Impacts	Significance before Mitigation	Mitigation Measures	Significance after Mitigation
<p>3.8-5: Safety Hazard for People Residing or Working Near Travis AFB. Lands within the Planning Area are designated as Zones C and D in the Travis AFB Land Use Compatibility Plan. Implementation of policies and programs in the 2035 General Plan would ensure that development is consistent with the Travis AFB LUCP. This impact is considered less than significant.</p>	PS	No mitigation beyond existing regulations and the policies and programs of the 2035 General Plan is required.	LTS
<p>3.8-6: Interference with an Adopted Emergency-Response or Emergency-Evacuation Plan. Implementation of the 2035 General Plan would accommodate land use change, which would indirectly generate additional vehicular travel and would involve the development of additional residences requiring evacuation in case of an emergency. Implementation of 2035 General Plan policies and programs and the LHMP, as well as continued coordination with the Solano County Office of Emergency Services and participation in the County’s Multi-Hazard Mitigation Plan would ensure that future development would not interfere with emergency-response or emergency-evacuation plans. This impact is considered less than significant.</p>	PS	No mitigation beyond existing regulations and the policies and programs of the 2035 General Plan is required.	LTS
<p>3.8-7: Exposure of Structures to Urban and Wildland Fires. Most of the undeveloped portions of the Planning Area are characterized as moderate fire risk. However, according to draft fire risk maps from CALFIRE, there are areas of high fire risk in the south-central and western portions of the Planning Area. Implementation of policies and programs in the 2035 General Plan and compliance with the Suisun Fire Protection District and California Fire Code regulations would ensure people and structures would not be exposed to a significant risk of loss or injury involving wildland fires. This impact is considered less than significant.</p>	LTS	No mitigation is required.	LTS
<p>3.9 Hydrology and Water Quality</p>			
<p>3.9-1: Increased Erosion and Violation of Water Quality Standards. The changes in land use designations that would occur with implementation of the 2035 General Plan could result in additional short-term construction-related and long-term operational erosion and discharges of pollutants to receiving water bodies. Such pollutants could result in violation of water quality standards and could result in downstream siltation. However, with implementation of 2035 General</p>	LTS	No mitigation is required.	LTS

NI = No Impact CC = Cumulatively Considerable LTS = Less than Significant S = Significant PS = Potentially Significant SU = Significant and Unavoidable
LCC = Less than Cumulatively Considerable

Table E0-1 Summary of Impacts and Mitigation Measures			
Impacts	Significance before Mitigation	Mitigation Measures	Significance after Mitigation
Plan policies and programs, combined with current land use, stormwater, grading, and erosion control regulations, this impact would be less than significant .			
3.9-2: Increased Flooding and Hydromodification from Increased Stormwater Runoff. Land use change accommodated under the 2035 General Plan would increase the amount of impervious surfaces, thereby increasing surface runoff. This increase in surface runoff would result in an increase in both the total volume and the peak discharge rate of stormwater runoff, and therefore could result in greater potential for hydromodification and on- and off-site flooding. However, with implementation of federal, state, and local stormwater requirements, this impact would be less than significant .	LTS	No mitigation is required.	LTS
3.9-3: Flood Hazards From Placement of Structures within a 100-Year Floodplain or From Levee Failure. Land use change accommodated under the 2035 General Plan could include residential or commercial structures in floodplains, thereby exposing people and structures to flood hazards. Similar exposure could occur in areas subject to flooding because of failure of levees in and near Suisun Marsh. Sea level rise associated with global climate change would exacerbate these risks. Implementation of 2035 General Plan policies and programs, combined with other relevant regulations and programs, would reduce the potential for flooding. However, this impact is considered significant .	PS	No additional feasible mitigation is available to reduce this impact beyond 2035 General Plan policies and programs. This impact would remain significant and unavoidable because the potential for flooding from failure of a Delta/Suisun Marsh levee and placement of structures within a 100-year floodplain would remain, even with implementation of the policies in the 2035 General Plan.	SU
3.9-4: Potential for Failure of a Dam. Of the 18 dams in Solano County, the State OES has identified 10 where dam inundation has the potential to cause human injury or loss of life, 2 of which may result in damage to Suisun City. In the unlikely event of dam failure, people and structures are exposed to inundation, and death, injury, or loss of property could result. 2035 General Plan policies and programs, combined with other relevant state and local regulations, would minimize the potential for effects on the Planning Area from dam failure. This impact is considered less than significant .	LTS	No mitigation is required.	LTS

Table E0-1 Summary of Impacts and Mitigation Measures			
Impacts	Significance before Mitigation	Mitigation Measures	Significance after Mitigation
3.9-5: Interference with Groundwater Recharge. Land use change accommodated under the 2035 General Plan would result in additional impervious surfaces, which could reduce the amount of groundwater recharge. Reductions in groundwater recharge could, in turn, affect the yield of hydrologically connected wells. However, a substantial reduction in groundwater recharge is not anticipated. With implementation of 2035 General Plan policies and programs, this impact is considered less than significant .	LTS	No mitigation is required.	LTS
3.10 Land Use and Planning			
3.10-1: Disruption and Division of Established Communities. Implementation of the 2035 General Plan would not divide or disrupt any existing community. The 2035 General Plan supports reinvestment and infill development, with a focus on vacant and underutilized properties. Existing neighborhoods would not be transformed relative to their existing character as a result of 2035 General Plan policies and programs. The 2035 General Plan does not identify future transportation facilities or other type of infrastructure that would divide existing developed communities. The 2035 General Plan does not propose other changes that would disrupt or divide existing neighborhoods. This impact would be less than significant .	LTS	No mitigation is required beyond the policies and programs included in the 2035 General Plan.	LTS
3.10-2: Conflict with Other Plans. Goals, policies, and programs of the 2035 General Plan would not conflict with relevant plans, programs, and regulations with jurisdiction over components of the 2035 General Plan that would cause adverse physical effects under CEQA. Therefore, this impact is considered less than significant .	LTS	No mitigation is required.	LTS
3.11 Noise and Vibration			
3.11-1: Potential for Temporary, Short-Term Exposure of Sensitive Receptors to Construction Noise. Short-term construction source noise levels could exceed the applicable City standards at nearby noise-sensitive receptors. In addition, if construction activities were to occur during more noise-sensitive hours, construction source noise levels could also result in annoyance and/or sleep disruption to occupants of existing and proposed noise-sensitive land uses and create a substantial temporary increase in ambient noise levels. The 2035 General Plan	PS	The policies and programs of the 2035 General Plan represent all feasible mitigation.	SU

NI = No Impact CC = Cumulatively Considerable LTS = Less than Significant S = Significant PS = Potentially Significant SU = Significant and Unavoidable
LCC = Less than Cumulatively Considerable

**Table E0-1
Summary of Impacts and Mitigation Measures**

Impacts	Significance before Mitigation	Mitigation Measures	Significance after Mitigation
includes policies and programs to reduce construction noise levels. The City cannot demonstrate at this time that the implementation of these policies and programs would avoid temporary construction noise impacts. The impact is considered significant .			
3.11-2: Long-Term Noise Exposure for Noise-Sensitive Land Uses. Existing and planned noise-sensitive land uses under the 2035 General Plan could occur in areas that either are currently adversely affected by transportation and non-transportation noise sources, or will be in the future. This could expose noise-sensitive uses to noise levels in excess of the 1992 General Plan noise policies and the 2035 General Plan noise policies. Implementation of the 2035 General Plan would also permanently and substantially increase existing ambient noise levels in certain locations. The 2035 General Plan establishes the City’s standards for land use and noise compatibility and strategies for addressing conflicts. While the policy approach would reduce adverse noise exposure impacts, the City cannot demonstrate that potentially significant impacts would be avoided in every case. The impact is considered significant .	PS	The policies and programs of the 2035 General Plan represent all feasible mitigation.	SU
3.11-3: Increases in Vibration Levels. Construction of projects under the 2035 General Plan could cause a temporary, short-term disruptive vibration if it were to occur near sensitive receptors. Under the 2035 General Plan, future development of new vibration-sensitive land uses could occur within vibration-generating areas (e.g., railroads). The impact is considered significant .	S	The policies and programs of the 2035 General Plan represent all feasible mitigation.	SU
3.11-5: Airport Noise Exposure. Future development of new noise-sensitive land uses would occur under the 2035 General Plan within areas that are affected by noise from airport operations. However, the 2035 General Plan would also include policies and actions to reduce the potential for noise levels to exceed established standards at noise-sensitive receptors. This impact would be less than significant .	PS	The 2035 General Plan does not accommodate new residential development in areas identified in the Travis AFB LUCP within the 60-65 dB CNEL noise contour. The 2035 General Plan includes land use restrictions relative to Travis AFB to avoid compatibility issues and review and conditioning for projects in areas affected by Travis AFB noise.	LTS

Table E0-1 Summary of Impacts and Mitigation Measures			
Impacts	Significance before Mitigation	Mitigation Measures	Significance after Mitigation
3.12 Population, Employment, and Housing			
3.12-1: Temporary Increase in Population and Subsequent Housing Demand during Construction. Implementation of the 2035 General Plan would generate a temporary increase in employment and subsequent housing demand from construction jobs. Because a substantial permanent relocation of these workers is not anticipated as a result of construction activity accommodated under the 2035 General Plan, neither substantial population growth nor an increase in housing demand in the region is anticipated from generation of these jobs. This impact is considered less than significant .	LTS	No mitigation is required.	LTS
3.12-2: Induce Population Growth. Implementation of the 2035 General Plan would accommodate population growth associated with development of residential land uses and indirectly through development of commercial, retail, office, and light industrial uses throughout the Planning Area. Because the 2035 General Plan provides a framework for the orderly and efficient long-term growth within Suisun City through the year 2035, substantial population and employment increases over existing conditions would be expected, and the 2035 General Plan would encourage substantial growth over the existing levels in the City. The level of population growth that could potentially be accommodated under the 2035 General Plan is less than that projected in the ABAG regional population projections. In addition, implementation of the 2035 General Plan would help create a substantially more balanced jobs/housing index by providing new housing and local jobs for existing and future residents. This impact would be less than significant .	LTS	No mitigation is required.	LTS
3.12-3: Displacement of Existing People or Housing. The 2035 General Plan supports reinvestment and infill development of vacant and underutilized properties. The 2035 General Plan does not propose displacement of people or housing. However, it is possible that some housing could be removed during buildout. The impact is considered potentially significant .	PS	The General Plan is intended to guide long-term land use change. There is no additional feasible mitigation that would prevent against the possibility of displacement. The impact is significant and unavoidable .	SU

Table E0-1 Summary of Impacts and Mitigation Measures			
Impacts	Significance before Mitigation	Mitigation Measures	Significance after Mitigation
3.13 Utilities and Service Systems, Public Services, and Recreation			
3.13-1: Increased Demand for Water Supplies. Implementation of the 2035 General Plan would increase water demand. Existing regulations require additional water conservation measures in new development and for large developments to demonstrate ongoing reliable water supply. Considering existing regulations that require conservation and demonstration of water supply and that the overall change in water demand compared to existing supply is not substantial, the impact is considered less than significant .	LTS	No mitigation is required.	LTS
3.13-2: Increased Demand for Water Supply Treatment and Conveyance Facilities. Land use change contemplated under the 2035 General Plan would increase demand for water conveyance and treatment facilities, including water transmission mains, pumping stations, and storage tanks, and SSWA treatment facilities. Construction of new or expansion of existing water conveyance and treatment facilities could have adverse effects on the physical environment. This impact is considered potentially significant .	PS	The policies and programs of the 2035 General Plan and compliance with other relevant requirements represent all feasible mitigation. The impact is considered significant and unavoidable .	SU
3.13-3: Exceed Wastewater Treatment Requirements of the San Francisco Regional Water Quality Control Board. Land use change contemplated under the 2035 General Plan would increase wastewater effluent discharged to wastewater systems. There are no land uses proposed in the 2035 General Plan that would be expected to generate wastewater of such poor quality and concentration or in such amounts that the Fairfield-Suisun WWTP's treatment systems would not be able to treat according to applicable water quality standards. This impact is considered less than significant .	LTS	No mitigation is required.	LTS
3.13-4: Construction of New or Expanded Wastewater Collection, Conveyance, and Treatment Plant Facilities. Land use change contemplated under the 2035 General Plan would increase wastewater flow that would increase the local demand for wastewater collection and conveyance facilities. Implementation of the 2035 General Plan would not result in an increase in wastewater flows that exceed the FSSD Fairfield-Suisun Subregional WWTP design capacity. However, wastewater conveyance infrastructure, such as pipes and pumping stations, will be required in currently undeveloped areas where no such	PS	The policies and programs of the 2035 General Plan and compliance with other relevant requirements represent all feasible mitigation. The impact is considered significant and unavoidable .	SU

**Table E0-1
Summary of Impacts and Mitigation Measures**

Impacts	Significance before Mitigation	Mitigation Measures	Significance after Mitigation
<p>infrastructure currently exists and existing infrastructure would require upgrades to serve new development. Construction of new or expansion of existing wastewater facilities could have adverse effects on the physical environment. This impact is considered potentially significant.</p>			
<p>3.13-5: New or Expanded Storm Water Drainage Facilities. The 2035 General Plan is anticipated to accommodate a variety of land use changes, including intensification of development on existing sites, demolition of existing structures with replacement land uses, and changes from undeveloped lands to developed, urban uses. Each type of land use change would each contribute different relative amounts of stormwater runoff corresponding to the percentage of impervious surface added. The construction of new facilities and conveyance infrastructure or the expansion of existing facilities and infrastructure to handle this runoff could generate significant environmental effects. This impact is considered potentially significant.</p>	PS	<p>The policies and programs of the 2035 General Plan and compliance with other relevant requirements represent all feasible mitigation. The impact is considered significant and unavoidable.</p>	SU
<p>3.13-6: Increased Demand for Solid Waste Disposal and Compliance with Solid Waste Regulations. Land use change accommodated under the 2035 General Plan would increase the population of Suisun City, with an associated increase in solid waste streams. Based on this generation rate, buildout could generate an additional 10.6 tons of solid waste per day (3,864 tons per year), conservatively estimated. Because Potrero Hills Landfill has sufficient permitted capacity to accommodate solid-waste disposal needs, no new facilities would need to be constructed to serve 2035 General Plan buildout. This impact is considered than less than significant.</p>	LTS	<p>No mitigation is required.</p>	LTS
<p>3.13-7: Demand for Additional Fire Protection Facilities. Implementation of the 2035 General Plan would accommodate construction of new physical structures and population, which would create additional demand for fire protection services, over current demand levels. The increased demand for services would result in the need for new fire stations, the construction of which could result in adverse impacts on the physical environment. However, the environmental effects of construction such facilities are analyzed program level throughout the environmental subsections of Section 3.0</p>	LTS	<p>No mitigation is required.</p>	LTS

NI = No Impact CC = Cumulatively Considerable LTS = Less than Significant S = Significant PS = Potentially Significant SU = Significant and Unavoidable
LCC = Less than Cumulatively Considerable

Table E0-1 Summary of Impacts and Mitigation Measures			
Impacts	Significance before Mitigation	Mitigation Measures	Significance after Mitigation
of this EIR and there are no additional significant impacts beyond that which is already fully addressed. This impact is considered less than significant .			
3.13-8: Increased Demand for Law Enforcement Facilities, Services, and Equipment. Implementation of the 2035 General Plan would increase the demand for law enforcement facilities and services. The increased demand for services could result in the need for new police protection facilities, the construction of which could have adverse impacts on the physical environment. However, the environmental effects of construction such facilities are analyzed program level throughout the environmental subsections of Section 3.0 of this EIR and there are no additional significant impacts beyond that which is already fully addressed. This impact is considered less than significant .	LTS	No mitigation is required.	LTS
3.13-9: Increased Demand for Public School Facilities and Services. Implementation of the 2035 General Plan would accommodate new residential development in Suisun City, which would increase population, including school-aged children requiring school services. The increased demand for services could result in the need for new or expanded school facilities, the construction of which could have adverse impacts on the physical environment. However, the environmental effects of such facilities expansion are analyzed program level throughout the environmental subsections of Section 3.0 of this EIR and there are no additional significant impacts beyond that which is already fully addressed. In addition, school impact fees will be collected in accordance with SB 50 to address increased demand for educational services. This impact is considered less than significant .	LTS	No mitigation is required.	LTS
3.13-10: Need for New or Expanded Parks and/or Recreation Facilities and/or Recreation Facilities and Potential for Accelerated Deterioration of Existing Parks. Implementation of the 2035 General Plan would result in the development of new residences in Suisun City, which would add new population and increase demand for new and existing parks, as well as recreation facilities. The construction of new parks and recreation facilities could have adverse impacts on the physical environment. In addition, this additional population would be likely to use existing park facilities potentially resulting in the accelerated physical deterioration of existing facilities. However, the	LTS	No mitigation is required.	LTS

**Table E0-1
Summary of Impacts and Mitigation Measures**

Impacts	Significance before Mitigation	Mitigation Measures	Significance after Mitigation
<p>environmental effects of such facilities expansion are analyzed throughout program level the environmental subsections of Section 3.0 of this EIR and there are no additional significant impacts beyond that which is already fully addressed. In addition, dedication of parkland or payment of in-lieu fees could also be used by the City to improve, expand, and maintain existing City parks to ensure that accelerated deterioration does not occur. This impact is considered less than significant.</p>			
3.14 Traffic and Transportation			
<p>3.14-1: Roadway Traffic Capacity – Non-Caltrans Roadways. Implementing the 2035 General Plan would increase traffic volumes on non-Caltrans roadways within Suisun City, the City of Fairfield, and Solano County. On one roadway segment, Walters Road south of Air Base Parkway, the projected LOS would exceed the City of Fairfield’s arterial LOS standard of D, falling to LOS E. This impact is considered cumulatively considerable.</p>	CC	No feasible mitigation measures beyond the 2035 General Plan policies and programs are available.	SU
<p>3.14-2: Roadway Traffic Capacity – Caltrans Routes. Implementing the 2035 General Plan would cause SR 12 between Beck Avenue and Walters Road to fall from LOS C or better (2010) to LOS D or worse in 2035. This impact is considered cumulatively considerable.</p>	CC	No feasible mitigation measures beyond the 2035 General Plan policies and programs are available.	SU
<p>3.14-3: Roadway Traffic Capacity – CMP Routes. Implementing the 2035 General Plan would increase traffic volumes on CMP routes, including SR 12 and Walters Road. The traffic increases would not cause these CMP routes to exceed the CMP LOS standard. There is no significant cumulative impact.</p>	NI	No mitigation is required.	NI
<p>3.14-4: Roadway Network Policy Consistency. The 2035 General Plan goals, objectives, policies, and programs with respect to roadway network planning, operations, and maintenance are internally consistent with the other Transportation Element policies and with the land use projections and policies in the Land Use Element. This impact is considered less than significant.</p>	LTS	No mitigation is required.	LTS

NI = No Impact CC = Cumulatively Considerable LTS = Less than Significant S = Significant PS = Potentially Significant SU = Significant and Unavoidable
LCC = Less than Cumulatively Considerable

Table E0-1 Summary of Impacts and Mitigation Measures			
Impacts	Significance before Mitigation	Mitigation Measures	Significance after Mitigation
3.14-5: Conflict with Adopted Policies, Plans, or Programs Regarding Public Transit, Bicycle, or Pedestrian Facilities. The 2035 General Plan is not projected to create conflicts with adopted policies, plans or programs regarding public transit, bicycle or pedestrian facilities, or otherwise decrease the performance or safety of such facilities. There is no impact .	NI	No mitigation is required.	NI
3.14-6: Hazards Due to a Design Feature or Incompatible Uses. Implementing the 2035 General Plan would not substantially increase hazards due to a design feature (e.g., sharp curves or dangerous intersections) or incompatible uses. This impact is considered less than significant .	LTS	No mitigation is required.	LTS
3.14-7: Emergency Access. Implementing the 2035 General Plan would not result in inadequate emergency access. This impact is considered less than significant .	LTS	No mitigation is required.	LTS
3.15 Visual Resources			
3.15-1: Adverse Impacts on Scenic Vistas and Visual Resources. Implementation of the 2035 General Plan could result in new urban development that would permanently alter and block some views of the Suisun Marsh, the Coastal Range, Cement Hill, the Potrero Hills, and the Vaca Mountains, which are defined by the City as locally important scenic vistas. This impact would be significant .	PS	No feasible mitigation is available that could fully preserve the existing views of the Suisun Marsh, the Coastal Range, Cement Hill, the Potrero Hills, and the Vaca Mountains while also accommodating future population and economic growth in the City under the 2035 General Plan. Therefore, this impact would remain significant and unavoidable .	SU
3.15-2: Damage to Scenic Resources within a State Scenic Highway. There are no officially designated scenic highways located within Suisun City or within Solano County. There would be no impact .	NI	No mitigation is required.	NI
3.15-3: Degradation of the Existing Visual Character. Implementation of the 2035 General Plan would substantially alter the existing visual character of the Planning Area. The 2035 General Plan provides extensive policy direction to ensure that new development, redevelopment, and infill projects contribute in a positive way to the overall visual character of the community. The General Plan’s design guidance will be largely implemented through parallel revisions to the City’s Zoning Ordinance, but will also be implemented through the typical project and plan review process, wherein the City may condition new development, redevelopment, and infill projects to ensure that they are consistent with design policies of the General Plan. However, there	PS	There is no feasible mitigation that would fully address aesthetic impacts associated with changes to the existing visual character. Although the 2035 General Plan includes policies and programs that would guide new developments so that they contribute positively to the local visual character, there is no mechanism to allow new developments, while also avoiding completely changes to the existing visual character.	SU

**Table E0-1
Summary of Impacts and Mitigation Measures**

Impacts	Significance before Mitigation	Mitigation Measures	Significance after Mitigation
<p>are no feasible policies or programs that could maintain the existing visual character of the City, while also allowing the City to accommodate future needs for population and employment growth in the Planning Area. This impact would be potentially significant.</p>			
<p>3.15-4: Increase in Nighttime Lighting and Daytime Glare. Implementation of the 2035 General Plan would accommodate land use change and new developments that will require security lighting and other types of lighting. This could inadvertently cause increased light and glare, potentially obscuring views of stars and other features of the nighttime sky. In addition, nighttime lighting or the presence of reflective surfaces on buildings may result in glare shining on residences and motorists traveling along SR 12, Petersen Road, and other roadways in day and nighttime conditions. Because land use change accommodated under the 2035 General Plan would introduce substantial new light sources, this is considered a potentially significant impact.</p>	PS	<p>With implementation of policies in the 2035 General Plan, the potential light and glare impacts of future development projects would be minimized to the maximum extent feasible. No mitigation measures beyond the policies and programs of the 2035 General Plan are feasible that would fully preserve existing nighttime views, while at the same time allowing population growth and economic development within the City.</p>	SU

NI = No Impact CC = Cumulatively Considerable LTS = Less than Significant S = Significant PS = Potentially Significant SU = Significant and Unavoidable
LCC = Less than Cumulatively Considerable

This page intentionally left blank.

1 INTRODUCTION

1.1 TYPE OF EIR

This environmental impact report (EIR) evaluates the impacts of the *City of Suisun City 2035 General Plan* (2035 General Plan) and *Draft Climate Action Plan*. The 2035 General Plan EIR is a program EIR, as described under the California Environmental Quality Act (CEQA) and the State CEQA Guidelines (California Code of Regulations, Title 14, Sections 15000 et seq. [14 CCR 15000 et seq.]).

According to the State CEQA Guidelines (Section 15168[a]), a state or local agency should prepare a program EIR, rather than a project EIR, when the lead agency proposes the following:

- ▶ a series of related actions that are linked geographically;
- ▶ logical parts of a chain of contemplated events, rules, regulations, or plans that govern the conduct of a continuing program; or,
- ▶ individual activities carried out under the same authorizing statutory or regulatory authority and having generally similar environmental effects that can be mitigated in similar ways.

A program EIR “may be prepared on a series of actions that can be characterized as one large project and are related...in connection with the issuance of rules, regulations, plans, or other general criteria to govern the conduct of a continuing program” (State CEQA Guidelines Section 15168[a][3]). In this case, the program EIR will address the 2035 General Plan and Draft Climate Action Plan, which is the proposed “project,” as defined by CEQA. This program EIR considers a series of actions related to implementation of the 2035 General Plan, including the Draft Climate Action Plan.

Although the legally required contents of a program EIR are the same as those of a project EIR, in practice, there are differences in level of detail. General Plans by their nature are broad, long-range, and conceptual. Program EIRs are typically conceptual and abstract. They contain a more general discussion of impacts, alternatives, and mitigation measures than do project-level EIRs. This is appropriate since the 2035 General Plan is meant to guide long-term development and conservation throughout the City’s Planning Area. The 2035 General Plan does not dictate specific site-planning requirements, internal transportation networks, or other project-level details. The City acknowledges and intends to make best use of the advantages to the programmatic approach to environmental analysis and reporting in this EIR. As noted in CEQA Guidelines Section 15168(b):

“Use of a program EIR can provide the following advantages. The program EIR can:

- (1) Provide an occasion for a more exhaustive consideration of effects and alternatives than would be practical in an EIR on an individual action;
- (2) Ensure consideration of cumulative impacts that might be slighted in a case-by-case analysis;
- (3) Avoid duplicative reconsideration of basic policy considerations;

- (4) Allow the Lead Agency to consider broad policy alternatives and programwide mitigation measures at an early time when the agency has greater flexibility to deal with basic problems or cumulative impacts; and
- (5) Allow reduction in paperwork.

The analysis in this program EIR is considered the first tier of environmental review and creates the foundation upon which future, project-specific CEQA documents can build. Tiering refers to the concept of a multi-level approach to preparing environmental documents set forth in the Public Resources Code Section 21083.3 and the State CEQA Guidelines Section 15152.

Project-level environmental analysis can be streamlined to limit the scope of site-specific approvals following the preparation of an EIR for a general plan.¹ This streamlining provision applies to site-specific approvals for projects that are consistent with the general plan. This program EIR will, in practice, help determine the need for subsequent environmental documentation, as well as dictate the scope of project level CEQA review.

A program EIR can be incorporated by reference into subsequently prepared environmental documents to address cumulative impacts and growth-inducing impacts, allowing the subsequent documents to focus on new or site-specific impacts (State CEQA Guidelines Section 15168[d]).

While many general plan program EIRs include only generalized analysis of conceptual land use change estimates, the City elected to include an enhanced level of analysis for this General Plan and EIR. The 2035 General Plan included detailed land use programming, with a focus on vacant and underutilized properties that would be appropriate for development between present and 2035. This EIR includes a comprehensive analysis of land use change anticipated under the 2035 General Plan, with additional detail in the analysis focused on these development opportunity sites. This EIR includes quantified estimates in certain impact areas, such as transportation, air quality, greenhouse gas emissions, noise, and other topics, based on reasonable assumptions as to the amount, type, and character of land use change under the 2035 General Plan. In addition, this EIR makes reference to 2035 General Plan policies and programs that will serve as mitigation for projects accommodated under the Plan. This enhanced level of analysis and mitigation guidance will serve to streamline and expedite later projects that are consistent with, and implement the policies and programs of the 2035 General Plan.

This program EIR also addresses the adverse physical environmental effects associated with the City's Draft Climate Action Plan. The reduction measures in the Draft Climate Action Plan implement policies in the 2035 General Plan and to a great extent analysis of the 2035 General Plan would simultaneously address impacts associated with the Draft Climate Action Plan.

1.1.1 TIERING AND STREAMLINING

The City intends to use the 2035 General Plan EIR to streamline environmental review and approval of private and public projects that are consistent with the 2035 General Plan. The City will make full use of existing streamlining provided by CEQA, and will make full use of emerging streamlining techniques, as appropriate.

¹ This section of the Public Resources Code also refers to consistency with community plans and zoning, but the above discussion is tailored to this General Plan EIR.

The material provided under Public Resources Code 21083.3 and CEQA Guidelines 15183 is sometimes called the “partial exemption.” Under this provision, CEQA only applies to issues “peculiar to the site.” Lead agencies can use programmatic EIRs for the general plan to analyze impacts of projects that could be accommodated under the plan, and greatly limit later project-level analysis to site-specific issues. CEQA Guidelines Section 15183 (f) establishes that impacts are not peculiar to the project if uniformly applied development policies or standards substantially mitigate that environmental effect. The determination of whether or not uniformly applied development policies or standards would substantially mitigate each environmental effect shall be based on substantial evidence, but not necessarily presented in an EIR.

In order to maximize the value of the General Plan EIR to future projects that promote the 2035 General Plan’s objectives, the City has strategically integrated the General Plan and the environmental review. The policy development process has been used to vet potential mitigation strategies. The General Plan Update process was used to investigate policies and programs that can serve as uniformly applied standards and substantially limit the scope of analysis for projects consistent with the 2035 General Plan.

Section 15152 of the CEQA Guidelines provides that where a first-tier EIR has “adequately addressed” the subject of cumulative impacts, such impacts need not be revisited in second- and/or third-tier documents. According to Section 15152(f)(3), significant effects identified in a first-tier EIR are adequately addressed, for purposes of later approvals, if the lead agency determines that such effects have been either:

“mitigated or avoided as a result of the prior [EIR] and findings adopted in connection with that prior [EIR]”; or

“examined at a sufficient level of detail in the prior [EIR] to enable those effects to be mitigated or avoided by site-specific revisions, the imposition of conditions, or by other means in connection with the approval of the later project.”

The Public Resources Code provides streamlining coverage to the City and other public agencies that have authority to implement General Plan EIR mitigation measures. Public agencies can use uniformly applied policies or standards to mitigate effects of future projects, avoiding the need to analyze these effects, unless new information arises that changes the impact analysis (Public Resources Code Section 21083.3 (d)). For this reason, this EIR includes references to General Plan policies and programs, where appropriate, to address environmental impacts. Future CEQA documents can reference the same General Plan policies and programs, where appropriate, to demonstrate less-than-significant impacts and that later project-level issues are not “peculiar to the parcel” if they have been substantially mitigated by General Plan policies and programs (uniformly applied development policies).

1.2 PURPOSE AND INTENDED USES OF THE EIR

This EIR was prepared in compliance with the CEQA of 1970 (Public Resources Code Section 21000 et seq.) and the State CEQA Guidelines (California Code of Regulations Section 15000 et seq.). This EIR evaluates the environmental impacts that could result from implementation of the 2035 General Plan and Draft Climate Action Plan.

The purpose of an EIR is neither to recommend approval nor denial of a project. An EIR is an informational document used in the planning and decision-making process by the lead agency and responsible and trustee

agencies. An EIR describes the significant environmental impacts of a project, potentially feasible measures to mitigate significant impacts are identified, and potentially feasible alternatives to the project that can reduce or avoid significant environmental effects. CEQA requires decision-makers to balance the benefits of a project against its unavoidable environmental effects in deciding whether to carry out a project.

The CEQA Guidelines charge public agencies with the responsibility of avoiding or minimizing environmental damage that could result from implementation of a project, where feasible. As part of this responsibility, public agencies are required to balance various public objectives, including economic, environmental, and social issues.

The lead agency is the public agency with primary responsibility over the proposed project. In accordance with CEQA Guidelines Section 15051(b)(1), “the lead agency will normally be the agency with general governmental powers, such as a city or county, rather than an agency with a single or limited purpose.” The City, as the lead agency, has prepared this EIR to evaluate the environmental impacts of implementation of the 2035 General Plan.

The EIR was prepared under the direction of the City and is provided for review by both the public and public agencies, as required by CEQA. The City Council must certify the final EIR before adopting the 2035 General Plan and approving the Draft Climate Action Plan.

If significant environmental effects are identified, the lead agency must adopt “findings” indicating whether feasible mitigation measures or alternatives exist that can avoid or reduce those effects. If the significant environmental impacts are identified as significant and unavoidable, the lead agency may still approve the project if it determines that social, economic, legal, technological, or other factors override the unavoidable impacts. The lead agency would then be required to prepare a “Statement of Overriding Considerations” that discusses the specific reasons for approving the project, based on information in the EIR and other information in the record.

In making its decision about the proposed project, the City considers the information in this EIR, comments received on the EIR, and responses to those comments, along with other available information and technical analysis.

1.3 SCOPE OF THE EIR

1.3.1 GEOGRAPHIC SCOPE

The geographic scope that could be affected by a proposed project varies depending on the issue topic. The geographic area associated with different environmental effects was used to define the area considered for impact analysis. The geographic scope for air pollutant impact analysis, such as those related to emissions of ozone precursors, is very broad, encompassing large areas within the same air basin. The geographic scope for stationary source noise impacts, on the other end of the spectrum, is relatively narrow, since noise attenuates substantially with distance, making impacts more localized. The environmental impact analysis throughout this EIR describes the environmental impacts of implementing the 2035 General Plan throughout the City’s Planning Area.

This EIR analyzes impacts of the 2035 General Plan relative to current conditions.

1.3.2 ENVIRONMENTAL ISSUES ADDRESSED

Environmental review in compliance with CEQA (Public Resources Code Sections 21000 et seq.) is required as part of the City’s consideration of the 2035 General Plan and Draft Climate Action Plan. The EIR has been prepared in accordance with CEQA, including the CEQA statutes (Public Resources Code Sections 21000–21178.1), CEQA Guidelines (California Code of Regulations, Title 14, Sections 15000–15387), and relevant court decisions. This EIR includes an evaluation of all required environmental topic areas, as well as other CEQA-mandated sections, as presented below:

- ▶ 3.1 Agricultural Resources
- ▶ 3.2 Air Quality
- ▶ 3.3 Biological Resources
- ▶ 3.4 Cultural Resources
- ▶ 3.5 Greenhouse Gas Emissions
- ▶ 3.6 Energy
- ▶ 3.7 Geology, Soils, Minerals, and Paleontological Resources
- ▶ 3.8 Hazards and Hazardous Materials
- ▶ 3.9 Hydrology and Water Quality
- ▶ 3.10 Land Use and Planning
- ▶ 3.11 Noise and Vibration
- ▶ 3.12 Population, Employment, and Housing
- ▶ 3.13 Utilities and Service Systems, Public Services, and Recreation
- ▶ 3.14 Traffic and Transportation
- ▶ 3.15 Visual Resources
- ▶ 4 Alternatives
- ▶ 5 Other CEQA Considerations

Chapter 4 includes an analysis of alternatives to the proposed 2035 General Plan, as required by Section 15126.6 of the CEQA Guidelines. Other CEQA-mandated issues discussed within the context of this EIR are cumulative impacts, growth-inducing impacts, and significant and unavoidable adverse impacts (Chapter 5). Chapter 6 lists the preparers of the EIR and Chapter 7 identifies the references and citations used in drafting the EIR.

To assist the City in determining the focus and scope of analysis for this EIR, the City circulated a Notice of Preparation (NOP) dated October 24th, 2011 to government agencies, special service districts, organizations, and individuals with an interest in or jurisdiction over the project. This step ensured early consultation on the scope of the EIR. The City held a public scoping meeting for the project on November 14th, 2013. The City developed and confirmed the preferred alternative for the General Plan and circulated an additional NOP dated October 24th, 2013 and an additional public scoping meeting on November 6th, 2013. Please see Appendix A for the NOP and responses to the NOP.

1.4 ENVIRONMENTAL REVIEW PROCESS

The CEQA Guidelines has specific requirements for EIRs related to descriptions of the project, the environmental setting, and certain types of impacts. Table 1-1 identifies the required elements of an EIR (with CEQA Guidelines

sections referenced) and the corresponding chapters or sections in which each element is discussed in this document.

Table 1-1 Analyses Required by the State CEQA Guidelines	
Required Description and Analysis	EIR Chapter or Section
Summary (Section 15123)	0
Description of the Project (Section 15124)	2
Description of the Existing Setting (Section 15125)	2 and 3
Environmental Impacts (Sections 15126 and 15143)	3
Alternatives (Section 15126.6)	4
Cumulative Impacts (Section 15355)	5
Growth-Inducing Impacts (Section 15126[d])	5
Irreversible Environmental Effects (Section 15126.2[c])	5
Significant Environmental Effects Which Cannot be Avoided (Section 15126.2[b])	5

1.5 NOTICE OF PREPARATION

As noted, pursuant to the provision of Section 15082 of the CEQA Guidelines, the City circulated a NOP of the General Plan EIR to public agencies and interested members of the public. The NOP was delivered to the Governor’s Office of Planning and Research State Clearinghouse.

The NOP is a brief notice sent by the lead agency to inform responsible agencies, trustee agencies, and potentially affected federal, state, and local agencies that the lead agency plans to prepare an EIR. The NOP also seeks comments regarding the scope and content of the EIR. The NOP and comments received on the NOP are included as Appendix A to this EIR.

The City received NOP comment letters from:

- ▶ California Emergency Management Agency
- ▶ California Department of Transportation (Caltrans) District 4
- ▶ Caltrans Division of Aeronautics
- ▶ Delta Stewardship Council
- ▶ Solano Local Agency Formation Commission (LAFCO)
- ▶ Native American Heritage Commission (NAHC)
- ▶ California Public Utilities Commission (CPUC)
- ▶ Solano Irrigation District (SID)
- ▶ Suisun-Solano Water Authority (SSWA)
- ▶ Hoffman Land Development Company (Robert Schwartz)
- ▶ United States Air Force (Travis Air Force Base)

The City received verbal comments during the scoping meeting from:

- ▶ Gary Laski
- ▶ Ted Aksnes
- ▶ City of Fairfield

The NOP comment letters and comments at the scoping meeting suggest that the following topics related to adverse physical environmental impacts are particular areas of focus for the City's environmental analysis:

- ▶ State planning low provisions for hazards issues
- ▶ Operational impacts to State Route (SR) 12 and Interstate 80 (I-80)
- ▶ Traffic safety impacts related to traffic backing up on off-ramps
- ▶ Pedestrian and bicycle safety impacts related to increased vehicular travel demand
- ▶ Reliable water supply
- ▶ Protecting, restoring, and enhancing the Delta ecosystem
- ▶ Protect and enhance unique cultural, recreational, and agricultural values of the Delta
- ▶ Airport-related noise and safety impacts
- ▶ Hazardous wildlife populations near Travis Air Force Base
- ▶ Impacts to Important Farmland and Williamson Act properties
- ▶ Cultural resources impacts
- ▶ Vehicular and pedestrian safety impacts related to railroad crossings and the rail corridor
- ▶ Consideration of the 2010 Urban Water Management Plan and Gentry Project Water Supply Assessment
- ▶ Connectivity with Fairfield, in particular, the area near Union Avenue and Main Street
- ▶ Impacts to adjacent communities
- ▶ Impacts related to planning for a large amount of commercial development that may adversely affect existing commercial operations
- ▶ Traffic impacts along Walters Road, East Tabor Avenue, and Airbase Parkway
- ▶ Wetlands impacts, especially in the area south of Travis Air Force Base
- ▶ Impacts on special-status species and vernal pools
- ▶ Impacts related to consistency with agricultural zoning

- ▶ Water supply and treatment capacity

Ideas for mitigation of potential adverse physical environmental impacts include:

- ▶ Traffic mitigation should consider highway and non-highway improvements
- ▶ Special attention should be given to solutions to travel demand impacts that do not involve highway construction
- ▶ Pedestrian and bicycle safety measures needed to maintain and improve access to transit facilities, reduce vehicle trips, and therefore reduce traffic impacts on state highways
- ▶ Monitor ground-disturbing activities for potential discovery of archeological resources
- ▶ Consultation with Native Americans regarding any discovery of artifacts and human remains
- ▶ Installation of grade separations at crossings, i.e., physically separating roads and railroad track by constructing overpasses or underpasses
- ▶ Improvements to warning devices at existing highway-rail crossings
- ▶ Installation of additional warning devices
- ▶ Improvements to traffic signaling at intersections adjacent to crossings, e.g., traffic preemption
- ▶ Installation of median separation to prevent vehicles from driving around railroad crossing gates
- ▶ Prohibition of parking within 100 feet of crossings to improve the visibility of warning devices and approaching trains
- ▶ Installation of pedestrian-specific warning devices, channelization, and sidewalks
- ▶ Construction of pull-out lanes for buses and vehicles transporting hazardous materials
- ▶ Installation of vandal-resistant fencing or walls to limit the access of pedestrians onto the railroad right-of-way
- ▶ Elimination of driveways near crossings
- ▶ Increased enforcement of traffic laws at crossings
- ▶ Rail safety awareness programs to educate the public about the hazards of highway-rail grade crossings
- ▶ Avoid locating wetlands mitigation areas, stormwater management facilities, and other facilities that are known hazardous wildlife attractants in areas that would substantially contribute to an increase in aircraft-wildlife strikes at Travis Air Force Base
- ▶ Mitigation banking in the Travis Reserve

1.6 NATIVE AMERICAN CONSULTATION

The City followed up with representatives of the Yocha Dehe Wintun Nation, including a meeting on November 22nd, 2011. During this meeting, the City and the Yocha Dehe Wintun Nation discussed how to establish meaningful dialogue between the City and the Yocha Dehe Wintun Nation, how to avoid potential conflicts of preservation of Native American cultural places, how to encourage preservation and protection of Native American cultural places while maintaining confidentiality, the City's General Plan Update process, developing appropriate treatment and management of preserved cultural places, and future follow-up discussions regarding the General Plan Update. The Yocha Dehe Wintun Nation requested in a September 16th, 2014 letter that the General Plan indicate that the goal of the City is to minimize adverse impacts to archaeological resources and practice avoidance, whenever possible, as well as to contact stakeholders for historic and archaeological resources when they may be impacted. This language was incorporated into Goal OSC-5, Policy OSC-5.2, and Program OSC-5.1.

1.7 ORGANIZATION OF THE EIR

This EIR is organized as follows:

- ▶ **Chapter 0, “Executive Summary,”** provides an overview of the findings and conclusions of this EIR.
- ▶ **Chapter 1, “Introduction,”** describes the type of EIR prepared for the 2035 General Plan; the purpose, intended uses, and geographic and environmental scope of the EIR; the environmental review process; the relationship of the EIR to other City plans and zoning; subsequent actions required; the EIR comment process; and other agencies expected to use this EIR.
- ▶ **Chapter 2, “Project Description,”** describes the project's location; project objectives; project purpose; the General Plan Update process; General Plan development estimates; and the relationship between the 2035 General Plan and other agencies and plans.
- ▶ **Chapter 3, “Environmental Impact Analysis,”** evaluates environmental effects of the 2035 General Plan and identifies mitigation for potentially significant and significant effects.
- ▶ **Chapter 4, “Alternatives,”** provides a comparative analysis between the 2035 General Plan as described in Chapter 3, “Project Description,” and three alternatives. This chapter also describes alternatives that were considered but eliminated from detailed consideration in the EIR and identifies the “environmentally superior” alternative.
- ▶ **Chapter 5, “Other CEQA Considerations,”** describes the impacts of implementing the 2035 General Plan in combination with the impacts of related past, present, and reasonably foreseeable projects. Chapter 6 also discusses the growth inducement potential of the 2035 General Plan, significant irreversible environmental changes associated with the plan, and significant and unavoidable effects of the plan.
- ▶ **Chapter 6, “References,”** lists the sources of information cited throughout the EIR.
- ▶ **Chapter 7, “List of Preparers,”** lists the individuals who contributed to preparation of the EIR.
- ▶ **Appendices** provide background and technical information.

Through the General Plan Update process an abundance of information was gathered, synthesized, and analyzed to allow strategic policy development that properly considers existing conditions, regulatory guidance, important trends, and the important relationships between different planning topics. The background reports were used to develop land use and circulation alternatives and the policy document, but also to provide setting information for this EIR. Reports are presented in Volume II of this document and address the following topics:²

- ▶ Air Quality;
- ▶ Biological Resources;
- ▶ Community Facilities and Services;
- ▶ Cultural Resources;
- ▶ Geology and Soils;
- ▶ Hazards and Hazardous Materials;
- ▶ Hydrology and Water Quality;
- ▶ Land Use
- ▶ Local Economy and Demographics;
- ▶ Noise; and
- ▶ Transportation.

Setting information for agricultural resources is provided in Appendix B.

1.8 RELATIONSHIP TO OTHER PLANS AND REGULATIONS

Regional governmental agencies have been established in recognition of the fact that planning issues extend beyond the boundaries of individual cities. These include, but are not limited to the Metropolitan Transportation Commission (MTC), the Association of Bay Area Governments (ABAG), the Bay Area Air Quality Management District (BAAQMD), the Regional Water Quality Control Board (RWQCB), and the San Francisco Bay Conservation and Development Commission (BCDC). Efforts to address regional planning issues, such as air and water quality, transportation, affordable housing, and habitat conservation have resulted in the adoption of regional plans. The policies adopted by the City will be affected by these plans, and will in turn have effects on these other plans.

As the lead agency for this “project,” the City is responsible for considering certification of the EIR, adoption of the 2035 General Plan, and approval of the Draft Climate Action Plan. The City may use this EIR in subsequent actions on 2035 General Plan implementing programs, general plan amendments or elements, the City’s Codes, specific plans and other area plans, or other relevant City actions.

The City is the CEQA lead agency for the 2035 General Plan and Draft Climate Action Plan. In conformance with Sections 15050 and 15367 of the State CEQA Guidelines, the lead agency is the “public agency which has the principal responsibility for carrying out or disapproving a project.”

In addition to the lead agency, State CEQA Guidelines Section 15124 states that an EIR should contain a statement briefly describing the intended uses of the EIR and, to the extent that it is known to the lead agency, a

² Volume I is the Policy Plan, Volume II includes Technical Background Reports, and Volume III is this EIR. The Draft Climate Action Plan is a separate implementation document.

list of agencies expected to use the EIR in their decision making, permits or other approvals implementing the project, and related environmental review and consultation required by law or regulation.

A wide variety of federal, state, regional, and local agencies may use this EIR in their planning process, issuance of their permits, or exercise of their regulatory authority over resources or jurisdictional actions within the Planning Area. Agencies may use the EIR as a program EIR for subsequent parts of their program actions subject to CEQA, tiering their project CEQA studies from this EIR, or using the EIR in whole or part to apply to a required CEQA study in conjunction with specific agencies' project approval actions.

A number of other jurisdictional and permit-granting agencies have control over specific environmental concerns in the City. The 2035 General Plan and EIR make reference to laws, plans, and regulations administered by other public agencies. In many instances, the City's policies are specifically designed to achieve consistency with regulations of another public agency. In other cases, the City commits to seeking input from other agencies on issues that may arise over the course of implementing the 2035 General Plan. Unless otherwise specified, any reference to "consulting with" or "coordinating with" other agencies in no way delegates the City's responsibility for land use entitlement or lead agency responsibilities for managing land use change. Some of the key areas of interaction with other agencies are described below.

1.8.1 CALIFORNIA DEPARTMENT OF TRANSPORTATION

California Department of Transportation (Caltrans) plans and oversees the state highway system and works with other governmental agencies and local jurisdictions to plan, develop, manage, and maintain California's transportation system. Caltrans has permitting authority for access to and from state highways, including SR 12 through the Planning Area.

1.8.2 METROPOLITAN TRANSPORTATION COMMISSION

Metropolitan Transportation Commission (MTC) is the Metropolitan Planning Organization (MPO) for the nine-county San Francisco Bay Area (including Solano County). MTC is responsible for updating the Regional Transportation Plan (RTP).

1.8.3 ASSOCIATION OF BAY AREA GOVERNMENTS

Association of Bay Area Governments (ABAG) is the regional planning agency for the nine-county San Francisco Bay Area. ABAG is engaged in a number of different efforts that are relevant for planning in Suisun City, including development of the regional housing needs assessment, issuance of technical assistance grants, demographic and economic forecasts, energy efficiency programs, and others.

MTC and ABAG adopted the Plan Bay Area to guide long-term regional transportation investments. Along with the transportation plan is a Sustainable Communities Strategy (SCS) designed to demonstrate how, through integrated land use and transportation planning, the Bay Area region can achieve passenger vehicle related greenhouse gas (GHG) emissions reduction targets. The primary strategy is to focus most job and housing development in Priority Development Areas (PDA) that are well-served with transit, including Suisun City's Downtown Waterfront Area PDA.

1.8.4 SAN FRANCISCO BAY REGIONAL WATER QUALITY CONTROL BOARD

The San Francisco Bay Regional Water Quality Control Board (RWQCB) is responsible for the preparation and implementation of basin water quality plans consistent with the Clean Water Act. Enforcement of these plans ensures that local water quality is protected. RWQCBs may become involved in water supply programs as responsible agencies with respect to project impacts on downstream beneficial uses.

1.8.5 SAN FRANCISCO BAY CONSERVATION AND DEVELOPMENT COMMISSION

The San Francisco Bay Conservation and Development Commission (BCDC) is a state agency created to protect the Bay as a natural resource and to develop the Bay and its shoreline with a minimum of Bay filling and a maximum of public access. BCDC has adopted the San Francisco Bay Plan, which primarily affects land use decisions in the Bay and on land within 100 feet of the Bay shoreline. The BCDC has developed land use policies that are applicable to land within the City adjacent to the Bay shoreline. The Bay Plan, initially developed in 1969 and subsequently updated periodically, encompasses San Francisco and San Pablo Bays and portions of the Sacramento-San Joaquin Delta as far east as Collinsville.

1.8.6 SOLANO TRANSPORTATION AUTHORITY

The Solano Transportation Authority (STA) is the County's Congestion Management Agency (CMA). The STA is charged with coordinating and providing transportation planning, services, and funding.

1.8.7 TRAVIS AIR FORCE BASE

Travis Air Force Base (Travis AFB) is home to the world's largest military airlift unit, the 60th Air Mobility Wing, and the Wing's reserve counterpart, the 349th Air Mobility Wing. In 1995, the function of the Base was expanded with the addition of air refueling assets from March Air Force Base.

1.8.8 SOLANO COUNTY AIRPORT LAND USE COMMISSION

State law requires the preparation of Airport Land Use Compatibility Plans (ALUCPs) that address potential airport and land use conflicts for each public-use and military airport. The ALUCP helps to reduce the potential for land use conflicts between airports and sensitive uses (i.e. residences, schools, etc.) and helps to regulate development through height and population density limitations. ALUCP's address land use compatibility around airports relative to noise, over flight, safety, and airspace protection. State law requires land development near airports to be consistent with compatibility criteria included in an ALUCP. The Solano County Airport Land Use Commission (ALUC) is the agency in Solano County empowered by state law to prepare the ALUCP for airports and heliports in the County. The ALUC has adopted plans for Nut Tree Airport, Rio Vista Municipal Airport, and Travis Air Force Base.

The 2035 General Plan was prepared consistent with the Travis AFB Land Use Compatibility Plan.

1.8.9 SOLANO COUNTY LOCAL AGENCY FORMATION COMMISSION

Each County Local Agency Formation Commission (LAFCO) is responsible for coordinating logical and timely changes in local governmental boundaries. A Sphere of Influence (SOI) is established by LAFCO through

negotiations between a city and county. The SOI is “the probable physical boundaries and service area” of a city. The SOI generally reflects areas within city general plans that are intended for urban development, and therefore requiring city services. In establishing the SOI, consideration is given to city Comprehensive Annexation Plans (CAP), which are required by LAFCO and establish near-term (one to five years) and long-term (five or more years) annexation areas.

1.8.10 SUISUN-SOLANO WATER AUTHORITY

Domestic water in Suisun City is provided through the Suisun-Solano Water Authority (SSWA), a joint powers authority between the City of Suisun City and the Solano Irrigation District (SID). The City handles the local billing and requests for water service.

1.8.11 FAIRFIELD-SUISUN SEWER DISTRICT

Sewer service is provided to City residents and businesses by the Fairfield-Suisun Sewer District (FSSD), an independent special district established to manage wastewater collection and treatment. In the FSSD service area, the City of Fairfield and the City of Suisun City own and operate sewers 10-inches and smaller in diameter and the FSSD owns and operates larger facilities. The City handles the local billing and requests for sewer service.

1.8.12 BAY AREA AIR QUALITY MANAGEMENT DISTRICT

The Bay Area Air Quality Management District (BAAQMD) attains and maintains air quality conditions in the southwestern portion of Solano County and balance of the Bay Area region through comprehensive programs of planning, regulation, enforcement, technical innovation, and promotion of the understanding of air quality issues. The clean-air strategy of BAAQMD involves the preparation of plans and programs for the attainment of ambient-air-quality standards, adoption and enforcement of rules and regulations, and issuance of permits for stationary sources. The District also inspects stationary sources, responds to citizen complaints, monitors ambient air quality and meteorological conditions, and implements other programs and regulations.

1.8.13 CITY OF FAIRFIELD

The 2035 General Plan applies only to the Planning Area of the City. However, because Suisun City and Fairfield are adjacent to one another, coordination will be required to implement some General Plan goals and policies. Recognizing this, the City invited planning staff from the City of Fairfield to participate in the General Plan Update Technical Advisory Committee meetings.

1.8.14 SPECIFIC PLANS

In accordance with State law, the City may adopt specific plans for properties within the boundaries of the Planning Area. If properly designed and implemented, a specific plan, as set forth in California Government Code, is a helpful tool for providing a transition between Citywide goals and policies contained in the 2035 General Plan and subsequent entitlement requests (e.g., tentative maps, conditional use permits).

DOWNTOWN WATERFRONT SPECIFIC PLAN

The City of Suisun City adopted the Downtown Waterfront Specific Plan to provide guidance for the development of approximately 376 acres in the central core of the community. The Specific Plan includes standards and guidelines that govern development of areas within the City’s Downtown Waterfront Area. The Downtown Waterfront Specific Plan provides zoning and development standards, with customized and specific guidance for land use change, site planning, and building design, appropriate to the City’s historic core.

The 2035 General Plan directs certain changes to the Downtown Waterfront Specific Plan.

1.8.15 GENERAL PLAN AND OTHER CITY REGULATIONS

State law places the General Plan atop the hierarchy of land use planning regulations. Local ordinances and other City plans must conform to General Plan policy direction. The General Plan provides a governing basis for all other plans and planning documents and all codes, ordinances, and policies related to land use change, transportation, environmental resources, infrastructure, and related topics.

Cities and counties must make a “consistency” finding with the general plan for any subdivision map, zoning action, public facility plans, and other functions of local government. Court decisions have concluded that these “consistency” determinations cannot be made if the local jurisdiction does not have a legally adequate general plan. In effect, local governments cannot issue development permits or perform many vital public functions without a legally adequate general plan.

In California, general plans are cities’ and counties’ guiding policy documents. Local agencies implement general plans in part through the adoption and enforcement of zoning codes, subdivision ordinances, and other regulations. General plan land use designations and planning policy provide a framework for zoning designations and development standards. Cities and counties’ design regulations and guidelines are also governed by general plans. General plans often contain policy that guides any municipal code sections and ordinances that regulate grading, building permits, open space dedications, landscaping requirements, parkland dedication, off-street parking requirements, transportation infrastructure, signage, improvement standards, impact fees, and other planning-related codes and ordinances.

1.9 SUBSEQUENT ACTIONS REQUIRED

Further actions or procedures required to allow implementation of the 2035 General Plan may include revisions to zoning, tentative maps, site plans, building permits, grading permits, and other actions. Future development project proposals, public investments, and other actions, would also be subject to CEQA requirements, as appropriate.

1.10 MITIGATION MEASURES

The CEQA Guidelines define mitigation to include:

- ▶ avoiding the impact altogether by not taking a certain action or parts of an action;
- ▶ minimizing impacts by limiting the degree or magnitude of the action and its implementation;

- ▶ rectifying the impact by repairing, rehabilitating, or restoring the affected environment;
- ▶ reducing or eliminating the impact over time by preservation and maintenance operations during the life of the action; or
- ▶ compensating for the impact by replacing or providing substitute resources or environments.

In this case, because the proposed project is the 2035 General Plan, mitigation to accomplish the above outcomes could take the form of:

- ▶ goals, policies, or programs included as part of the 2035 General Plan;
- ▶ policy diagrams in the 2035 General Plan capable of minimizing or eliminating a potentially significant impact; and
- ▶ other actions (e.g., actions performed by another agency).

The 2035 General Plan’s policies take into account many of the impacts discussed in this EIR, and many potential mitigation measures are included as part of the proposed project itself.

CEQA requires the adoption of a mitigation monitoring program for all adopted mitigation measures. The mitigation monitoring plan must be designed to ensure compliance during project implementation (Public Resources Code Section 21081.6, State CEQA Guidelines Section 15097). Many mitigation measures identified for the 2035 General Plan take the form of goals, policies, and programs.

Mitigation measures that are built into the General Plan are adopted by the City and will be implemented and enforced through the application of the 2035 General Plan to land use and planning decisions and the implementation of actions directed by the plan.

The City is required by Section 65400 of the Government Code to monitor and report on an annual basis to the City Council and to the Governor’s Office of Planning and Research and the State Department of Housing and Community Development on General Plan implementation. The monitoring plan for policies in the General Plan that mitigate impacts is the General Plan itself. The reporting program for these mitigating policies is the City’s annual reporting process (see CEQA Guidelines Section 15097 (b)).

1.11 AVAILABILITY OF THE EIR

Copies of the 2035 General Plan, the Draft Climate Action Plan, and this EIR were made available through the City of Suisun City Community Development Department.

The City has circulated the document to public agencies, other public and private organizations, property owners, developers, and other interested individuals. Comments on the EIR were invited in writing or via email to:

City of Suisun City
 Community Development Department
 John Kearns, Associate Planner
 701 Civic Center Boulevard

Suisun City, CA 94585

jkearns@suisun.com

To keep the document succinct and useful as a decision-making tool, the CEQA Guidelines charge that an EIR focus on a project's significant environmental impacts and not address every imaginable less-than-significant effect. Comments should be focused on the adequacy and completeness of the EIR, or should address questions about the environmental consequences of project implementation. In this case, "adequacy" is defined as the thoroughness of the EIR in addressing significant adverse physical environmental effects, identifying mitigation measures for those impacts, and supplying enough information for public officials to make decisions about the merits of the project.

After the close of the public review period, a Final Environmental Impact Report (FEIR) is prepared, containing all the comments received during the public review period and responses to those comments. This document is made available to public agencies and the general public so those parties can review the FEIR before the City certifies it as complete.