4.12 OTHER RESOURCE TOPICS

4.12.1 INTRODUCTION

This section describes all other environmental topics, including aesthetics, agricultural resources, geology and soils, hydrology and water quality, mineral resources, population and housing, and wildfire that would either not be affected by the proposed project or that the impacts of the project would be clearly less than significant.

4.12.2 AESTHETICS

In accordance with Appendix G of the *California Environmental Quality Act (CEQA) Guidelines*, the impacts of the proposed project related to aesthetics would be considered significant if the projects would:

- have a substantial adverse effect on a scenic vista;
- substantially damage scenic resources, including, but not limited to, trees, rock outcroppings, and historic buildings within a state scenic highway;
- substantially degrade the existing visual character or quality of the site and its surroundings; or
- create a new source of substantial light or glare which would adversely affect day or nighttime views in the area.

Impact AES-1: The proposed project would have no effect on a scenic vista. (*No Impact*)

A scenic vista is generally defined as an expansive view of highly valued landscape as observable from a publicly accessible vantage point. The proposed project site is not part of any scenic vista designated in the City of Fairfield's (City's) General Plan or other applicable planning documents. The nearest designated scenic vista is the Green Valley Scenic Vista Area, which is located to the northwest of the project site, and the closest portion of the scenic area that is visible from the project site is Rockville Hills Regional Park, located approximately one mile north of the project site. As noted in the City's *Scenic Vistas and Roadways Plan*, Rockville Hills Regional Park provides views of scenic value of the Green Valley to the north and west, in the opposite direction from the project site (City of Fairfield 1999). The project site is flat and is located in an urbanizing area with commercial and residential uses adjacent to the west and north. The project site is not located within the viewshed of the Green Valley Scenic Area. Therefore, no impact would occur with respect to this criterion.

Mitigation Measures: No mitigation measures are required.

Impact AES-2: The proposed project would not substantially damage scenic resources, including, but not limited to, trees, rock outcroppings, and historic buildings within a state scenic highway. (*No Impact*)

There are no state scenic highways within the vicinity of the project site (CSHP 2018) and the site does not contain scenic resources as identified in the City's General Plan or any other land use plans. As a result, the proposed project would not substantially damage scenic resources, including, but not limited to, trees, rock outcroppings, and historic buildings within a state scenic highway. There would be no impact with regard to this criterion.

Mitigation Measures: No mitigation measures are required.

Impact AES-3: The proposed project would not substantially degrade the existing visual character or quality of public views of the site and its surroundings. (*Less than Significant*)

The proposed project is a mixed-use residential and commercial development consisting of four apartment buildings and four commercial buildings. Each apartment building would be 4-stories tall and would range in height from approximately 47 to 53 feet while each commercial structure would be one-story and range in height from 23 to 31 feet.

An office complex consisting of two buildings is located to the north of the project site, across Business Center Drive and Mangels Boulevard, while a residential neighborhood is located to the northwest of the project site, across the intersection of Business Center Drive and Suisun Valley Road. A vacant parcel is located to the east of the project site across Suisun Valley Road while another vacant parcel adjoins the project site to the south. Finally, an office complex consisting of two buildings is located to the west of the project site, across Business Center Drive.

The existing office buildings to the north are two and three stories in height while the existing office buildings to the west are two stories in height. The office buildings to the north are located on land zoned CO (Office Commercial), which permits a maximum floor-to-area ratio (FAR) of 1.0 and a maximum height of 45 feet, while the existing office buildings to the west are located on land zoned IBP-NC, which permits a maximum FAR of 1.0 and a maximum building height of 50 feet. In addition, the existing residential uses to the northwest are one-story in height and are zoned RM (Residential, Medium Density), which permits a density of 8 to 15 units per acre and a maximum height of 35 feet. All of the existing office buildings adjacent to the site generally conform to the standards for the CO and IBP-NC

zones. In addition, the density of the existing residential neighborhood to the northwest also generally conforms to density standards for the RM zone while the heights of the structures at 15 to 20 feet are well below the maximum height allowed in the RM zone.

The vacant land to the east is zoned CR (Regional Commercial) while the vacant land to the south is zoned IBP-NC. The CR zoning district permits a FAR of 1.0 and a maximum height of 55 feet while, as discussed above, the IBP-NC zoning district permits a FAR of 1.0, and a maximum building height of 50 feet. It is expected that any future development on these parcels would conform to applicable zoning standards.

Given that the existing buildings to the north and west generally range in height from 45 to 50 feet and that the future building to the east and west would likely range in height from 50 and 55 feet in height, the height of the proposed apartment buildings would be consistent with existing and future development with in the area. In addition, the proposed one-story commercial structures on the northern portion of the site, which would range in height from 23 to 31 feet, would be consistent with the heights of the residential uses to the northwest. Next, with an FAR of 0.6, the residential component would be consistent with the scale of existing and future development in the area. Finally, the design of the proposed structures would adhere to both the North Cordelia Design Standards and the Green Valley Corporate Park guidelines. For this reason, the proposed project would not substantially degrade the existing visual character or quality of public views of the site and its surroundings, and this impact is less than significant.

Mitigation Measures: No mitigation measures are required.

Impact AES-4: **The proposed project would not create a new source of substantial light or glare which would adversely affect day or nighttime views in the area. (*No Impact*)**

The proposed project would substantially increase nighttime illumination on the project site as no light sources are currently present on the site. However, the proposed project would comply with the City of Fairfield's zoning code related to outdoor lighting placement and installation, such the placement and installation of lighting in the parking lots serving both the residential and commercial components of the proposed project. As a result, lighting on the site would be shielded or recessed to control glare and reflections, and thus would not adversely affect adjacent residential properties and public rights-of-way (City of Fairfield 2018). Nighttime glare from the headlights of vehicles entering and existing the project site would not negatively affect nearby residential uses to the northwest of the site as the nearest

driveway would be located approximately 500 feet east of the neighborhood. Non-reflective materials would be used in the construction of the proposed project, and thus the project would not result in a substantial new source of glare that would adversely affect daytime views in the area. For these reasons, the impact of the proposed project with regard to light and glare would be less than significant.

Mitigation Measures: No mitigation measures are required.

4.12.3 AGRICULTURE AND FORESTRY RESOURCES

In accordance with Appendix G of the *California Environmental Quality Act (CEQA) Guidelines*, the impacts of the proposed project related to agriculture and forestry resources would be considered significant if the projects would:

- convert Prime Farmland, Unique Farmland, or Farmland of Statewide Importance (Farmland), as shown on the maps prepared pursuant to the Farmland Mapping and Monitoring Program of the California Resources Agency, to non-agricultural use;
- conflict with existing zoning for agricultural use, or a Williamson Act contract;
- conflict with existing zoning for, or cause rezoning of, forest land (as defined in Public Resources Code section 12220(g)) or timberland (as defined in Public Resources Code section 4526);
- result in the loss of forest land or conversion of forest land to non-forest use; or
- involve other changes in the existing environment, which, due to their location or nature, could result in conversion of Farmland, to non-agricultural use.

Impact AG-1: **The proposed project would not convert Farmland to non-agricultural use, nor conflict with existing zoning for agricultural use or Williamson Act contract, or conflict with existing zoning for, or cause rezoning of, forest land or timberland. In addition, the proposed project would not result in the loss of forest land or conversion of forest land to non-forest use, or involve other changes in the existing environment that could result in conversion of Farmland to non-agricultural use. (*No Impact*)**

The project site is not currently in agricultural production and is designated as Urban and Built-Up Land on maps prepared by the California State Department of Conservation pursuant to the Farmland Mapping and Monitoring Program (FMMP 2018). In addition, the project site is not zoned for agricultural, forest land or timberland use nor is it subject to a Williamson Act contract (DOC 2017), and thus would not conflict with the existing zoning for agricultural, forest land or timberland use or a

Williamson Act contract. For these reasons, the proposed project would have no impact on agricultural or forest resources.

Mitigation Measures: No mitigation measures are required.

4.12.4 GEOLOGY AND SOILS

In accordance with Appendix G of the *California Environmental Quality Act (CEQA) Guidelines*, the impacts of the proposed project related to geology and soils would be considered significant if the projects would:

- Directly or indirectly cause potential substantial adverse effects, including the risk of loss, injury, or death involving:

    i. Rupture of a known earthquake fault, as delineated on the most recent Alquist-Priolo Earthquake Fault Zoning Map issued by the State Geologist for the area or based on other substantial evidence of a known fault. (Refer to Division of Mines and Geology Special Publication 42.)

    ii. Strong seismic ground shaking.

    iii. Seismic-related ground failure, including liquefaction.

    iv. Landslides.

- Result in substantial soil erosion or the loss of topsoil.

- Be located on a geologic unit or soil that is unstable, or that would become unstable as a result of the project, and potentially result in on- or off-site landslide, lateral spreading, subsidence, liquefaction, or collapse.

- Be located on expansive soil, as defined in Table 18-1-B of the Uniform Building Code (1994), creating substantial direct or indirect risks to life and property.

- Have soils incapable of adequately supporting the use of septic tanks or alternative wastewater disposal systems where sewers are not available for the disposal of wastewater.

- Directly or indirectly destroy an unique paleontological resource or site or unique geologic feature

Impact GEO-1: **The proposed project would not directly or indirectly cause potential substantial adverse effects, including the risk of loss, injury, or death involving rupture of a known earthquake fault. (*Less than Significant*)**

Fault rupture is the displacement that occurs along the surface of a fault during an earthquake. The California Geological Survey (CGS) designates Alquist-Priolo Earthquake Fault Zones, which are

regulatory zones around active faults. The nearest Alquist-Priolo Earthquake Fault Zone to the proposed project is associated with faults that comprise the Cordelia fault zone, which is located approximately 300 to 400 feet west of the project site (Wallace Kuhl 2018). Therefore, the potential for surface fault rupture on the project site is low, and this impact is considered less than significant.

Mitigation Measures: No mitigation measures are required.

Impact GEO-2: **The proposed project would not expose people or structures to potential substantial adverse effects, including the risk of loss, injury, or death involving strong seismic ground shaking. (*Less than Significant*)**

In addition to the nearby Cordelia fault, there are also several active faults located within a 25-mile radius of the project site (Wallace Kuhl 2018). As a result, the project site could be subject to moderate and possibly strong ground motion due to earthquakes on these faults. However, the proposed project would be designed and constructed in accordance with the California Building Code (CBC), and thus would be consistent with the current prevailing standard of care for structural and civil engineering and seismic safety. As a result, impacts associated with groundshaking would be less than significant.

Mitigation Measures: No mitigation measures are required.

Impact GEO-3: **The proposed project would not expose people or structures to potential substantial adverse effects, including the risk of loss, injury, or death involving seismic-related ground failure, including liquefaction. (*Less than Significant*)**

Liquefaction refers to the sudden, temporary loss of soil strength during strong ground shaking. Liquefaction occurs in areas where there are saturated, loose, granular (sandy) deposits subjected to seismic shaking. Liquefaction-related impacts include settlement, flow failure, and lateral spreading. The potential for seismic-related ground failure, including liquefaction, on the project site is low (Wallace Kuhl 2018). Compliance with the CBC would ensure that any potential impacts related to seismic-related ground failure would not be substantial. For this reason, impacts associated seismic-related ground failure would be less than significant.

Mitigation Measures: No mitigation measures are required.

Impact GEO-4: The proposed project would not expose people or structures to potential substantial adverse effects, including the risk of loss, injury, or death involving landslides. (*No Impact*)

The potential for seismically induced landslides to affect the project site is low since the surface topography of the project site and immediate vicinity is relatively flat. The City would review the project plans to ensure compliance with the CBC. No impact is anticipated with regard to this criterion.

Mitigation Measures: No mitigation measures are required.

Impact GEO-5: The proposed project would not result in substantial soil erosion or the loss of topsoil. (*Less than Significant*)

The project area is relatively flat. Construction of the proposed project would require grading and other earthmoving activities, which could subject exposed soils to erosion by water or wind. As the proposed project would disturb more than 1 acre, coverage under the state's National Pollutant Discharge Elimination System (NPDES) General Permit for Discharges of Storm Water Associated with Construction Activity would be required prior to construction and the construction contractor would be required to file a notice of intent (NOI) with the State Water Resources Control Board and develop and implement a site-specific Storm Water Pollution Prevention Plan (SWPPP). In compliance with the NPDES requirements, Best Management Practices (BMPs) to control on-site erosion and off-site sedimentation, and to keep construction pollutants from coming into contact with storm water would be incorporated into the SWPPP and implemented during site grading and construction. These measures would include but are not limited to control of surface flows over exposed soils and use of sediment traps such as hay bales. Upon completion of construction, erosion potential would be low because all disturbed areas would be covered by buildings, pavement, and landscaping. In addition, the project site would comply with the City's grading ordinance. Finally, grading activities for the project would be limited to the drier seasons (April 15 through November 14) to reduce potential erosion or loss of soil or topsoil during rain events. For these reasons, the potential for soil erosion under the proposed project would be minimal and the impact would be less than significant.

Mitigation Measures: No mitigation measures are required.

Impact GEO-6: **The proposed project would not be located on a geologic unit or soil that is unstable, or that would become unstable as a result of the project, and potentially result in on- or off-site landslide, lateral spreading, subsidence, liquefaction, or collapse. (*Less than Significant*)**

As stated above under **Impact GEO-3**, the potential for liquefaction on the project site is low. In addition, as stated above under **Impact GEO-4**, the potential for landslides to occur on the project site is low. However, there is still some potential that the underlying soils could be unstable. The project would be designed and constructed in conformance with the CBC to control for potential adverse impacts associated with unstable soils. Therefore, impacts associated with unstable soils would be less than significant.

Mitigation Measures: No mitigation measures are required.

Impact GEO-7: **The proposed project would not be located on expansive soil, as defined in Table 18-1-B of the Uniform Building Code (1994), creating substantial direct or indirect risks to life and property. (*Less than Significant with Mitigation*)**

This impact is discussed in the analysis in **Section 4.5, Hazards and Hazardous Materials.**

Impact GEO-8: **The proposed project would not be located on soils incapable of adequately supporting the use of septic tanks or alternative wastewater disposal systems where sewers are not available for the disposal of wastewater. (*No Impact*)**

The project would be connected to the City sewer system and would not use septic tanks. Therefore, there is no impact, and no further analysis is required.

Mitigation Measures: No mitigation measures are required.

Impact GEO-9: **The proposed project would not directly or indirectly destroy a unique paleontological resource or site of unique geologic feature. (*Less than Significant*)**

A search of the University of California Museum of Paleontology, University of California, Berkeley Database identified 1,698 paleontological resources in Solano County. None of these resources were discovered within the vicinity of the project site (UCMP 2018). Subsurface soils on the project site are classified as Brentwood series soils with a small portion of the west side of the project site belonging to the Antioch-San Ysidro complex. Both of these soils are moderately-drained with Brentwood soils found on alluvial fans and soils well-draining soils found on alluvial fans and Antioch and San Ysidro soils found on terraces. Such materials are considered to have a very low likelihood of containing significant paleontological features. In addition, the project site has been disturbed by past grading activities. Consequently, excavations on the project site and off-site along Business Center Drive during construction of the proposed project are unlikely to disturb or damage fossil resources. This impact is considered less than significant.

4.12.5 HYDROLOGY AND WATER QUALITY

In accordance with Appendix G of the California Environmental Quality Act (CEQA) Guidelines, the impacts of the proposed project related to hydrology and water quality would be considered significant if the projects would:

- violate any water quality standards or waste discharge requirements or otherwise substantially degrade surface or groundwater quality;
- substantially decrease groundwater supplies or interfere substantially with groundwater recharge such that the project may impede sustainable groundwater management of the basin
- substantially alter the existing drainage pattern of the site or area, including through the alteration of the course of a stream or river or through the addition of impervious surfaces, in a manner which would;
- result in substantial erosion or siltation on or off site
- substantially increase the rate or amount of surface runoff in a manner which would result in flooding on or off site
- create or contribute runoff water which would exceed the capacity of existing or planned stormwater drainage systems or provide substantial additional sources of polluted runoff or
- in flood hazard tsunami or seiche zones risk release of pollutants due to project inundation

- conflict with or obstruct implementation of a water quality control plan or sustainable groundwater management plan

Impact HYDRO-1: The proposed project would not result in the discharge of storm water that would violate any water quality standards or otherwise substantially degrade water quality. (*Less than Significant*)

During construction of the proposed project, there is a potential for increased erosion, sedimentation, and discharge of polluted runoff from the project site. As discussed above under **Impact GEO-5**, NPDES regulations require that the proposed project develop and implement a SWPPP, including control measures (or Best Management Practices) to control erosion and release of sediment and other pollutants from the site. Groundwater underneath the project site is located at a depth of about three feet, and any excavations below this depth would require temporary dewatering during construction. Groundwater encountered during construction of the proposed project is subject to City regulations requiring that groundwater meet specified water quality standards before discharge into the sewer system. In addition, as discussed in **Section 4.5**, there are no detections of target compounds on the project site that are above regulatory screening levels, and there are no nearby uses with existing levels of contamination that could affect the site. As a result, groundwater underneath the city does not pose a risk to humans or to the environment. For these reasons, the impact to water quality from construction activities would be less than significant.

The project site is currently undeveloped and development of the proposed project would increase the total impervious surface on the project site by approximately 373,120 sf (64 percent). The site runoff is subject to requirements listed in provision C.3 of the San Francisco Bay Region Municipal Regional Stormwater NPDES Permit (or MRP) (Regional Water Quality Board Order R2-2009-0074; and Order R2-2011-0083). This permit requires permittees to comply with the discharge prohibitions and receiving water limitations through the timely implementation of control measures and other actions as specified in the permit (San Francisco Bay RWQCB 2009). Development on the project site would be required by law to comply with applicable NPDES requirements for stormwater quality. The project design includes a series of stormwater treatment systems to comply with the permit, including bioswales located in the commercial component to treat runoff. Therefore, development of the proposed project would not result in any storm water discharges that would violate water quality standards or waste discharge requirements. The impact to water quality would be less than significant during operation.

Mitigation Measures: No mitigation measures are required.

Impact HYDRO-2: The proposed project would not substantially decrease groundwater supplies or interfere substantially with groundwater recharge such that the project may impede sustainable groundwater management of the basin. (*Less than Significant*)

The project would be connected to municipal water supplies and would not use any groundwater supplies. The proposed project would increase the total impervious surface on the project site by approximately 373,120 sf (64 percent), limiting groundwater recharge on the project site. However, the proposed project includes site design, source control, and stormwater treatment measures in accordance with the *Fairfield-Suisun Urban Runoff Management Program, Stormwater C.3 Guidebook* (City of Fairfield 2012). These measures include disconnect downspouts, covered dumpster areas with drains to sanitary sewer, swimming pool and fountain drains to sanitary sewer, beneficial landscaping, outdoor material storage protection, ongoing maintenance commitments, storm drain signage, vegetated swales, and bio-retention areas. Project plans would be reviewed by the City for adequacy and conformance with national and municipal stormwater quality requirements. Therefore, the project would not substantially deplete groundwater supplies or interfere with groundwater recharge. The impact would be less than significant.

Impact HYDRO-3: The proposed project would not substantially alter the existing drainage pattern of the site or area in a manner that would result in substantial erosion, siltation, or flooding on-site or off-site. In addition, the project would not result in runoff that would exceed the capacity of existing or planned stormwater drainage systems. (*Less than Significant*)

There are no streams or rivers on the site. The project site is flat and grading activities would not substantially alter the existing site grade. However, the project includes construction of new structures, hardscaped areas, and landscaped areas. As discussed above under **Impact HYDRO-2**, in accordance with the City's stormwater management regulations, the proposed project would include specific measures to control, treat, and manage stormwater. In addition, site stormwater would be discharged to the existing municipal storm drain system instead of the existing infiltration and runoff condition. As a result, the proposed project would not substantially alter the existing natural drainage patterns.

As discussed above under **Impact HYDRO-1** and **Impact GEO-5**, the proposed project would be required to control soil erosion or siltation during construction through the preparation and implementation of a SWPPP. Implementation of the SWPPP would reduce the potential for erosion on the project site and minimize the discharge of sediment into the storm drain system.

Once the proposed project is constructed, the proposed project would be developed with impervious surfaces (buildings, pavement, etc.) and landscaping. This would minimize the potential for erosion and sedimentation in the long term. In addition, the project's stormwater drainage system would be designed so that post-project runoff rates and durations shall not exceed estimated pre-project rates and duration in accordance with criteria listed in the *Fairfield-Suisun Urban Runoff Management Program, Stormwater C.3 Guidebook*, thus preventing erosion and flooding on- or off-site. Therefore, this impact is considered less than significant.

Mitigation Measures: No mitigation measures are required.

4.12.6 MINERAL RESOURCES

In accordance with Appendix G of the *California Environmental Quality Act (CEQA) Guidelines*, the impacts of the proposed project related to mineral resources would be considered significant if the projects would:

- result in the loss of availability of a known mineral resource that would be of future value to the region and the residents of the state; or
- result in the loss of availability of a locally important mineral resource recovery site delineated on a local general plan, specific plan, or other land use plan.

Impact MR-1: **The proposed project would not result in the loss of availability of a known mineral resource or in the loss of availability of a locally important mineral resource recovery site. (*No Impact*)**

The project site is designated as MRZ-1 ("areas where adequate information indicates that no significant mineral deposits are present, or where it is judged that little likelihood exists for their presence") by the State Department of Conservation (DOC 1988). Implementation of the proposed project would not result in the loss of availability of a known mineral resource that would be of value to the region or the residents of the state. There would be no impact with regard to these criteria.

Mitigation Measures: No mitigation measures are required.

4.12.7 POPULATION AND HOUSING

In accordance with Appendix G of the *California Environmental Quality Act (CEQA) Guidelines*, the impacts of the proposed project related to population and housing would be considered significant if the projects would:

- Induce substantial unplanned population growth in an area, either directly (for example, by proposing new homes and businesses) or indirectly (for example, through extension of roads or other infrastructure); or
- Displace substantial numbers of existing people or housing, necessitating the construction of replacement housing elsewhere.

Impact PH-1: **The proposed project would not induce substantial unplanned population growth in an area, either directly (for example, by proposing new homes and businesses) or indirectly (for example, through extension of roads or other infrastructure). (*Less than Significant*)**

The most recent Department of Finance (DOF) estimate for the average household size in the City of Fairfield is 3.04 persons per household (DOF 2018). This household size has been used in this Draft EIR to estimate the total residential population associated with the residential component of the proposed project. Thus, the proposed 270 new residential units have the potential to increase the population of the City of Fairfield by approximately 821 people. The DOF estimates the total population for the City of Fairfield in 2018 was 116,156 people (DOF 2018), and the residential component of the proposed project would thus increase the City's population by approximately 0.7 percent to 124,287 persons, and this direct increase would not be substantial.

The commercial component of the proposed project would generate approximately 45 employees based on an average of one worker per 500 square feet of commercial space. Given the sizable workforce in the Solano County portion of the Bay Area, most of these new employees would likely be living in the area at the time of hire based on commute times for residents in Fairfield and surrounding communities.[1] In addition, some of the employees may reside in the residential component of the site. For these reasons, the proposed project would not indirectly increase population in the City.

A city's jobs and housing balance is reflected in the ratio of jobs to the number of households within the City. This ratio shows whether a jurisdiction has a surplus or deficit of jobs relative to its population and

[1] Mean travel time to work for residents of Fairfield and nearby communities: Fairfield (30.3 minutes); Vacaville (26.6 minutes); Benicia (31.1 minutes); and Rio Vista (38.6 minutes) (U.S. Census 2018).

housing supply. A surplus is defined as greater than 1.0 job for every household, whereas a deficit is defined as less than 1.0 job for every household. In January 2018, the City of Fairfield had an estimated 1.29 jobs for every housing unit.[2] Fairfield's jobs-to-housing ratio indicates that the City is "job rich," meaning there are more jobs than the number of households). The addition of 270 residential units to the City of Fairfield will help improve the City's jobs/housing balance and the impact due to the increase in population will be less than significant.

For the reasons listed above, the proposed project would not induce substantial population growth in the area, either directly or indirectly, and this impact would be less than significant.

Mitigation Measures: No mitigation measures are required.

Impact PH-2: **The proposed project would not displace substantial numbers of existing people or housing, necessitating the construction of replacement housing elsewhere. (*No Impact*)**

No housing exists on the project site and the site is currently undeveloped. The proposed project would not result in the displacement of existing housing or displace a substantial number of people resulting in the construction of replacement housing elsewhere. No impacts would occur.

Mitigation Measures: No mitigation measures are required.

4.12.8 WILDFIRE

In accordance with Appendix G of the *California Environmental Quality Act (CEQA) Guidelines*, the impacts of the proposed project related to wildfire would be considered significant if, for a project located in or near state responsibility areas or lands classified as very high fire hazard severity zones the project would:

- Substantially impair an adopted emergency response plan or emergency evacuation plan;
- Due to slope, prevailing winds, and other factors, exacerbate wildfire risks, and thereby expose project occupants to, pollutant concentrations from a wildfire or the uncontrolled spread of a wildfire;

---

2 50,900 employment positions (EDD 2018)/39,599 housing units (DOF 2018) = 1.29 jobs per housing unit

- Require the installation or maintenance of associated infrastructure (such as roads, fuel breaks, emergency water sources, power lines or other utilities) that may exacerbate fire risk or that may result in temporary or ongoing impacts to the environment;
- Expose people or structures to significant risks, including downslope or downstream flooding or landslides, as a result of runoff, post-fire slope instability, or drainage changes;

Impact FIRE-1: The proposed project would not substantially impair an adopted emergency response plan or emergency evacuation plan. (*Less than Significant*)

The City of Fairfield General Plan Health and Safety Element includes objectives and policies that address fire hazards. **Objective HS 4, Protect people and property by minimizing fire danger**, creates policies which include prohibiting residential development in Extreme Wildfire Risk areas, requirements for buffer zones for risk areas, and maintain the ability to provide fire protection in areas of new development.

Construction and operational activities associated with future development of the proposed project has the potential to interfere with the City of Fairfield's adopted emergency response or evacuation plans as a result of temporary construction activities, primarily by temporary construction barricades or other obstructions that could impede emergency access. However, implementation of the policies in the Fairfield General Plan Health and Safety Element would ensure that the project does not substantially impair an adopted emergency response plan or emergency evacuation plan.

Impact FIRE-2: The proposed project, due to slope, prevailing winds, or any other factors, would not exacerbate wildfire risks, and thereby expose project occupants to pollutant concentrations from a wildfire or the uncontrolled spread of a wildfire. (*No Impact*)

The project is located in a partially developed urban area consisting of office complexes and nearby residential neighborhoods. The surrounding area is relatively flat and prevailing winds throughout the year come from a southwestern direction. According to maps from the California Department of Forestry and Fire Protection (CAL FIRE), the project would not be located in or near a Very High Fire Hazard Severity Zone (CAL FIRE, 2007). Since the project is not in a Fire Hazard Zone and there are no surrounding areas that are a Very High Hazard Zone, the project would not exacerbate fire risk due to slope or the prevailing winds.

Impact FIRE-3: The proposed project would not require the installation or maintenance of associated infrastructure (such as roads, fuel breaks, emergency water sources,

power lines or other utilities) that may exacerbate fire risk or that may result in temporary or ongoing impacts to the environment. (*Less than Significant*)

With respect to wildfire risk, the project would not require the installation or maintenance of associated infrastructure, such as roads, fuel breaks, or emergency water sources. Furthermore, the project would also not require new power lines or utilities that would exacerbate fire risk. The impact of installation or maintenance of associated infrastructure would be less that significant.

Impact FIRE-4: **The proposed project would not expose people or structures to significant risks, including downslope or downstream flooding or landslides, as a result of runoff, post-fire slope instability, or drainage changes. (*Less than Significant*)**

The project area is located on relatively flat ground. The proposed project area is located within a Local Responsibility Area (LRA), but is not designated a moderate/high/or very high fire hazard severity zone. The areas to the north and to the south across Interstate 80 are designated moderate and high fire hazard areas. Although these areas have a moderate and high fire hazard, they are already partially developed and any wildfire risk is minimal. Furthermore, with adherence to fire suppression design requirements, and the physical characteristics of the project location being in a flat area, the potential to expose people or structures to flooding and landslide risks resulting from post-fire slope instability, runoff, or drainage changes as they relate to wildfire would be less than significant.

4.12.9 REFERENCES

California Department of Conservation (DOC), Farmland Mapping and Monitoring Program (FMMP). 2018. Accessed September 2018. Available online at: http://www.conservation.ca.gov/dlrp/fmmp.

California DOC. 1988. *Mineral Land Classification: Portland Cement Concrete-Grade Aggregate in the Sacramento-Fairfield Production-Consumption Region. Special Report 156. Cordelia Quadrangle, Plate 34.* 1988. Accessed August 2018. Available online at: ftp://ftp.consrv.ca.gov/pub/dmg/pubs/sr/SR_156/SR-156_Plate-34.pdf.

California Department of Finance. 2018. *Report E-5: Population and Housing Estimates for Cities, Counties, and the State, January 1, 2011-2018, with 2010 Benchmark*. Accessed September 2018. Available online at: http://www.dof.ca.gov/Forecasting/Demographics/.

California Department of Transportation (Caltrans), Scenic Highways Program (CSHP). 2018. Accessed September 2018. Available online at: http://www.dot.ca.gov/design/lap/livability/scenic-highways/index.html.

California Department of Forestry and Fire Protection (CAL FIRE). 2008. *Solano County Fire Hazard Severity Map*. Accessed June 2019. Available online at: http://www.fire.ca.gov/fire_prevention/fhsz_maps_solano.

City of Fairfield. *City of Fairfield General Plan Health and Safety Element.* Accessed June 2019. Available online at: http://www.fairfield.ca.gov/civicax/filebank/blobdload.aspx?BlobID=14424

City of Fairfield. 2015. *City of Fairfield General Plan Land Use Map*. Accessed September 2018. Available online at: https://www.fairfield.ca.gov/gov/depts/cd/plan.asp.

City of Fairfield. 2018a. *City of Fairfield Zoning Ordinance, 25.30.4, Outdoor Lighting*. Accessed August 2018. Available online at: https://www.fairfield.ca.gov/gov/depts/cd/planning/zoning/.

City of Fairfield. 2018b. *City of Fairfield Zoning Ordinance, Zoning Map*. Accessed September 2018. Available online at: https://www.fairfield.ca.gov/gov/depts/cd/planning/zoning/.

City of Fairfield. 2012. *Fairfield-Suisun Urban Runoff Management Program*. October. Accessed August 2018. Available online at: https://www.fairfield.ca.gov/civicax/filebank/blobdload.aspx?blobid=9584.

City of Fairfield. *Scenic Vistas and Roadway Plan*. 1999. Accessed September 2018. Available online at: https://www.fairfield.ca.gov/civicax/filebank/blobdload.aspx?BlobID=15620.

Federal Emergency Management Agency (FEMA). *Flood Insurance Rate Map (FIRM), 06095C0432E*. 2009. Accessed August 2018. Available online at: https://msc.fema.gov/portal/home.

U.S. Census Bureau. 2018. *2012-2016 American Community Survey 5-Year Estimates*. Retrieved August 30, 2018.

Wallace Kuhl & Associates. 2018. *Geotechnical Engineering Report, Green Valley II - Mixed-use Complex*. March 12.