

5.0 OTHER CEQA CONSIDERATIONS

As required by CEQA, this chapter discusses the following types of impacts that could result from implementation of the proposed project: (1) effects found not to be significant; (2) growth-inducing impacts; (3) significant irreversible changes; and (4) significant unavoidable effects.

5.1 EFFECTS FOUND NOT TO BE SIGNIFICANT

The environmental topics analyzed in **Chapter 4.0: Environmental Setting, Impacts, and Mitigation Measures** of this EIR represent those environmental topics which generated the greatest potential controversy and expectation of adverse impacts associated with development of the proposed project. As discussed in more detail below, the following environmental topics are not addressed in **Chapter 4.0** because impacts related to these topics either would not occur or would be less than significant with implementation of applicable standard conditions of approval: agricultural and forestry resources, hazards and hazardous materials, mineral resources, and population and housing.

5.1.1 Agriculture and Forestry Resources

In accordance with Appendix G of the *State CEQA Guidelines*, the impacts of the proposed project related to agriculture and forestry resources would be considered significant if the project 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.

The project site is currently vacant and undeveloped, is located in an urbanized area of Fairfield, and is surrounded by a residential neighborhood to the north, an office-business park to the east, a future hotel to the south (currently under construction), and an unnamed drainage and Green Valley Road to the west. No land adjacent, near, or in the vicinity of the project site is currently in agricultural production or is occupied by forest land. There is no active agricultural or timber production occurring on or adjacent to the project site. According to the California Department of Conservation Farmland Mapping and Monitoring Program 2018 Solano County data, the project site is designated as “Other Land (X)” and “Urban and Built-Up Land (D)” and is not designated as Important Farmland (i.e., Prime Farmland, Unique Farmland, Farmland of Statewide Importance, or Farmland of Local Importance).¹ The project site is not under a Williamson Act contract and the nearest parcel under a Williamson Act contract is south of Cordelia Road (approximately 0.75 mile from the project site).² The project site is currently zoned as Industrial Business Park-North Cordelia Overlay (IBP-NC) and is not zoned for agricultural, forest land or timberland resources.³ A riparian area comprising trees and understory is located to the west of the project site along an unnamed drainage that is tributary to Green Valley Creek; however, this riparian area does not constitute forest land pursuant to CEQA.

Improvements associated with the project would be limited to the project site and no offsite improvements (i.e., road widening, new road development, etc.) or disturbance of the riparian area would occur. As the project site does not contain Important Farmlands or forestry resources, there would be no direct impacts on agriculture and forestry resources. Furthermore, the development of the project site with urban uses will not place development pressure on or result in conflicts with agricultural lands as none are present in the project vicinity. There would be no impacts on agricultural and forest resources.

Level of Significance prior to Mitigation: No Impact

Mitigation Measures: No mitigation measures are required.

Level of Significance after Mitigation: Not Applicable

5.1.2 Hazards and Hazardous Materials

In accordance with Appendix G of the *State CEQA Guidelines*, the impacts of the proposed project related to hazards and hazardous materials would be considered significant if the project would:

- **Create a significant hazard to the public or the environment through the routine transport, use, or disposal of hazardous materials; or**

¹ California Department of Conservation, Farmland Mapping and Monitoring Program, 2018 Solano County. Website: <https://gis.conservation.ca.gov/portal/home/group.html?id=b1494c705cb34d01acf78f4927a75b8f#overview> (accessed April 10, 2022).

² Solano County, *Solano County General Plan*, Chapter 3 Agriculture, Figure AG-2, page AG-9, November 2008.

³ City of Fairfield, Fairfield Zoning Map. Website: <https://fairfield.maps.arcgis.com/apps/webappviewer/index.html?id=2631cd4c79da4c6099c6e0a4ded9a172> (accessed February 15, 2022).

- **Create a significant hazard to the public or the environment through reasonably foreseeable upset and accident conditions involving the release of hazardous materials into the environment; or**
- **Emit hazardous emissions or handle hazardous or acutely hazardous materials, substances, or waste within one-quarter mile of an existing or proposed school; or**
- **Be located on a site which is included on a list of hazardous materials sites compiled pursuant to Government Code Section 65962.5 and, as a result, would it create a significant hazard to the public or the environment; or**
- **Be located within an airport land use plan or, where such a plan has not been adopted, within two miles of a public airport or public use airport, would the project result in a safety hazard or excessive noise for people residing or working in the project area; or**
- **Impair implementation of or physically interfere with an adopted emergency response plan or emergency evacuation plan; or**
- **Expose people or structures, either directly or indirectly, to a significant risk of loss, injury or death involving wildland fires.**

Impact HAZ-1: The proposed project would not create a significant hazard to the public or the environment through the routine transport, use, or disposal of hazardous materials, or through reasonably foreseeable upset and accident conditions involving the release of hazardous materials into the environment. Nor would the project emit hazardous emissions or handle hazardous or acutely hazardous materials, substances, or waste within one-quarter mile of an existing or proposed school.

Construction activities have the potential to create a hazard to the public, nearby schools (Nelda Mundy Elementary School located 0.15 mile west of the project site) or the environment through the routine transportation, use and disposal of construction related hazardous materials such as fuels, oils, solvents, and other materials. These materials are typical materials delivered to residential construction sites. However, due to the limited quantities of these materials to be used by construction contractors during project construction, they are not considered hazardous to the public at large. In accordance with State (i.e., Title 13 of the California Code of Regulations) and local policies (i.e., *City of Fairfield General Plan* Objective HS 7) governing the transport, use, and storage of hazardous materials, the project would be constructed pursuant to applicable laws.

Once operational, the proposed project site would be occupied by a 185-unit apartment complex and two-story parking garage. The project would not emit hazardous emissions that could affect nearby schools. Residents and maintenance crews may use and store small quantities of common household hazardous materials, such as cleaning agents and paints, on site; however, due to the nature and limited quantities of these materials to be used during project operation, their use would not be considered hazardous to the public, nearby schools, or the environment. Compliance with all applicable local, State, and federal laws related to the transportation, use and storage of hazardous

materials would reduce the likelihood and severity of potential accidents during project construction and operation. The impact would be less than significant.

Level of Significance prior to Mitigation: Less than Significant

Mitigation Measures: No mitigation measures are required.

Level of Significance after Mitigation: Not Applicable

Impact HAZ-2: The proposed project would not be located on a site which is included on a list of hazardous materials sites compiled pursuant to Government Code Section 65962.5. It would also not be located within an airport plan area.

The *Phase I Environmental Site Assessment* (Phase I ESA) (see **Appendix K**) was prepared for the proposed project to assess whether the site is located on or near an area where Recognized Environmental Conditions (RECs) occur. The Phase I ESA determined that no RECs exist on or near the site nor is the project site on a list of hazardous materials sites compiled pursuant to Government Code Section 65962.5.

The proposed project is not located within 2 miles of an airport or in an area under the jurisdiction of an airport land use plan. The closest airport to the project site is Napa County Airport, located approximately 7.5 miles west of the project site. Travis Air Force Base is located about 10 miles east of the project site. As described in **Section 4.9: Land Use and Planning**, the project site is located within Compatibility Zone D of the *Travis Air Force Base Land Use Compatibility Plan* (LUCP); however, none of the criteria applicable to development in Compatibility Zone D are applicable to the proposed project. Therefore, the project would not conflict with the Travis Air Force Base LUCP. Therefore, the project would not result in a safety hazard or excessive noise for people residing or working in the project area. There would be no impact.

Level of Significance prior to Mitigation: No Impact

Mitigation Measures: No mitigation measures are required.

Level of Significance after Mitigation: Not Applicable

Impact HAZ-3: The proposed project would not impair implementation of or physically interfere with an adopted emergency response plan or emergency evacuation plan; or expose people or structures, either directly or indirectly, to a significant risk of loss, injury or death involving wildland fires.

The proposed project would be constructed and would operate on a site-specific parcel just to the northeast of the Green Valley Road and Business Center Drive intersection. During construction, there is potential that temporary lane closures along Business Center Drive could occur to connect the proposed project to existing utilities; however, one lane would always be maintained open for traffic, and the construction contractor would notify the Fairfield Police Department and Fairfield

Fire Department prior to closing lanes to ensure that emergency response to the project site and the existing uses in the surrounding area would not be affected.

Access to the project site during construction and occupancy of the project would occur via the Fairfield Business Center driveway connected to Business Center Drive. The access plan, prepared for the proposed project, shows access to the site would be available via an entrance just northwest of the under-construction hotel property and an entrance just northwest of the parking structure. These access points would connect as a loop roadway around the apartment building and parking structure thus making up the internal circulation of the project site. A third access point from the Fairfield Business Center driveway would provide ingress/egress for residents to the two-story parking structure on the site. The internal circulation of the project site would be composed of roads that would be 26 feet in width pursuant to fire code and emergency vehicle access standards. In the event of an emergency, residents of the proposed project could exit the project site via Business Center Drive and access I-80 via Green Valley Road interchange or travel north on Business Center Drive or Neitzel Road to access the Suisun Valley Road-Pittman Road interchange. Overall, the proposed project, during construction and operation, would not include design features that would impair implementation of or physically interfere with an adopted emergency response plan or emergency evacuation plan. The impact would be less than significant.

Fire Hazard Severity Zones Maps prepared by Cal Fire designate the project site as within Local Responsibility Area (LRA) Urban Unzoned area.⁴ Hazards associated with wildfires are analyzed in **Section 4.14: Wildfire**, of this EIR.

Level of Significance prior to Mitigation: Less than Significant

Mitigation Measures: No mitigation measures are required.

Level of Significance after Mitigation: Not Applicable

5.1.3 Mineral Resources

In accordance with Appendix G of the *State CEQA Guidelines*, the impacts of the proposed project related to mineral resources would be considered significant if the project would:

- **Result in the loss of availability of a known mineral resource that would be of value to the region and the residents of the state; 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.**

⁴ California Office of the State Fire Marshal, Fire Hazard Severity Zones Maps, Solano County, website: <https://osfm.fire.ca.gov/divisions/community-wildfire-preparedness-and-mitigation/wildland-hazards-building-codes/fire-hazard-severity-zones-maps/> (accessed February 18, 2022).

Impact MR-1: The proposed project would not result in the loss of availability of a known mineral resource that would be of value to the region and the residents of the state, or a locally important mineral resource recovery site.

According to the California Geological Survey, the project site is in a Mineral Resource Zone 1 (MRZ-1).⁵ An MRZ-1 is defined as an area where adequate information indicates that no significant mineral deposits are present, or where it is judged that little likelihood exists for their presence. Further, the project site is not designated a locally important mineral resource site in the *City of Fairfield General Plan*. Implementation of the proposed project would therefore not result in the loss of availability of a known mineral resource of value to the region or the state, nor the loss of a locally important mineral resource recovery site delineated on a local general plan, specific plan, or other land use plan. As such, there would be no impact on mineral resources.

Level of Significance prior to Mitigation: No Impact

Mitigation Measures: No mitigation measures are required.

Level of Significance after Mitigation: Not Applicable

5.1.4 Population and Housing

In accordance with Appendix G of the *State CEQA Guidelines*, the impacts of the proposed project related to population and housing would be considered significant if the project 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 or indirectly.

The proposed project is located in the City of Fairfield which as of 2021, the year for which the most current data is available, has a population of 119,897 residents.⁶ The *City of Fairfield General Plan*

⁵ California Geological Survey (CGS). CGS Information Warehouse: Mineral Land Classification, Special Report 156 Mineral Land Classification: Portland Cement Concrete Grade Aggregate in the Sacramento-Fairfield Production Consumption Region, 1988, Plate 35. Website: <https://maps.conservation.ca.gov/cgs/informationwarehouse/index.html?map=mlc> (accessed February 16, 2022).

⁶ California Department of Finance, E-5 Population and Housing Estimates for Cities, Counties, and the State, 2022 data for the City of Fairfield. Website: <https://dof.ca.gov/forecasting/demographics/estimates/estimates-e5-2010-2021/> (accessed May 6, 2022).

estimates that buildout of the City per the General Plan would result in a population of 136,160 residents.^{7,8} The project site is currently vacant.

The proposed project would include the development of an apartment building with 185 residential units. Implementation of the proposed project is estimated to generate 5 employees and 509 residents that would be added to the existing population of the City of Fairfield.^{9 10} The number of residents generated by the proposed project would increase the current population of the City by less than 0.5 percent and the project population would make a small fraction of the projected population of Fairfield at buildout under the General Plan. As discussed in **Section 4.9: Land Use and Planning**, the site is currently not zoned for residential use and is designated for business park use in the General Plan. Therefore, the residential population growth associated with the proposed project could be considered unplanned because residential use was not anticipated in the General Plan on the project site. However, the population increase would not be considered substantial and adverse for a number of reasons: (1) The population added by the project is well within the remaining residential population growth projected to occur in Fairfield under the General Plan. As noted above, the City currently has a population of 119,897 residents, and the *City of Fairfield General Plan* estimates that buildout of the City per the General Plan would result in a population of 136,160. (2) As shown by the analysis in other sections of this Draft EIR, the population added to the City due to the project would not place a substantial demand on schools, fire, police services, library services, recreational resources (see **Section 4.11: Public Services and Recreation**), utilities (see **Section 4.13: Utilities and Service Systems**), and transportation systems (see **Section 4.12: Transportation**) and that the impacts of this population growth on these resources would be less than significant or reduced to less than significant with the proposed mitigation measures. (3) The project would improve the City's jobs/housing balance. 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 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. Based on the latest employment and housing data, the City of Fairfield has an estimated 1.21 jobs for every housing unit.¹¹ Fairfield's jobs-to-housing ratio indicates that the City is "job

⁷ The current *City of Fairfield General Plan EIR* used 2020 as the planning horizon for the General Plan. The EIR acknowledged that buildout would occur after that year but did not indicate by which year buildout of the City under the General Plan would occur.

⁸ City of Fairfield. 2016. *City of Fairfield General Plan* Land Use Element, Table LU-1 projection of Housing, Population and Jobs at Buildout of General Plan, page LU-36, October 2016.

⁹ 2.75 residents per multifamily unit x 185 units = 509 residents (rounded). Derived from City of Fairfield, *Fairfield Guidelines for Project VMT Screening Transportation Analysis*, December 22, 2020, American Community Survey 2012-2016 Five-Year Estimates.

¹⁰ Based on a recent population assessment conducted by the project applicant for the Green Valley 1 Project, which consists of a multi-family residential development in Fairfield similar to the proposed project, there are 1.9 residents/unit. If this household size were to be used, the proposed project would generate about 350 residents. As such, 509 residents or 2.75 residents/unit for the proposed project reflects a conservative population assessment that has been used for this EIR analysis.

¹¹ According to California Employment Development Department (EDD), there are a total of 49,900 jobs in Fairfield as of early 2022. Based on housing unit data from the Department of Finance, there are a total of 41,172 housing units in Fairfield as of January 2022. This yields an approximate job-housing ratio of 1.21 jobs per housing unit.

rich,” meaning there are more jobs than the number of households.¹² The addition of 185 residential units to the City’s housing stock will help improve the City’s jobs/housing balance. Based on the above, the project’s impact due to the increase in population would be less than significant.

The proposed project would extend infrastructure onto a site that is previously undeveloped; however, the infrastructure improvements would only occur on and serve the project site and no off-site improvements would be required. Therefore, the proposed infrastructure improvements would not spur development in undeveloped portions or parcels of the City that would be available for future development. As such, there would be a less than significant impact pertaining to population and housing.

Level of Significance prior to Mitigation: Less than Significant

Mitigation Measures: No mitigation measures are required.

Level of Significance after Mitigation: Not Applicable

Impact PH-2: The proposed project would not displace substantial numbers of existing people or housing, necessitating the construction of replacement housing elsewhere.

The project site is vacant and therefore the proposed project would not displace substantial numbers of existing people or housing, and no replacement housing would be required. There would be no impact.

Level of Significance prior to Mitigation: No Impact

Mitigation Measures: No mitigation measures are required.

Level of Significance after Mitigation: Not Applicable

5.2 GROWTH INDUCEMENT

State CEQA Guidelines Section 15126.2(d) requires that an EIR discuss the ways in which a proposed project could foster economic or population growth, or the construction of additional housing, either directly or indirectly, in the surrounding environment. In general terms, a project may have a growth-inducing impact if it meets any one of the criteria that are identified below:

- The project removes an impediment to growth (e.g., the establishment of an essential public service, the provision of new access to an area, or a change in zoning or general plan designation).

¹² California Department of Finance, E-5 Population and Housing Estimates for Cities, Counties, and the State. Website: <https://dof.ca.gov/forecasting/demographics/estimates/estimates-e5-2010-2021/> (accessed May 6, 2022); California Employment Development Department, Labor Market Information Division, Monthly Labor Force Data for Cities and Census Designated Places, March 2022. Website: <http://www.labormarketinfo.edd.ca.gov> (accessed May 6, 2022).

- Economic expansion, population growth, or the construction of additional housing occurs in the surrounding environment in response to the project, either directly or indirectly (e.g., changes in revenue base, employment expansion, etc.).
- Development or encroachment in an isolated or adjacent area of open space (being distinct from an “infill” type of project).

An evaluation of the proposed project with regard to these criteria is provided below. The *State CEQA Guidelines* require that consideration also be given to potential impacts on community service facilities resulting from increases in population. **Chapter 4.0: Environmental Setting, Impacts, and Mitigation Measures** of this Draft EIR addresses potential impacts on community service facilities (e.g., police fire, water, wastewater, etc.) resulting from increases in population on the project site.

5.2.1 Removal of an Impediment to Growth

Growth in an area may result from the removal of physical impediments or restrictions to growth, as well as the removal of planning impediments resulting from land use plans and General Plan policies. In this context, physical impediments to growth may include nonexistent or inadequate access to an area or the lack of essential public and utility services (e.g., natural gas, potable and non-potable water, sewage, electricity), and planning impediments may include restrictive zoning and/or general plan designations.

The project site is in an area planned for future development, and while vacant, is surrounded by development that includes a residential neighborhood to the north, the Fairfield Business Center to the east, and an under-construction hotel to the south. Urban services, including water, sewer, electricity, natural gas, and police and fire protection are available at the project site. As discussed in **Section 4.13: Utilities and Service Systems**, while connections to existing infrastructure would be required in the off-site public right-of-way, no off-site upgrades to the water supply, sewer and storm drain system would be required and no off-site improvements would be made that could serve to induce growth in the surrounding area. As such, the proposed project would not remove an impediment to growth related to utility infrastructure.

The project site is in close proximity to regional roadways, such as Interstate 80, Interstate 680, and State Route 12. The project site is currently accessible from Business Center Drive and no off-site roadway extensions would be required to implement the proposed project. Consequently, there would be no extension of transportation infrastructure to serve the project and no growth would be induced in the surrounding area due to the project.

General Plan land use designations and policies and zoning may also restrict or deter growth and can be considered an impediment to growth. The City General Plan land use designation of the project site is Business and Industrial Park (IBP) and the site is currently zoned Industrial Business Park-North Cordelia Overlay (IBP-NC). The project site does not have a land use designation and zoning that precludes development, and the General Plan does provide for the project site to be developed with urban uses. Therefore, even if the proposed project were not developed at this site, development of other uses would occur at this site.

As the proposed project includes residential uses which are not permitted under the current General Plan designation and zoning of the project site, the project will require a General Plan Amendment (GPA) and rezone to Residential Very High Density (RVH). However, the proposed General Plan amendment and rezone associated with the proposed project would be specific to the project site and would not affect other parcels in the project area or facilitate the development of other parcels in the surrounding area. Other vacant parcels in the surrounding area are already designated and zoned for urban development.

5.2.2 Population and Economic Growth

The proposed project, during construction, would result in a temporary increase in construction-related job opportunities in the City and local area. Construction employment opportunities on the project site would not likely result in construction worker household relocations to the vicinity of the project area. Construction workers would likely be drawn from the existing labor force residing in the City, in Solano County, the Sacramento region to the east, and the Bay Area to the west. Employment opportunities during construction of the proposed project would be relatively short and would not constitute a substantial or permanent growth in employment.

The project site would be developed with 185 multi-family residential units and with an average household size of 2.75 residents per household, the project would add 5 employees and approximately 509 new residents to the City of Fairfield. As of January 2021, the California Department of Finance (DOF) estimates that the population of the City was 119,897. Although some of the future residents of the proposed project may relocate from within the City of Fairfield, if all 5 employees and 509 residents anticipated to live at the project site are considered new to the community, the project would result in an approximately 0.42 percent increase in the existing population of the City and the City would have a population of 120,406 residents. Population levels are dependent on a wide variety of factors, many of which are not related to land use planning. Such variables as birth and death rates, income, migration and immigration levels, Federal immigration policies, natural disasters, economic trends and employment levels all factor in to determine if growth or decline in population of a jurisdiction occurs. Population levels, while partially related to building permit (development) activity, are not directly tied to the number of housing units available in a jurisdiction. Population increase (or decreases) can occur during periods of slow or even no growth in the number of available residential units. Similarly, for short periods of time, it is possible to have stable or declining population levels during periods of rapid housing unit construction. Over shorter time periods, construction cycles and population trends may not be consistent.

As discussed above, the proposed project does not include or require new or expanded infrastructure off-site that could in turn provide additional capacity or facilities for additional development in the area. Further, as the proposed project is located on a site and in an area planned for development, the project would not create increased pressure on land use intensification in the area or in the City. While the proposed project includes a General Plan amendment and rezone of the site, these changes would only apply to the project site and not any other off-site locations. As such, the increase in population and economic growth associated with the proposed project would not induce growth.

5.2.3 Development of Open Space

The proposed project would be located on a parcel of land that is vacant; however, the existing General Plan land use and zoning of the site are not designated as open space. Land designated as open space is adjacent to the southwestern boundary of the project site; however, no development in this area associated with the proposed project would occur and no change in land use or zoning to a non-open space designation would occur. Therefore, implementation of the proposed project would not involve the development of open space, nor would it induce the development of any lands that are currently designated as open space. Under this criterion, the proposed project is not considered growth inducing.

5.3 SIGNIFICANT IRREVERSIBLE CHANGES

CEQA requires an assessment of whether a proposed project would result in significant irreversible changes to the physical environment. The *State CEQA Guidelines* list three categories of significant irreversible changes that should be considered. Each is addressed below.

5.3.1 Changes in Land Use Which Commit Future Generations

The proposed project would result in the development of a vacant site located in an urbanized area of Fairfield. The purpose of the proposed project is to develop a 185-unit apartment building to provide more housing opportunities in the City of Fairfield. The development of the proposed project site (from its vacant condition) would constitute a permanent commitment of land to urban uses, and it is unlikely that circumstances would occur that would justify the return of the site to its original vacant condition. While the proposed project is essentially an irreversible change that would commit future generations to urban uses, alteration of the project site from vacant to a developed site is consistent with the *City of Fairfield General Plan*, which anticipates this site would be developed and placed under urban uses based on its location within a business park and adjacent to existing residential uses.

5.3.2 Irreversible Damage from Environmental Accidents

The *State CEQA Guidelines* also require a discussion of the potential for irreversible environmental damage caused by an accident associated with the proposed project. While the proposed project could result in the use, transport, storage, and disposal of small quantities of hazardous materials and waste during construction, and storage/disposal of hazardous materials and waste during operation, as described above in **Section 5.1.2, Hazards and Hazardous Materials**, common hazardous materials would be used in small quantities, and all activities would comply with applicable State and federal laws related to hazardous materials. Compliance with such laws would reduce the likelihood and severity of accidents that could result in irreversible environmental damage.

5.3.3 Consumption of Non-Renewable Resources

Consumption of nonrenewable resources includes conversion of agricultural lands and forest resources, and lost access to mining reserves. As discussed in **Section 5.1.1, Agriculture and Forestry Resources**, and **Section 5.1.3, Mineral Resources**, above, the proposed project is not located on a parcel that is currently under agricultural production, occupied by or zoned as forest

land or timberland, or designated as a mineral resource zone. Thus, development of the proposed project would not result in the conversion of agricultural/forestry resources to urbanized uses nor would it result in the loss of access to mining reserves.

During construction of the proposed project, the use of materials such as steel, wood, copper and fossil fuels would be required. Energy consumption would also occur during the operational period of the proposed project. As discussed in **Section 4.5: Energy**, of this EIR, the proposed project would not result in the wasteful, inefficient, or unnecessary consumption of fuel or energy and would incorporate renewable energy or energy efficiency measures into building design, equipment use, and transportation. The proposed building would be all-electric; the only natural gas that would be used for the project would be associated with the tanks used for the barbeque areas. Additionally, the proposed project would not require the construction of major new infrastructure to deliver electricity, as this service is already provided in the area and City of Fairfield. Therefore, the proposed project would not result in substantial consumption of nonrenewable resources.

5.4 SIGNIFICANT UNAVOIDABLE ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACTS

Section 15126.2(c) of the *State CEQA Guidelines* requires that an EIR describe any significant impacts that cannot be avoided, even with the implementation of feasible mitigation measures. As part of the certification process, the City Council for the City of Fairfield will make a final decision as to the significance of impacts and the feasibility of mitigation measures in this EIR. The environmental effects of the proposed project on various aspects of the environment are discussed in detail in **Chapter 4.0: Environmental Setting, Impacts, and Mitigation Measures** of this EIR. The analysis shows that the proposed project will not result in significant and unavoidable environmental impacts.