

## **II. SUMMARY**

### **A. PROJECT UNDER REVIEW**

In compliance with the California Environmental Quality Act (CEQA), this Environmental Impact Report (EIR) describes the environmental consequences of the Draft 2030 Countywide General Plan for Yolo County (Draft General Plan). This EIR is designed to fully inform decision-makers in Yolo County, other responsible and trustee agencies, and the general public of the potential environmental consequences of approval and implementation of the updated General Plan. This Draft EIR has been prepared to evaluate the environmental impacts of the Draft General Plan (referred to hereafter as the “proposed project”). A detailed description of the proposed project is provided in Chapter III, Project Description. Yolo County (County) is the lead agency for environmental review of the proposed project. This EIR will be used by Yolo County staff and the public in their review of the Draft General Plan.

### **B. SUMMARY OF IMPACTS AND MITIGATION MEASURES**

This summary provides an overview of the analysis contained in Chapter IV, Setting, Impacts, and Mitigation Measures. CEQA requires a summary to include discussion of: 1) potential areas of controversy; 2) significant impacts of the project; 3) significant unavoidable impacts of the project; and 4) alternatives to the project. Table II-1 in this chapter has been organized to correspond with the environmental issues discussed in Chapter IV and provides a summary of all the significant impacts and mitigation measures that were identified.

#### **1. Potential Areas of Controversy**

This EIR is a comprehensive document that evaluates each environmental topic that could be applicable to the County. The environmental topics covered, as potential areas of controversy, include: Land Use and Housing; Agricultural Resources; Transportation and Circulation; Air Quality; Noise; Global Climate Change; Public Services; Utilities and Energy; Cultural Resources; Biological Resources; Hydrology and Water Quality; Geology, Soils, Seismicity and Mineral Resources; Hazards and Hazardous Materials; and Visual and Scenic Resources.

Yolo County published and circulated a Notice of Preparation (NOP) on September 22, 2008, which was distributed to local, regional, and State agencies and posted on the County website at <http://www.yolocounty.org/Index.aspx?page=1589>. NOP and written comments received on the NOP are included in Appendix A. Issues raised by reviewing agencies and the public during the scoping process include: potential impacts to the State highway system; regional and local traffic congestion; alternative transportation options; air quality effects and consistency with regional plans including SACOG Blueprint; air quality impacts of farming and transportation; motor vehicle emissions; hazards and hazardous materials; flood control and flood plain management; water supply and resource allocation; residential uses on farmland; land use compatibilities including landfill operations; land use management in the Yolo Bypass; climate change and Assembly Bill 32; and effects of alternative energy sources on wildlife. The EIR addresses each of these topics.

## 2. Significant Impacts and Significant Unavoidable Impacts

Each of the CEQA-defined environmental factors is considered within Chapter IV, Setting, Impacts, and Mitigation Measures, of this EIR. No topics suggested for consideration in the CEQA Statute or Guidelines have been “focused out” of detailed analysis. Under CEQA, a significant impact on the environment is defined as: a substantial, or potentially substantial, adverse change in any of the physical conditions within the area affected by the project including land, air, water, minerals, flora, fauna, ambient noise, and objects of historic or aesthetic significance.<sup>1</sup>

**a. Significant Impacts.** Implementation of the proposed project has the potential to result in adverse environmental impacts. Impacts in the following areas would be significant without the implementation of mitigation measures, but would be reduced to a less-than-significant level if the mitigation measures noted in this report are implemented:

- **Land Use and Housing**

- LU-1: Build-out of the Draft General Plan could disrupt or physically divide established communities.
- LU-5: Build-out of the Draft General Plan would result in conflicts with the plans and policies of other agencies.

- **Agricultural Resources**

- AG-4: Implementation of Draft General Plan policies could result in less effective buffer protection for agricultural operations.

- **Air Quality**

- AIR-3: Build-out of the Draft General Plan could expose sensitive receptors to toxic air contaminants.

- **Noise**

- NOISE-2: Build-out of the proposed Draft General Plan would result in traffic noise levels in excess of the County’s normally acceptable standard of 60 dBA L<sub>dn</sub> for new noise sensitive land use development.
- NOISE-4: Build-out of the proposed Draft General Plan would result in excessive groundborne vibration levels from construction activities.

- **Public Services**

- PUB-1: Growth associated with build-out of the Draft General Plan would generate a demand for fire protection and emergency services that may exceed the ability of the fire districts and departments to meet established service thresholds.
- PUB-2: Growth occurring under the Draft General Plan would generate a demand for school services beyond the existing public school capacity and may result in the need for additional facilities to the degree that acceptable services ratios may not be met concurrent with new growth.

---

<sup>1</sup> *CEQA Guidelines*, 2008. Sections 21060.5 and 21068.

- PUB-3: Growth occurring under the Draft General Plan would generate a demand for community parks and resource parks to the degree that service thresholds may not be met concurrent with new growth.
- **Utilities and Energy**
  - UTIL-3: Build-out of the Draft General Plan would generate wastewater flows that would exceed the capacities of existing wastewater treatment systems.
- **Hydrology and Water Quality**
  - HYD-1: Build-out of the Draft General Plan could result in increased overdraft of County aquifers and a reduction of aquifer recharge resulting in a net reduction aquifer capacity, availability of groundwater resources, and ground surface subsidence.
- **Geology, Soils, Seismicity and Mineral Resources**
  - GEO-1: Implementation of the Draft General Plan could result in the destruction or modification of a unique geologic feature.
- **Hazards and Hazardous Materials**
  - HAZ-1: The public may be exposed to health risks from agricultural chemical residues in soils as a result of redevelopment of former agricultural properties that may occur under the Draft General Plan.
  - HAZ-3: The public may be exposed to safety hazards due to new development near private and informal airstrips.
- b. Significant Unavoidable Impacts.** Build-out of the Draft General Plan could result in unavoidable significant impacts related to Land Use and Housing, Agricultural Resources, Transportation and Circulation, Air Quality, Noise, Global Climate Change, Public Services, Utilities and Energy, Cultural Resources, Biological Resources, Hydrology and Water Quality, Hazards and Hazardous Materials, and Visual and Scenic Resources as analyzed in Chapter IV, Setting, Impacts and Mitigation Measures of this EIR, and summarized below:
  - **Land Use and Housing**
    - LU-2: Build-out of the Draft General Plan could create substantial incompatibilities between land uses.
    - LU-3: Build-out of the Draft General Plan would substantially alter the type and intensity of land uses within the community areas of the unincorporated County.
    - LU-4: Land uses and development consistent with the Draft General Plan would fail to achieve a jobs/housing balance and match in some community areas and could potentially exacerbate an existing jobs/housing imbalance in some community areas.
  - **Agricultural Resources**
    - AG-1: Build-out of the Draft General Plan and the associated development would convert Prime Farmland, Unique Farmland, or Farmland of Statewide Importance to non-agricultural uses.
    - AG-2: Build-out of the Draft General Plan and the associated development would conflict with or result in the cancellation of a Williamson Act contract.

- AG-3: Build-out of the Draft General Plan and the associated development would result in permanent conversion of agricultural soils to non-agricultural use.
- **Transportation and Circulation**
  - CI-1: Build-out of the Draft General Plan could result in increased vehicle miles of travel.
  - CI-2: Build-out of the Draft General Plan would add vehicle trips to roadways that would operate below the 1983 Yolo County General Plan level of service (LOS) under cumulative conditions.
  - CI-3: Build-out of the Draft General Plan would rely upon future roadway capacity expansion projects for which full funding is not ensured.
  - CI-4: Build-out of the Draft General Plan would contribute vehicle trips to roadways projected to operate worse than the LOS thresholds identified in the Congestion Management Program (CMP) under cumulative conditions.
  - CI-5: Build-out of the Draft General Plan would contribute vehicle trips to roadways projected to operate worse than the LOS thresholds of the incorporated Cities of Davis, West Sacramento, Winters, and Woodland under cumulative conditions.
  - CI-6: Build-out of the Draft General Plan would contribute vehicle trips on state highways that would operate worse than the Caltrans LOS threshold under cumulative conditions.
  - CI-7: Build-out of the Draft General Plan could result in increased travel on roadways that do not meet current design standards.
  - CI-8: Build-out of the Draft General Plan could result in increased travel on state facilities that do not meet current design standards.
  - CI-9: Build-out of the Draft General Plan would result in an adverse physical environmental impact associated with an increase in traffic on roadways in comparison to the policies of the 1983 General Plan.
- **Air Quality**
  - AIR-1: Build-out of the Draft General Plan could result in construction-related emissions that exceed the YSAQMD thresholds of significance for criteria pollutants.
  - AIR-2: Build-out of the Draft General Plan could result in long-term operational emissions that would exceed YSAQMD thresholds of significance and substantially contribute to air quality violations.
  - AIR-4: Build-out of the Draft General Plan could result in a cumulatively considerable impact on criteria air pollutants.
  - AIR-5: Build-out of the Draft General Plan could result in conflicts with air quality planning efforts by other agencies.
- **Noise**
  - NOI-1: Increased traffic from build-out of the proposed Draft General Plan would result in a significant increase in traffic noise levels on roadway segments throughout the County.
  - NOI-3: Build-out of the proposed Draft General Plan would result in a substantial or periodic increase in ambient noise levels.
- **Global Climate Change**

- GCC-1: Build-out of the Draft General Plan would result in greenhouse gas emissions that would have a significant physical adverse impact and cumulatively contribute to global climate change.
- GCC-2: While uncertainty exists in the degree to which the effects of climate change will occur, it is likely that significant adverse physical impacts from the effects of global climate change will occur on existing and future planned land uses in the County by 2030.
- **Utilities and Energy**
  - UTIL-1: Build-out of the Draft General Plan may result in a demand for water in excess of available groundwater supply.
  - UTIL-2: Build-out of the Draft General Plan could result in increased overdraft of County aquifers and a net increase in ground surface subsidence.
- **Cultural Resources**
  - CULT-1: Build-out of the Draft General Plan would result in the potential for impacts to architectural resources and archaeological deposits that qualify as historical resources under CEQA.
  - CULT-2: Build-out of the Draft General Plan would result in the potential for impacts to archaeological deposits that qualify as unique archaeological resources under CEQA.
- **Biological Resources**
  - BIO-1: Build-out of the Draft General Plan may result in loss or destruction of riparian habitats and the wildlife and plants that depend on those habitats.
  - BIO-2: Build-out of the Draft General Plan may result in loss or destruction of wetlands and vernal pools and the wildlife and plants that depend on those habitats.
  - BIO-3: Build-out of the Draft General Plan may result in loss or destruction of oak woodlands and the wildlife and plants that depend on those habitats.
  - BIO-4: Build-out of the Draft General Plan may result in the disruption of movement corridors and nursery sites on which local wildlife depend.
  - BIO-5: Build-out of the Draft General Plan may result in the loss or destruction of special-status plants and their habitats, and/or to special-status fish and wildlife and their habitats.
  - BIO-6: Build-out of the Draft General Plan would result in a general loss of habitat in natural and agricultural areas.
- **Hydrology and Water Quality**
  - HYD-2: Build-out of the Draft General Plan would expose more people and structures flood hazards and may impede or redirect flood flows, resulting in increased flood hazards.
  - HYD-3: Build-out of the Draft General Plan would expose more people and structures flood hazards as a result of climate-induced sea level rise.
- **Hazards and Hazardous Materials**
  - HAZ-2: New development under the Draft General Plan may impair emergency response during peak traffic periods.
- **Visual and Scenic Resources**
  - VIS-1: Build-out of the Draft General Plan would result in new growth that degrades the existing visual character and quality of the County.

- VIS-2: Implementation of the Draft General Plan could result in additional uses that would create new sources of substantial light or glare, which could adversely affect nighttime views outside of identified growth areas.
- **Cumulative Impacts**
  - GROWTH-INDUCING-1: Build-out of the Draft General Plan would result in growth inducing impacts.
  - IRREVERSIBLE CHANGES-1: Build-out of the Draft General Plan would result in significant irreversible changes.
  - CUMULATIVE LU-1: Build-out of the Draft General Plan in conjunction with other planned development in the region would contribute cumulatively to land use and housing impacts in the region.
  - CUMULATIVE AG-1: Build-out of the Draft General Plan in conjunction with other planned development in the region would contribute cumulatively to loss of agricultural land.
  - CUMULATIVE CI-1: Build-out of the Draft General Plan in conjunction with other planned development in the region would contribute cumulatively to transportation and circulation impacts in the region.
  - CUMULATIVE AIR-1: Build-out of the Draft General Plan, in conjunction with other planned development in the region would contribute cumulatively to air quality impacts in the region.
  - CUMULATIVE NOISE-1: Build-out of the Draft General Plan in conjunction with other planned development in the region would contribute cumulatively to noise impacts in the region.
  - CUMULATIVE GCC-1: Build-out of the Draft General Plan, in conjunction with other planned development in the region would contribute cumulatively to global climate change.
  - CUMULATIVE UTIL-1: Build-out of the Draft General Plan in conjunction with other planned development in the region would contribute cumulatively to water supply and infrastructure impacts.
  - CUMULATIVE UTIL-2: Build-out of the Draft General Plan in conjunction with other planned development in the region would contribute cumulatively to energy impacts.
  - CUMULATIVE BIO-1: Build-out of the Draft General Plan in conjunction with other planned development in the region would contribute cumulatively to biological resources.
  - CUMULATIVE HYDRO-1: Build-out of the Draft General Plan, in conjunction with other planned development in the region would contribute cumulatively to hydrology and water quality impacts.

### 3. Alternatives to the Project

Chapter V, of this EIR contains a full description and analysis of the three alternatives to the proposed project that are analyzed in this Draft EIR. The three alternatives are:

- The CEQA-required **No Project alternative** assumes that the proposed project would not be adopted or implemented and that development would continue in accordance with the 1983 General Plan. This alternative assumes the full build-out of the development envisioned under the 1983 General Plan and would result in a total of approximately 34,505 persons, 11,277 dwelling units, 33,945 jobs, and 1,962 acres of commercial/industrial development within the

unincorporated County by 2030, as shown in Table V-1. This alternative would result in approximately 47 percent fewer residents, 48 percent of the residential units, and 37 percent of the commercial/industrial acres of development allowed under the proposed project. In addition, under this alternative the 1983 General Plan policy framework would continue to be in effect, which represents a business-as-usual approach to regulating land use in the County.

- The **Rural Sustainability alternative** assumes that a moderate amount of growth would occur in several unincorporated communities, increasing the level of economic development and restricting housing in the rural agricultural areas. Additional density would be allowed in Monument Hills. By 2030, this alternative would result in a total of approximately 44,926 persons, 14,241 dwelling units, 42,372 commercial/industrial jobs, and 2,345 acres of commercial/industrial development within the unincorporated County. This alternative could result in approximately 30 percent fewer persons, 65 percent of the residential units, and 14 percent of the commercial/industrial acres of development than allowed under the proposed project. In addition, under this alternative the smart growth framework proposed by the Draft General Plan would be in effect, but there would not be enough development to achieve sustainability within the communities in terms of issues such as achieving a jobs/housing balance within the community areas, lowering the vehicle miles traveled and thereby reducing greenhouse gas emissions, and providing basic levels of community-serving water, wastewater, and storm drainage, and public services.
- The **Market Demand alternative** assumes that the County's historic constraints on growth would be removed. By 2030, this alternative would result in 71,165 persons, 24,200 dwelling units, 61,945 commercial/industrial jobs, and 3,246 acres of commercial/industrial development within the unincorporated County. This alternative examines the effects of meeting residential market demand within the County and could result in an approximately 11 percent increase in population and 10 percent more dwelling units, and a 31 percent more commercial/industrial acres of development than the growth allowed under the proposed project. In addition, under this alternative the 1983 General Plan policy framework would continue to be in effect, which represents a business-as-usual approach to regulating land use in the County.

Based on the evaluation described in this section, the Rural Sustainability alternative would be the environmentally superior alternative because it would reduce impacts in the greatest number of topic areas compared to the Draft General Plan. However, the overall level of remaining significant and unavoidable impacts is similar between the Rural Sustainability alternative and the Draft General Plan, and the analysis contained in Chapter V, demonstrates that adoption of the Draft General Plan would be the superior choice when comparing and balancing land use, policy, economic viability, environmental impact, and community values.

## C. SUMMARY TABLE

Information in Table II-1, Summary of Impacts and Mitigation Measures, has been organized to correspond with the environmental issues discussed in Chapter IV. The table is arranged in four columns: 1) impacts; 2) level of significance prior to mitigation measures; 3) mitigation measures; and 4) level of significance after mitigation. Levels of significance are categorized as follows: SU = Significant and Unavoidable; S = Significant; and LTS = Less Than Significant. For a complete description of potential impacts and recommended mitigation measures, please refer to the specific discussions in Chapter IV.

**Table II-1: Summary of Impacts and Mitigation Measures**

Environmental Impacts	Level of Significance Without Mitigation	Mitigation Measures	Level of Significance With Mitigation
<b>A. LAND USE AND HOUSING</b>			
<p><u>LU-1</u>: Build-out of the Draft General Plan could disrupt or physically divide established communities.</p>	S	<p><u>LU-1a</u>: Amend Policy CC-2.16 of the Draft General Plan as follows: Policy CC-2.16: Require the following sustainable design standards as appropriate for projects located within the growth boundaries of the unincorporated communities: <u>HH. Provide multiple connections for all modes through the community and with existing and planned development so that individual development projects are integrated with the surrounding communities.</u></p> <p><u>LU-1b</u>: Amend Policy CC-3.5 of the Draft General Plan as follows: Policy CC-3.5: In addition to Table LU-10, achieve the following within the Dunnigan Specific Plan growth boundary: <u>H. Develop an internal road system that directs local trips to local roadways, rather than the freeways, to the greatest practical extent. Plan for multi-modal access between the communities separated by I-5.</u></p> <p><u>LU-1c</u>: Amend Policy CC-3.13 of the Draft General Plan as follows: Policy CC-3.13: <u>Amend Policy CC-3.13 and the Draft General Plan Land Use Map for Esparto to change the designation on the new mixed-use residential area (79 acres) south of State Route 16 to Industrial use to avoid dividing the existing community and allow for an increase in the number of jobs in that community. Reconsider and rebalance the land use designations in Esparto in an effort to attain a jobs/housing ratio of 1.2 during preparation of the new or updated Area/Community Plan or Specific Plan for Esparto as required under Policy CC-3.1</u></p>	LTS



Table II-1 *Continued*

Environmental Impacts	Level of Significance Without Mitigation	Mitigation Measures	Level of Significance With Mitigation
LU-1 <i>Continued</i>		<p>The following development capacities shall guide development of new Esparto mixed use residential area (79 acres) southeast of town, south of State Route 16 and east of County Road 86A:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>○ 10 acres CG (assumes 781 existing industrial jobs are replaced with 160 new commercial jobs)</li> <li>○ 2 acres CL (assumes 46 existing commercial jobs)</li> <li>○ 36 acres of residential uses in various densities allowing for approximately 590 new units:</li> <li>31 acres RM (range of 310 to 619 units [typical 465])</li> <li>5 acres RH (100 to 200 or more units [typical 125]; no new jobs assumed)</li> <li>Potential range 310 to 819 or more units [typical 590]</li> <li>○ 31 acres OS (300 foot agricultural buffer on east and south)</li> </ul>	

Table II-1 *Continued*

Environmental Impacts	Level of Significance Without Mitigation	Mitigation Measures	Level of Significance With Mitigation
<p><u>LU-2</u>: Build-out of the Draft General Plan could create substantial incompatibilities between land uses.</p>	<p>S</p>	<p><u>LU-2a</u>: Amend Policy CC-3.1 of the Draft General Plan as follows: Policy CC-3.1: Require that a Specific Plan be prepared for the entire area within the growth boundary for the communities of Dunnigan, Knights Landing and Madison, to replace each of the existing Area General Plans, as shown in Figure LU-4. The growth allowed in Elkhorn shall also require a Specific Plan. See Table LU-X for a summary of allowed growth within the four Specific Plan areas. Update the Area General Plans for Capay Valley, Clarksburg, Esparto and Monument Hills in the form of new or updated Area Community Plans or Specific Plans. Prepare an area community plan for Yolo/Zamora. <u>Prepare a Specific Plan or Master Plan for the Covell/Pole Line Road property. During the planning process, require that target land uses and development capacities identified for the Specific Plan areas be modified to ensure that the community park threshold of 5 acres/1,000 population is met.</u></p>	<p>SU</p>

Table II-1 *Continued*

Environmental Impacts	Level of Significance Without Mitigation	Mitigation Measures	Level of Significance With Mitigation
LU-2 <i>Continued</i>		<p>LU-2b: Amend Policy CC-4.11 of the Draft General Plan as follows:                      Policy CC-4.11: <del>Require</del> Site specific information shall be <u>required for appropriate to each application, subject to site conditions and available technical information as determined by the County lead department, in order to enable informed decision-making and ensure consistency with the General Plan.</u> Technical information and surveys requested shall <del>include, including</del> but not be limited to the following: air quality and/or greenhouse gas emissions calculations, <u>agricultural resource assessment/agricultural and evaluation and site assessment (LESA), biological resources assessment, cultural resources assessment, fiscal impact analysis, flood risk analysis, hydrology and water quality analysis, geotechnical/soils study, land use compatibility analysis, noise analysis, Phase One environmental site assessment, sewer capacity and service analysis, storm drainage capacity and service analysis, title report, traffic and circulation study, visual simulation and lighting study, and water supply assessment.</u></p> <p><u>Each technical study must cover the entire acreage upon which development is being proposed including any off-site improvements (e.g. wells; pumps; force mains; new roads; dirt borrow sites; etc.) that may be necessary. Technical studies must meet CEQA standards and the standards in the applicable industry. As necessary, the technical studies shall include recommendations that are to be implemented as part of the project.</u></p>	

Table II-1 *Continued*

Environmental Impacts	Level of Significance Without Mitigation	Mitigation Measures	Level of Significance With Mitigation
LU-2 <i>Continued</i>		<p>LU-2c: Amend Action CC-A34 of the Draft General Plan as follows:                      Action CC-A34: The discretionary review of development proposals shall evaluate and address impacts on the rural landscapes and views. (Policies CC-1.1 through CC-1.19)</p> <p><u>This review shall also evaluate the potential for land use incompatibilities and require incorporation of design features to reduce potential impacts, to the greatest extent feasible.</u>                      Responsibility: Planning and Public Works Department                      Timeframe: 2009/2010</p>	
<p><u>LU-3</u>: Build-out of the Draft General Plan would substantially alter the type and intensity of land uses within the community areas of the unincorporated County.</p>	S	<p><u>LU-3</u>: Implement Mitigation Measure LU-2b to revise Policy CC-4.11.</p>	SU
<p><u>LU-4</u>: Land uses and development consistent with the Draft General Plan would fail to achieve a jobs/housing balance and match in some community areas and could potentially exacerbate an existing jobs/housing imbalance in some community areas.</p>	S	<p><u>LU-4a</u>: Amend Policy CC-2.10 of the Draft General Plan as follows:                      Policy CC-2.10: Strive to achieve a minimum jobs/housing balance of 1.2 jobs for every dwelling unit on average within each unincorporated community, <u>to the greatest extent feasible.</u></p> <p><u>LU-4b</u>: Amend Policy CC-2.11 of the Draft General Plan as follows:                      Policy CC-2.11: Strive to achieve a match between the prices of dwelling units and the salaries of the jobs provided within each unincorporated community, <u>to the greatest extent feasible.</u></p>	SU

Table II-1 *Continued*

Environmental Impacts	Level of Significance Without Mitigation	Mitigation Measures	Level of Significance With Mitigation
LU-4 <i>Continued</i>		<p>LU-4c: Amend Policy CC-3.3 of the Draft General Plan as follows:</p> <p>Policy CC-3.3: Ensure that jobs are created concurrent with housing <u>to the greatest extent feasible</u>. Include requirements to ensure a reasonable ongoing balance between housing and jobs and/or other mechanisms to constrain housing to stay balanced with job creation through build-out of the area. Each phase of housing shall be required to be accompanied by balanced job-generating development. Strive to match overall wages to home prices.</p> <p><u>For areas within Specific Plans, including Dunnigan, Knights Landing, and Madison, the amount of land designated for residential and job generating uses shall be evaluated during the Specific Plan process, and land uses shall be “re-balanced” if necessary in order to achieve a jobs/housing balance of 1.2. A jobs/housing balance monitoring program shall be established as part of each Specific Plan for its planning area. The jobs/housing balance for each specific plan area shall be monitored every five years. To the greatest feasible extent, if one land use sector is out of balance with another, the over-built land use type shall be stayed until the under-built land use type is rebalanced.</u></p>	

Table II-1 *Continued*

Environmental Impacts	Level of Significance Without Mitigation	Mitigation Measures	Level of Significance With Mitigation
<p>LU-4 <i>Continued</i></p>		<p><u>LU-4d</u>: Amend Policy CC-3.11 of the Draft General Plan as follows:                      Policy CC-3.11: Achieve the following within the Elkhorn Specific Plan growth boundaries:                      D. <u>Transit to move workers and customers and visitors to and from the site shall be evaluated and planned for during the Specific Plan process.</u>                      E. <u>Modify and amend the Elkhorn Specific Plan to accommodate high density residential development to provide workforce housing. The inclusion of residential development is intended to achieve a jobs/housing balance and reduce the vehicle miles travelled (VMT) of the Elkhorn Specific Plan area.</u>                      F. <u>The need for freeway ramp improvements on Interstate 5 at County Road 22 shall be identified as part of the Elkhorn Specific Plan consistent with the policy thresholds of the Draft General Plan.</u></p>	
		<p><u>LU-4e</u>: Amend Policy ED-3.3 of the Draft General Plan as follows:                      Policy ED-3.3: Create jobs in tandem with housing-, <u>to the greatest extent feasible.</u> Strive for a minimum ratio of 1.2 permanent jobs per home and seek to match local wages with com-munity housing prices.</p>	
		<p><u>LU-4f</u>: Amend Policy ED-5.6 of the Draft General Plan as follows:                      Policy ED-5.6: Encourage employers to hire locally and to help employees find homes in the community where they work. Ensure that new jobs are created in proportion to new housing-, <u>to the greatest extent feasible.</u> Seek to maintain a minimum ratio of 1.2 jobs for each household within a community.</p>	

Table II-1 *Continued*

Environmental Impacts	Level of Significance Without Mitigation	Mitigation Measures	Level of Significance With Mitigation
<p>LU-4 <i>Continued</i></p>		<p><u>LU-4g</u>: The Draft General Plan shall be amended to include the following new policy in the Land Use and Community Character Element.                      Policy CC-#: Coordinate with and encourage the Rumsey Band of Wintun Indians to prepare, adopt, and implement a long-range tribal general plan for tribal trust land and meet or exceed a vehicle miles travelled (VMT) threshold of 44 miles generated per household per weekday.</p> <p><u>LU-4h</u>: The Draft General Plan shall be amended to include the following new policy in the Land Use and Community Character Element.                      Policy CC-#: Coordinate with and encourage the federal government for D-Q University and the University of California Regents for UC Davis to provide for a mix of uses on their land that would achieve a jobs/housing balance and meet or exceed a vehicle miles travelled (VMT) threshold of 44 miles generated per household per weekday.</p> <p><u>LU-4i</u>: Implement MM LU-1.                      As described above, a jobs/housing balance or match is infeasible for several community areas due to physical, environmental and market constraints. While implementation of the policies and actions included in the Draft General Plan and amended above would reduce the severity of this impact, no additional feasible mitigation measures are available to attain a jobs/housing balance and match for all community areas or for the unincorporated County as a whole. Therefore, this impact would remain significant and unavoidable.</p>	
<p><u>LU-5</u>: Build-out of the Draft General Plan would result in conflicts with the plans and policies of other agencies.</p>	<p>S</p>	<p><u>LU-5</u>: Implement Mitigation Measure LU-4g to encourage the Rumsey Band of Wintun Indians to prepare and adopt a long range general plan for their tribal lands.</p>	<p>LTS</p>

Table II-1 *Continued*

Environmental Impacts	Level of Significance Without Mitigation	Mitigation Measures	Level of Significance With Mitigation
<b>B. AGRICULTURAL RESOURCES</b>			
<u>AG-1</u> : Build-out of the Draft General Plan and the associated development would convert Prime Farmland, Unique Farmland, or Farmland of Statewide Importance to non-agricultural uses.	S	<u>AG-1</u> : None available. Permanent conversion of agricultural land to non-agricultural uses will occur with build-out of the Draft General Plan, and while implementation of the policies and actions included in the Draft General Plan would reduce the severity of this impact, no additional feasible mitigation measures are available, and this impact would remain significant and unavoidable.	SU
<u>AG-2</u> : Build-out of the Draft General Plan and the associated development would conflict with or result in the cancellation of a Williamson Act contract.	S	<u>AG-2</u> : The Draft General Plan shall be amended to include the following new policy in the Agricultural and Economic Development Element.  Policy AG-#:       Where planned growth would occur on lands under Williamson Act contract, ensure that development is phased to avoid the need for contract cancellation, where feasible.  Because some Williamson Act contracts may still be cancelled with build-out of the Draft General Plan, for example those in the Madison Specific Plan area, and while implementation of the policies and actions included in the Draft General Plan would reduce the severity of this impact, no additional feasible mitigation measures are available, and this impact would remain significant and unavoidable.	SU
<u>AG-3</u> : Build-out of the Draft General Plan and the associated development would result in permanent conversion of agricultural soils to non-agricultural use.	S	<u>AG-3</u> : None available. Permanent conversion of agricultural soils to non-agricultural uses will occur with build-out of the Draft General Plan, and while implementation of the policies and actions included in the Draft General Plan would reduce the severity of this impact, no additional feasible mitigation measures are available, and this impact would remain significant and unavoidable.	SU



Table II-1 *Continued*

Environmental Impacts	Level of Significance Without Mitigation	Mitigation Measures	Level of Significance With Mitigation
<p><u>AG-4:</u> Implementation of Draft General Plan policies could result in less effective buffer protection for agricultural operations.</p>	<p>S</p>	<p><u>AG-4:</u> Amend Policy AG-1.8 of the Draft General Plan as follows:  <u>Policy AG-1.8:</u> The intent of this policy ... the decision-making body. <u>Except as noted below where no buffer is required, in no case shall the buffer be reduced to less than 100 feet.</u> The buffer area shall generally be designated Open Space (OS), but may also be designated Public and Quasi-Public (PQ) or Parks and Recreation (PR) based on applicable circumstances. Agricultural buffers are not required for planned urban growth elsewhere within a growth boundary because the agricultural-urban interface will be temporary until full build-out occurs.</p>	<p>LTS</p>
<p><b>C. TRANSPORTATION AND CIRCULATION</b></p>			
<p><u>CI-1:</u> Build-out of the Draft General Plan could result in increased vehicle miles of travel.</p>	<p>S</p>	<p><u>CI-1a:</u> The Draft General Plan shall be amended to include the following new policy in the Circulation Element.  <u>Policy CI-#</u> The Dunnigan Specific Plan shall incorporate a maximum of 44 vehicle miles of travel (VMT) generated per household per weekday through implementation of all feasible actions including but not limited to specifications contained in Policies CC-3.3 through CC-3.6. As part of the specific plan implementation, the VMT performance shall be monitored at each phase. If VMT performance exceeds the threshold in this policy, then additional actions shall be implemented and may include, but are not limited to, the following types of actions:</p>	<p>SU</p>

Table II-1 *Continued*

Environmental Impacts	Level of Significance Without Mitigation	Mitigation Measures	Level of Significance With Mitigation
CI-1 <i>Continued</i>		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Promote ride sharing programs by, for example, designating a certain percentage of parking spaces for ride sharing vehicles, designating adequate passenger loading and unloading and waiting areas for ride sharing vehicles, and providing a Web site or message board for coordinating rides.</li> <li>• Provide the necessary facilities and infrastructure to encourage the use of low or zero-emission vehicles (<i>e.g.</i>, electric vehicle charging facilities and conveniently located alternative fueling stations).</li> <li>• Increase the cost of driving and parking private vehicles by, for example, imposing parking fees.</li> <li>• Build or fund a transportation center where various public transportation modes intersect.</li> <li>• Provide shuttle service to public transit.</li> <li>• Provide public transit incentives such as free or low-cost monthly transit passes.</li> <li>• Incorporate bicycle lanes and routes into street systems, new subdivisions, and large developments.</li> <li>• Incorporate bicycle-friendly intersections into street design.</li> </ul>	

Table II-1 *Continued*

Environmental Impacts	Level of Significance Without Mitigation	Mitigation Measures	Level of Significance With Mitigation
CI-1 <i>Continued</i>		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• For commercial projects, provide adequate bicycle parking near building entrances to promote cyclist safety, security, and convenience. For large employers, provide facilities that encourage bicycle commuting, including, for example, locked bicycle storage or covered or indoor bicycle parking.</li> <li>• Create bicycle lanes and walking paths directed to the location of schools, parks and other destination points.</li> <li>• Work with the school district to create and expand school bus services.</li> <li>• Institute a telecommute work program. Provide information, training, and incentives to encourage participation. Provide incentives for equipment purchases to allow high-quality teleconferences.</li> <li>• Provide education and information about public transportation.</li> <li>• Consider unique transportation incentives such as free bikes, re-charging stations for electric vehicles, alternative fuel filling stations, plug-in hybrid car-sharing, and carpool concierge services.</li> </ul>	

Table II-1 *Continued*

Environmental Impacts	Level of Significance Without Mitigation	Mitigation Measures	Level of Significance With Mitigation
<p>CI-1 <i>Continued</i></p>		<p>Achievement of the VMT threshold shall be measured based on the build-out of the plan area phases using a travel demand forecasting model that is sensitive to built environment variables including but not limited to the 4Ds (density, diversity, design, and destination).</p>	
		<p><u>CI-1b:</u> The Draft General Plan shall be amended to include the following new policy in the Circulation Element. Policy CI-#: Other Specific Plan areas allowed under the Draft General Plan shall strive to achieve the VMT threshold of 44 miles generated per household per weekday to the extent feasible, using the same methods described above.</p>	
		<p><u>CI-1c:</u> Implement Mitigation Measure LU-4c that amends Policy CC-3.3 in regards to achieving a jobs/housing balance in the Specific Plan areas.</p>	
		<p><u>CI-1d:</u> Implement Mitigation Measure LU-4d that amends Policy CC-3.11 for the Elkhorn Specific Plan area.</p>	
		<p><u>CI-1e:</u> The Draft General Plan shall be amended to include the following new policy in the Circulation Element. Policy CI-#: Require Specific Plan areas to establish mode split goals for walking, bicycling, and transit trips in development of the required transit plan (per Action CI-A6) for each area. Bi-annual household surveys should be conducted to ensure identified model split goals are being achieved as the Specific Plan areas build out.  While implementation of the policies and actions included in the Draft General Plan and the identified mitigation measures above would reduce VMT generated by new development, the Draft General Plan would still result in an increase in VMT. This impact would remain significant and unavoidable.</p>	

Table II-1 *Continued*

Environmental Impacts	Level of Significance Without Mitigation	Mitigation Measures	Level of Significance With Mitigation
<p>CI-2: Build-out of the Draft General Plan would add vehicle trips to roadways that would operate below the 1983 Yolo County General Plan level of service (LOS) under cumulative conditions.</p>	<p>S</p>	<p>Policy CI-3.1: Maintain Level of Service (LOS) C or better for roadways and intersections in the unincorporated County. In no case shall land use be approved that would either result in worse than LOS C conditions, or require additional improvements to maintain the required level of service, except as specified below. The intent of this policy is to consider level of service as a limit on the capacity of the County's roadways.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• <u>Interstate 5 (County Road 6 to Interstate 505)</u> – LOS D is acceptable, assuming that one additional auxiliary lane is constructed in each direction through this segment. The County will secure a fair share towards these improvements from planned development.</li> <li>• Interstate 5 (Interstate 505 to Woodland City Limit) – LOS D is acceptable.</li> <li>• <u>Interstate 5 (Woodland City Limit to Sacramento County Line)</u> – LOS F is acceptable. The County will secure a fair share towards intersection improvements from planned development at the Elkhorn site.</li> <li>• Interstate 80 (Davis City Limit to West Sacramento City Limit) – LOS F is acceptable.</li> <li>• State Route 16 (County Road 78 to County Road 85B) – LOS D is acceptable.</li> <li>• State Route 16 (County Road 85B to County Road 21A) – LOS E is acceptable.</li> </ul>	<p>SU</p>

Table II-1 *Continued*

Environmental Impacts	Level of Significance Without Mitigation	Mitigation Measures	Level of Significance With Mitigation
CI-2 <i>Continued</i>		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• <u>State Route 16 (County Road 21A to Interstate 505)</u> – LOS D is acceptable, assuming that this segment is widened to four lanes with intersection improvements appropriate for an arterial roadway. The County will secure a fair share towards these improvements from planned development. Caltrans and the Rumsey Band of Wintun Indians shall be encouraged to establish a funding mechanism to pay the remainder.</li> <li>• <u>State Route 16 (Interstate 505 to County Road 98)</u> – LOS D is acceptable, assuming that passing lanes and appropriate intersection improvements are constructed. The County will secure a fair share towards these improvements from planned development. Caltrans and the Rumsey Band of Wintun Indians shall be encouraged to establish a funding mechanism to pay the remainder.</li> <li>• State Route 113 (Sutter County Line to County Road 102) – LOS F is acceptable.</li> <li>• State Route 113 (County Road 102 to Woodland City Limits) – LOS D is acceptable.</li> <li>• State Route 113 (Solano County Line to Davis City Limits) – LOS D is acceptable.</li> <li>• State Route 128 (Interstate 505 to Napa County Line) – LOS D is acceptable.</li> <li>• Old River Road (Interstate 5 to West Sacramento City limits) – LOS D is acceptable.</li> <li>• South River Road (West Sacramento City Limit to the Freeport Bridge) – LOS D is acceptable.</li> </ul>	

Table II-1 *Continued*

Environmental Impacts	Level of Significance Without Mitigation	Mitigation Measures	Level of Significance With Mitigation
<p>CI-2 <i>Continued</i></p>		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• <u>County Road 6 (County Road 99W to the Tehama Colusa Canal)</u> – LOS D is acceptable, assuming this segment is widened to four lanes. The County will secure a fair share towards these improvements from planned development.</li> <li>• County Road 24 (County Road 95 to County Road 98) – LOS D is acceptable.</li> <li>• County Road 27 (County Road 98 to State Route 113) – LOS D is acceptable.</li> <li>• County Road 31 (County Road 95 to County Road 98) – LOS D is acceptable.</li> <li>• County Road 32A (County Road 105 to Interstate 80) – LOS D is acceptable.</li> <li>• County Road 98 (County Road 29 to County Road 27) – LOS D is acceptable.</li> <li>• <u>County Road 99W (County Road 2 to County Road 8)</u> – LOS D is acceptable, assuming that this segment is widened to four lanes. The County will secure a fair share towards these improvements from planned development.</li> <li>• <u>County Road 102 (County Road 13 to County Road 17)</u> – LOS D is acceptable, assuming that passing lanes and appropriate intersection improvements are constructed. The County will secure a fair share towards these improvements from <u>all feasible sources planned development</u>.</li> <li>• <u>County Road 102 (County Road 17 to the Woodland City Limit)</u> - LOS E is acceptable, assuming that passing lanes and appropriate intersection improvements are constructed. The County will secure a fair share towards these improvements from <u>all feasible sources planned development</u>.</li> </ul>	

Table II-1 *Continued*

Environmental Impacts	Level of Significance Without Mitigation	Mitigation Measures	Level of Significance With Mitigation
<p>CI-2 <i>Continued</i></p>		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• <u>County Road 102 (County Road 17 to the Woodland City Limit)</u> - LOS E is acceptable, assuming that passing lanes and appropriate intersection improvements are constructed. The County will secure a fair share towards these improvements from <u>all feasible sources planned development</u>.</li> <li>• County Road 102 (Woodland City Limit to Davis City Limit) – LOS D is acceptable. Additional exceptions to this policy may be allowed by the Board of Supervisors on a case-by-case basis, where reducing the level of service would result in a clear public benefit. Such circumstances may include, but are not limited to, the following:               <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Preserving agriculture or open space land;</li> <li>• Enhancing the agricultural economy;</li> <li>• Preserving scenic roadways/highways;</li> <li>• Preserving the rural character of the County;</li> <li>• Avoiding adverse impacts to alternative transportation modes;</li> <li>• Avoiding growth inducement;</li> <li>• Preserving downtown community environments; <u>or</u></li> <li>• <u>Right-of-way constraints determined by the Board of Supervisors to make the improvement infeasible.</u></li> </ul> </li> </ul> <p>No additional mitigation measures are feasible to reduce the impact to the 1983 General Plan LOS policy to a less-than-significant level. Therefore this impact would remain significant and unavoidable in the context of the 1983 threshold.</p>	



Table II-1 *Continued*

Environmental Impacts	Level of Significance Without Mitigation	Mitigation Measures	Level of Significance With Mitigation
<p><u>CI-3</u>: Build-out of the Draft General Plan would rely upon future roadway capacity expansion projects for which full funding is not ensured.</p>	<p>S</p>	<p><u>CI-3a</u>: The Draft General Plan shall be amended to include the following new action in the Circulation Element. Action CI-A#: Establish a regional funding mechanism to fund the planned roadway capacity expansion projects identified in the Circulation Element.</p> <p><u>CI-3b</u>: The Draft General Plan shall be amended to include the following new action in the Circulation Element. Action CI-A#: Amend the existing County Facilities Services Assessment (FSA) Fee to include planned roadway projects identified in the Circulation Element.</p> <p>While implementation of the policies and actions included in the Draft General Plan and implementation of the above mitigation measure would ensure full funding for the planned roadway capacity expansion projects, there is no guarantee that other jurisdictions will participate in the program. Therefore, there is no assurance that full funding for the planned roadway improvements can be collected. For these reasons, this impact would be significant and unavoidable.</p>	<p>SU</p>
<p><u>CI-4</u>: Build-out of the Draft General Plan would contribute vehicle trips to roadways projected to operate worse than the LOS thresholds identified in the Congestion Management Program (CMP) under cumulative conditions.</p>	<p>S</p>	<p><u>CI-4</u>: The Draft General Plan shall be amended to include one of the following new actions in the Circulation Element. Action CI-A#: Coordinate with YCTD on the update to the Yolo County CMP to ensure consistency with the LOS policies established in the Yolo County Circulation Element.</p>	<p>SU</p>

Table II-1 *Continued*

Environmental Impacts	Level of Significance Without Mitigation	Mitigation Measures	Level of Significance With Mitigation
<p>CI-4 <i>Continued</i></p>		<p>OR</p> <p>Action CI-A#: Monitor roadways identified in the Yolo County CMP and prepare a deficiency plan as outlined in the CMP when the CMP LOS thresholds are exceeded. The deficiency plan shall focus on modifications to the transportation system that reduce vehicle travel by accommodating more travel by walking, bicycling, and transit modes consistent with the Draft General Plan.</p> <p>OR</p> <p>Action CI-A#: Coordinate with the cities to opt out of the CMP pursuant to Section 65088.3 of the Government Code.</p> <p>While implementation of one of the actions identified in the above mitigation measure would ensure consistency between the Draft General Plan and Yolo County CMP, there is no guarantee that the LOS policies in the CMP will be updated or a deficiency plan would reduce the potential roadway impacts. Therefore, this impact would remain significant and unavoidable.</p>	
<p>CI-5: Build-out of the Draft General Plan would contribute vehicle trips to roadways projected to operate worse than the LOS thresholds of the incorporated Cities of Davis, West Sacramento, Winters, and Woodland under cumulative conditions.</p>	<p>S</p>	<p>CI-5: None available.</p> <p>While implementation of the policies and actions included in the Draft General Plan would ensure fair-share funding toward roadway impacts in the cities, there is no guarantee that the cities will agree to new funding mechanisms or construct roadway capacity expansion projects to reduce the identified impacts. Therefore, this impact would remain significant and unavoidable.</p>	<p>SU</p>
<p>CI-6: Build-out of the Draft General Plan would contribute vehicle trips on state highways that would operate worse than the Caltrans LOS threshold under cumulative conditions.</p>	<p>S</p>	<p>CI-6a: Implement Mitigation Measure LU-1b that amends Policy CC-3.5 of the Draft General Plan in regards to the need to identify interchange improvements on Interstate 5.</p>	<p>SU</p>

Table II-1 *Continued*

Environmental Impacts	Level of Significance Without Mitigation	Mitigation Measures	Level of Significance With Mitigation
<i>CI-6 Continued</i>		<p><u>CI-6b:</u> Amend Policy CC-3.9 of the Draft General Plan as follows:            Policy CC-3.9: In addition to Table LU-10, achieve the following within the Madison Specific Plan growth boundary:  <u>G. The need for intersection and roadway improvements on State Route 16 between Madison and I-505 shall be identified as part of the Madison Specific Plan consistent with the policy thresholds of the Draft General Plan.</u></p> <p><u>CI-6c:</u> Implement Mitigation Measure LU-4d that amends Policy CC-3.11 of the Draft General Plan in regards to the need to identify freeway ramp improvements on Interstate 5.            Even with these mitigations and the polices and actions included in the Draft General Plan this impact would be significant and unavoidable.</p>	
<u>CI-7:</u> Build-out of the Draft General Plan could result in increased travel on roadways that do not meet current design standards.	S	<u>CI-7:</u> None available. While implementation of the policies and actions included in the Draft General Plan would reduce the severity of this impact, no additional feasible mitigation measures are available. Therefore, this impact would remain significant and unavoidable.	SU
<u>CI-8:</u> Build-out of the Draft General Plan could result in increased travel on state facilities that do not meet current design standards.	S	<u>CI-8:</u> None available. While implementation of the policies and actions included in the Draft General Plan would reduce the severity of this impact, no additional feasible mitigation measures are available. Therefore, this impact would remain significant and unavoidable.	SU
<u>CI-9:</u> Build-out of the Draft General Plan would result in an adverse physical environmental impact associated with an increase in traffic on roadways in comparison to the policies of the 1983 General Plan.	S	<u>CI-9:</u> None available. While implementation of the policies and actions included in the Draft General Plan would reduce the severity of this impact, no additional feasible mitigation measures are available. Therefore, this impact would remain significant and unavoidable.	SU

Table II-1 *Continued*

Environmental Impacts	Level of Significance Without Mitigation	Mitigation Measures	Level of Significance With Mitigation
<b>D. AIR QUALITY</b>			
<p><u>AIR-1:</u> Build-out of the Draft General Plan could result in construction-related emissions that exceed the YSAQMD thresholds of significance for criteria pollutants.</p>	S	<p><u>AIR-1:</u> Amend the Draft General Plan Policy CO-6.6 as follows: Policy CO-6.6: Encourage implementation of YSAQMD Best Management Practices <u>including those listed below</u> to reduce emissions and control dust during construction activities.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• <u>Water all active construction areas at least twice daily.</u></li> <li>• <u>Haul trucks shall maintain at least two feet of freeboard.</u></li> <li>• <u>Cover all trucks hauling soil, sand, and other loose materials.</u></li> <li>• <u>Apply non-toxic binders (e.g., latex acrylic copolymer) to exposed areas after cut-and-fill operations and hydroseed area.</u></li> <li>• <u>Apply chemical soil stabilizers on inactive construction areas (disturbed lands within construction projects that are unused for at least four consecutive days).</u></li> <li>• <u>Plant tree windbreaks on the windward perimeter of construction projects if adjacent to open land.</u></li> <li>• <u>Plant vegetative ground cover in disturbed areas as soon as possible.</u></li> <li>• <u>Cover inactive storage piles.</u></li> <li>• <u>Sweep streets if visible soil material is carried out from the construction site.</u></li> <li>• <u>Treat accesses to a distance of 100 feet from the paved road with a 6 to 12 inch layer of wood chips or mulch.</u></li> <li>• <u>Treat accesses to a distance of 100 feet from the paved road with a 6-inch layer of gravel.</u></li> </ul>	SU

Table II-1 *Continued*

Environmental Impacts	Level of Significance Without Mitigation	Mitigation Measures	Level of Significance With Mitigation
<i>AIR-1 Continued</i>		According to the YSAQMD, the effectiveness of the construction dust mitigation measures range from 50 to 90 percent. Equipment exhaust mitigation is also not 100 percent effective, therefore even with implementation of Mitigation Measure AIR-1, implementation of the Draft General Plan may still result in construction emissions that exceed the significance criteria established by the YSAQMD, and therefore this impact is considered to be significant and unavoidable.	
<u>AIR-2</u> : Build-out of the Draft General Plan could result in long-term operational emissions that would exceed YSAQMD thresholds of significance and substantially contribute to air quality violations.	S	<u>AIR-2</u> : Implement Mitigation Measure CI-1a, CI-1b, CI-1c, and CI-1d. While implementation of the policies and actions included in the Draft General Plan and identified mitigation measures would reduce VMT generated by new development and long-term operational emissions, the YSAQMD thresholds of significance would continue to be exceeded at build-out of the Draft General Plan. No additional feasible mitigation measure was identified to reduce this impact to a less-than-significant level. This impact would remain significant and unavoidable.	SU
<u>AIR-3</u> : Build-out of the Draft General Plan could expose sensitive receptors to toxic air contaminants.	S	<u>AIR-3</u> : Amend Action CO-A106 of the Draft General Plan as follows: Action CO-106: Regulate the location and operation of land uses to avoid or mitigate harmful or nuisance levels of air emissions to the following sensitive receptors: residential uses, hospitals and nursing/convalescent homes, hotels and lodging, schools and day care centers and neighborhood parks. <u>New development shall follow the recommendations for siting new sensitive land uses consistent with the CARB's recommendation as shown in Table IV.D-8.</u> (Policy CO-6.1, Policy CO-6.2)	LTS

Table II-1 *Continued*

Environmental Impacts	Level of Significance Without Mitigation	Mitigation Measures	Level of Significance With Mitigation
<u>AIR-4</u> : Build-out of the Draft General Plan could result in a cumulatively considerable impact on criteria air pollutants.	S	<u>AIR-4</u> : None available. While implementation of the policies and actions and mitigation measures included in the Draft General Plan to reduce VMT would reduce the severity of cumulative impacts on criteria air pollutants, no feasible mitigation measure was identified to reduce this impact to a less-than-significant level. This impact would remain significant and unavoidable.	SU
<u>AIR-5</u> : Build-out of the Draft General Plan could result in conflicts with air quality planning efforts by other agencies.	S	<u>AIR-5</u> : Implement Mitigation Measure CI-1a and CI-1b. While implementation of the mitigation measure, policies and actions included in the Draft General Plan would reduce the severity of this impact, no additional feasible mitigation measures are available to reduce this impact to a less-than-significant level. This impact would remain significant and unavoidable.	SU
<b>E. NOISE</b>			
<u>NOI-1</u> : Increased traffic from build-out of the proposed Draft General Plan would result in a significant increase in traffic noise levels on roadway segments throughout the County.	S	<u>NOI-1</u> : None available. While implementation of the policies and actions included in the Draft General Plan would reduce the severity of this impact, no feasible mitigation measure was identified to reduce this impact to a less-than-significant level. This impact would remain significant and unavoidable.	SU
<u>NOI-2</u> : Build-out of the proposed Draft General Plan would result in traffic noise levels in excess of the County's normally acceptable standard of 60 dBA L <sub>dn</sub> for new noise sensitive land use development.		<u>NOI-2</u> : The Draft General Plan shall be amended to include the following new policy in the Health and Safety Element. Policy HS-#: All proposed new development of noise sensitive land uses in areas that would experience traffic noise levels in excess of 60 dBA L <sub>dn</sub> shall submit an acoustical analysis prior to issuance of building permits demonstrating how all reasonable and feasible noise insulation features have been incorporated into the project design that would reduce traffic noise impacts to meet the County's interior noise level standard for such land uses.	LTS

Table II-1 *Continued*

Environmental Impacts	Level of Significance Without Mitigation	Mitigation Measures	Level of Significance With Mitigation
<u>NOI-3</u> : Build-out of the proposed Draft General Plan would result in a substantial or periodic increase in ambient noise levels.	S	<u>NOI-3</u> : None available. While implementation of the policies and actions included in the Draft General Plan would reduce the severity of this impact, no feasible mitigation measure was identified to reduce this impact to a less-than-significant level. This impact would remain significant and unavoidable.	SU
<u>NOI-4</u> : Build-out of the proposed Draft General Plan would result in excessive groundborne vibration levels from construction activities.	S	<u>NOI-4</u> : Amend Action HS-A61 of the Draft General Plan as follows: Action HS-A61: Adopt a comprehensive Noise Ordinance that includes the following components: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Standards to implement “quiet” pile driving technology (such as pre-drilling of piles, the use of auger cast piles, or similar technology) where feasible in consideration of geotechnical and structural requirements and conditions.</li> </ul>	LTS
<b>F. GLOBAL CLIMATE CHANGE</b>			
<u>GCC-1</u> : Build-out of the Draft General Plan would result in greenhouse gas emissions that would have a significant physical adverse impact and cumulatively contribute to global climate change.	S	<u>GCC-1a</u> : Implement Mitigation Measures LU-4c and CI-1a and CI-1b. While implementation of the policies and actions included in the Draft General Plan would reduce the severity of the impact on global climate change, no additional mitigation measures are available to reduce this impact to a less-than-significant level. This impact is considered significant and unavoidable.	SU
<u>GCC-2</u> : While uncertainty exists in the degree to which the effects of climate change will occur, it is likely that significant adverse physical impacts from the effects of global climate change will occur on existing and future planned land uses in the County by 2030.	S	<u>GCC-2</u> : None Available. While implementation of the policies and actions included in the Draft General Plan would reduce the severity of the impacts on the County related to global climate change, no additional feasible mitigation measures are available to reduce this impact to a less-than-significant level. This impact is considered significant and unavoidable.	SU

Table II-1 *Continued*

Environmental Impacts	Level of Significance Without Mitigation	Mitigation Measures	Level of Significance With Mitigation
<b>G. PUBLIC SERVICES</b>			
<p><u>PUB-1</u>: Growth associated with build-out of the Draft General Plan would generate a demand for fire protection and emergency services that may exceed the ability of the fire districts and departments to meet established service thresholds.</p>	S	<p><u>PUB-1</u>: The Draft General Plan shall be amended to include the following new policy in the Public Services and Facilities Element: Policy PF-#: The County shall require, and applicants must provide, a will-serve letter from the appropriate fire district/department confirming the ability to provide fire protection services to the project and any required terms of service.</p>	LTS
<p><u>PUB-2</u>: Growth occurring under the Draft General Plan would generate a demand for school services beyond the existing public school capacity and may result in the need for additional facilities to the degree that acceptable services ratios may not be met concurrent with new growth.</p>	S	<p><u>PUB-2a</u>: The Draft General Plan shall be amended to include the following policy to the Public Facilities and Services Element of the Draft General Plan: Policy PF-#: Require coordination with school districts during the preparation of specific plans to ensure to the greatest feasible extent that specific sites for new school facilities are identified and located within the residential neighborhoods they will serve.</p> <p><u>PUB-2b</u>: The Draft General Plan shall be amended to include the following policy to the Public Facilities and Services Element of the Draft General Plan: Policy PF-#: Require that the associated environmental review for all specific plans include and incorporate the planning, design and siting of new school and education facilities to the greatest feasible extent with the intent that subsequent school construction consistent with the specific plans, can proceed without additional subsequent environmental review and clearance.</p> <p><u>PUB-2c</u>: The Draft General Plan shall be amended to include the following policy to the Public Facilities and Services Element of the Draft General Plan: Policy PF-#: Encourage the use of development agreements to pay for infrastructure and fees for school sites with the intent of helping to defray costs of school construction.</p>	LTS



Table II-1 *Continued*

Environmental Impacts	Level of Significance Without Mitigation	Mitigation Measures	Level of Significance With Mitigation
<p><u>PUB-3</u>: Growth occurring under the Draft General Plan would generate a demand for community parks and resource parks to the degree that service thresholds may not be met concurrent with new growth.</p>	<p>S</p>	<p><u>PUB-3a</u>: Implement Mitigation Measure LU-2a that amends Policy CC-3.1 to address the provision of community parks in the specific plan areas.</p> <p><u>PUB-3b</u>: The Draft General Plan shall be amended to include the following new policy in the Land Use and Community Character Element.</p> <p>Policy CC-3#:     Ensure that the provision of community parks is phased concurrently with residential growth in the Specific Plan and Community Plan areas to meet and maintain the service threshold of 5 acres/1,000 population.</p> <p><u>PUB-3c</u>: Amend Action PF-A20 of The Draft General Plan as follows:</p> <p>Action PF-A20:     Establish new or expand existing special districts, <u>especially in those areas which have a deficit in community parks</u>, to provide <u>funding opportunities</u> and operation and maintenance costs for community parks. Also consider transferring existing Esparto and Dunnigan community parks into special districts.</p>	<p>LTS</p>
<p><b>H. UTILITIES AND ENERGY</b></p>			
<p><u>UTIL-1</u>: Build-out of the Draft General Plan may result in a demand for water in excess of available groundwater supply.</p>	<p>S</p>	<p><u>UTIL-1a</u>: The Draft General Plan shall be amended to include the following new policy in the Land Use and Community Character Element.</p> <p>Policy CC-#:     As part of the Dunnigan Specific Plan process, establish and implement construction criteria, infrastructure standards, landscaping requirements, etc. to limit water use under normal conditions to a specified daily maximum. Use that threshold for purposes of sizing the community water system.</p>	<p>SU</p>

Table II-1 *Continued*

Environmental Impacts	Level of Significance Without Mitigation	Mitigation Measures	Level of Significance With Mitigation
UTIL-1 <i>Continued</i>		<p><u>UTL-1b</u>: Implement Mitigation Measure LU-2b that modifies Policy CC-4.11 and requires site-specific technical information (including a water supply assessment) be provided, subject to site conditions and as determined by the County lead department, to enable informed decision-making by the County regarding site specific issues for individual projects.</p> <p>Even with implementation of Draft General Plan policies and this mitigation measure, groundwater overdraft could still occur because the new groundwater resources management program would not have the regulatory authority to limit groundwater withdrawal from private water supply wells. This impact is significant and unavoidable.</p>	
<p><u>UTIL-2</u>: Build-out of the Draft General Plan could result in increased overdraft of County aquifers and a net increase in ground surface subsidence.</p>	S	<p><u>UTIL-2a</u>: The Draft General Plan shall be amended to include the following new policy in the Land Use and Community Character Element.</p> <p>Policy CC #: Create guidelines for local water providers to enact programs that promote investigations of new sustainable sources such as recycled water and graywater that match water quantity and quality to the beneficial uses and the securing of additional water rights for the water purveyors.</p> <p><u>UTIL-2b</u>: The Draft General Plan shall be amended to include the following new policy in the Land Use and Community Character Element.</p> <p>Policy CC #: Encourage the Madison and Esparto CSDs to explore the availability of Cache Creek water via the Flood Control District. Encourage the Knights Landing CSD to explore the availability of Sacramento River water.</p>	SU

Table II-1 *Continued*

Environmental Impacts	Level of Significance Without Mitigation	Mitigation Measures	Level of Significance With Mitigation
<i>UTIL-2 Continued</i>		<p><u>UTIL-2c</u>: The Draft General Plan shall be amended to include the following new policy in the Land Use and Community Character Element.</p> <p>Policy CC #:        In water districts where there is insufficient water to serve new development, the County shall require new development to offset demand so that there is no net increase in demand through one or more of the following measures, as appropriate: use of reclaimed water; water catchments and reuse on site; water retention serving multiple sites; retrofits of existing uses in the district to offset increased demand; and other such means. These measures should be achieved in partnership with the applicable water district.</p> <p><u>UTIL-2d</u>: Implement Mitigation Measure LU-1b that amends Policy CC-3.5 regarding the Dunnigan Specific Plan process. However, even with implementation of these mitigation measures, increased groundwater overdraft could still occur because the new groundwater resources management program would not have the regulatory authority to limit groundwater withdrawal from private water supply wells. This impact is significant and unavoidable.</p>	
<u>UTIL-3</u> : Build-out of the Draft General Plan would generate wastewater flows that would exceed the capacities of existing wastewater treatment systems.	S	<u>UTIL-3</u> : Implement Mitigation Measure LU-2b that modifies Policy CC-4.11 and requires site specific technical information (including a sewer capacity and service analysis) be provided, subject to site conditions and as determined by the County lead department, to enable informed decision-making by the County regarding site specific issues for individual projects.	LTS
<b>I. CULTURAL RESOURCES</b>			
<u>CULT-1</u> : Build-out of the Draft General Plan would result in the potential for impacts to architectural resources and archaeological deposits that qualify as historical resources under CEQA.	S	<u>CULT-1</u> : None available. While implementation of the policies and actions included in the Draft General Plan would reduce the severity of the impact to cultural resources, no additional feasible mitigation measures are available. Therefore, this impact would remain significant and unavoidable.	SU

Table II-1 *Continued*

Environmental Impacts	Level of Significance Without Mitigation	Mitigation Measures	Level of Significance With Mitigation
<p><u>CULT-2</u>: Build-out of the Draft General Plan would result in the potential for impacts to archaeological deposits that qualify as unique archaeological resources under CEQA.</p>	S	<p><u>CULT-2</u>: None available. While implementation of the policies and actions included in the Draft General Plan would reduce the severity of this impact to unique archaeological resources, no additional feasible mitigation measures are available. Therefore, this impact would remain significant and unavoidable.</p>	SU
<b>J. BIOLOGICAL RESOURCES</b>			
<p><u>BIO-1</u>: Build-out of the Draft General Plan may result in loss or destruction of riparian habitats and the wildlife and plants that depend on those habitats.</p>	S	<p><u>BIO-1a</u>: Implement Mitigation Measure LU-2b that revises Policy CC-4.11 of the Draft General Plan.</p> <hr/> <p><u>BIO-1b</u>: Amend Policy CO-2.22 of the Draft General Plan as follows: Policy CO-2.22: Prohibit development within a minimum of 100 feet from the top of banks for all lakes, perennial ponds, rivers, creeks, sloughs, and perennial streams. The setback will allow for fire and flood protection, a natural riparian corridor (or wetland vegetation), a planned recreational trail where applicable, and vegetated landscape for storm water to pass through before it enters the water body. <u>Recreational trails and other features established in the setback should be unpaved and located along the outside of the riparian corridors whenever possible to minimize intrusions and maintain the integrity of the riparian habitat.</u> Exceptions to this action include irrigation pumps, roads and bridges, levees, docks, <u>public</u> boat ramps, and similar uses. <u>In all cases where intrusions into the riparian buffer are made, only the minimum amount of riparian vegetation necessary to construct the feature shall be removed.</u></p>	SU

Table II-1 *Continued*

Environmental Impacts	Level of Significance Without Mitigation	Mitigation Measures	Level of Significance With Mitigation
<p>BIO-1 <i>Continued</i></p>		<p><u>BIO-1c:</u> The Draft General Plan shall be amended to include the following new policy in the Conservation and Open Space Element. Policy CO-#: Require that all mitigation and monitoring activities be fully funded with a secure funding source prior to implementation of habitat or species mitigation and monitoring plans. Habitat preserved as part of any mitigation and monitoring plan should be preserved in perpetuity through a conservation easement, deed restriction, or other method to ensure that the habitat remains protected.</p> <p><u>BIO-1d:</u> The Draft General Plan shall be amended to include the following new action in the Conservation and Open Space Element. Action CO-A#: Where applicable, in riparian areas, ensure that required state and federal permits/approvals are secured prior to implementation.</p> <p>Implementation of these mitigation measures, in addition to the policies and actions contained in the Draft General Plan, would reduce potential adverse effects on riparian habitats but not to a less than significant level. Therefore, impacts to riparian habitats would remain significant and unavoidable.</p>	
<p><u>BIO-2:</u> Build-out of the Draft General Plan may result in loss or destruction of wetlands and vernal pools and the wildlife and plants that depend on those habitats.</p>	<p>S</p>	<p><u>BIO-2:</u> Implement Mitigation Measures BIO-1a, BIO-1b, BIO-1c, and BIO-1d.</p> <p>Implementation of these mitigation measures, in addition to the policies and actions contained in the Draft General Plan, would reduce potential adverse effects to wetlands and vernal pools but not to a less than significant level. Therefore, impacts to wetlands or vernal pool habitats would remain significant and unavoidable.</p>	<p>SU</p>

Table II-1 *Continued*

Environmental Impacts	Level of Significance Without Mitigation	Mitigation Measures	Level of Significance With Mitigation
<p><u>BIO-3</u>: Build-out of the Draft General Plan may result in loss or destruction of oak woodlands and the wildlife and plants that depend on those habitats.</p>	S	<p><u>BIO-3a</u>: Amend Policy CO-2.14 of the Draft General Plan as follows: Policy CO-2.14: Ensure no net loss of oak woodlands, alkali sinks, rare soils, vernal pools, or geological substrates that support rare endemic species, <u>with the following exception</u>. The limited loss of <del>blue</del> oak woodland and grasslands may be acceptable, where the fragmentation of large forests exceeding 10 acres is avoided, and <u>where</u> losses are mitigated <del>to the extent feasible</del>.</p> <p><u>BIO-3b</u>: Implement Mitigation Measures BIO-1a, BIO-1b, BIO-1c, and BIO-1d. Implementation of these mitigation measures, in addition to the policies and actions contained in the Draft General Plan, would reduce potential adverse effects to oak woodlands but not to a less than significant level. Therefore, impacts to oak woodlands would remain significant and unavoidable.</p>	SU
<p><u>BIO-4</u>: Build-out of the Draft General Plan may result in the disruption of movement corridors and nursery sites on which local wildlife depend.</p>	S	<p><u>BIO-4a</u>: The Draft General Plan shall be amended to include the following new policy in the Conservation and Open Space Element: Policy CO-#: Avoid adverse impacts to wildlife movement corridors and nursery sites (e.g., nest sites, dens, spawning areas, breeding ponds). Preserve the functional value of movement corridors to ensure that essential habitat areas do not become isolated from one another due to the placement of either temporary or permanent barriers within the corridors. Encourage avoidance of nursery sites (e.g., nest sites, dens, spawning areas, breeding ponds) during periods when the sites are actively used and that nursery sites which are used repeatedly over time are preserved to the greatest feasible extent or fully mitigated if they cannot be avoided.</p>	SU

Table II-1 *Continued*

Environmental Impacts	Level of Significance Without Mitigation	Mitigation Measures	Level of Significance With Mitigation
<i>BIO-4 Continued</i>		<p><u>BIO-4b</u>: The Draft General Plan shall be amended to include the following new action in the Conservation and Open Space Element: Action CO-#: Require new or retrofitted bridges, and new or expanded roads to incorporate design and construction measures to maintain the functional value of wildlife movement corridors.</p> <p><u>BIO-4c</u>: The Draft General Plan shall be amended to include the following new action in the Conservation and Open Space Element: Action CO-#: Preserve grassland habitat within 2,100 feet of California tiger salamander breeding ponds and require that unavoidable impacts be fully mitigated consistent with local, State, and Federal requirements.</p> <p><u>BIO-4d</u>: Implement Mitigation Measures BIO-1a, BIO-1b, BIO-1c, and BIO-1d. Implementation of these mitigation measures, in addition to the policies and actions contained in the Draft General Plan, would reduce potential adverse effects to movement corridors and nursery sites but not to a less than significant level. Therefore, impacts to movement corridors and nursery sites would remain significant and unavoidable.</p>	
<u>BIO-5</u> : Build-out of the Draft General Plan may result in the loss or destruction of special-status plants and their habitats, and/or to special-status fish and wildlife and their habitats.	S	<u>BIO-5a</u> : The Draft General Plan shall be amended to include the following new policy in the Conservation and Open Space Element: Policy CO-#: Require that impacts to species listed under the State or federal Endangered Species Acts, or species identified as special-status by the resource agencies, be avoided to the greatest feasible extent. If avoidance is not possible, fully mitigate impacts consistent with applicable local, State, and Federal requirements.	SU

Table II-1 *Continued*

Environmental Impacts	Level of Significance Without Mitigation	Mitigation Measures	Level of Significance With Mitigation
BIO-5 <i>Continued</i>		<p><u>BIO-5b:</u> The Draft General Plan shall be amended to include the following new policy in the Conservation and Open Space Element:</p> <p>Action CO-#: Projects with the potential to impact Swainson’s hawk foraging habitat shall follow the Agreement Regarding Mitigation for Impacts to Swainson’s Hawk Foraging Habitat in Yolo County entered into by the CDFG and the Yolo County HIP/NCCP Joint Powers Agency.</p>	
		<p><u>BIO-5c:</u> The Draft General Plan shall be amended to include the following new action in the Conservation and Open Space Element:</p> <p>Action CO-#: For all projects that would impact potential California tiger salamander breeding or terrestrial habitat in the Dunnigan Hills area, require an assessment be conducted to determine the potential of development projects (such as roads, structures) to impact California tiger salamander upland or breeding habitat (if such assessment has not already been done as part of an approved HCP/NCCP). Such an assessment will be required for all projects located within 1.3 miles of a known or potential breeding site. Development activities that would result in isolation of the breeding or upland habitat will be required to mitigate for such impacts. Mitigation shall consist of two components: 1) habitat preservation and enhancement of suitable upland habitat, and 2) preservation and construction of new breeding habitat. CTS upland habitat will be mitigated at a ratio of 3:1 (preserved:impacted). Preserved upland habitat must be located within 2,100 feet of an occupied habitat and must have at least one suitable breeding pond.</p>	



Table II-1 *Continued*

Environmental Impacts	Level of Significance Without Mitigation	Mitigation Measures	Level of Significance With Mitigation
BIO-5 <i>Continued</i>		<p><u>BIO-5d</u>: Implement Mitigation Measures BIO-1a, BIO-1b, BIO-1c, BIO-1d, BIO-4a, BIO-4b, and BIO-4c.</p> <p>Implementation of these mitigation measures, in addition to the policies and actions contained in the Draft General Plan, would reduce potential adverse effects to special-status plant and animal species but not to a less than significant level. Therefore, impacts to special-status plant and animal species would remain significant and unavoidable.</p>	
<p><u>BIO-6</u>: Build-out of the Draft General Plan would result in a general loss of habitat in natural and agricultural areas.</p>	S	<p><u>BIO-6</u>: None available.</p> <p>Implementation of the policies and actions contained in the Draft General Plan would reduce impacts associated with general loss of habitat, natural and agricultural areas; however not to a less than significant level. Therefore, the reduction of habitat associated with build-out of the Draft General Plan in the County remains significant and unavoidable.</p>	SU
<b>K. HYDROLOGY AND WATER QUALITY</b>			
<p><u>HYD-1</u>: Build-out of the Draft General Plan could result in increased overdraft of County aquifers and a reduction of aquifer recharge resulting in a net reduction aquifer capacity, availability of groundwater resources, and ground surface subsidence.</p>	S	<p><u>HYD-1a</u>: Amend Policy CO-5.3 of the Draft General Plan as follows:</p> <p>Policy CO-5.3: <del>Strive to m</del> Manage the County’s groundwater resources on a sustainable yield basis that can provide water purveyors and individual users with reliable, high quality groundwater to serve existing and planned land uses during prolonged drought periods.</p> <p><u>HYD-1b</u>: The Draft General Plan shall be amended to include the following new policy in the Conservation and Open Space Element.</p> <p>Policy CO-#: Strive to increase artificial recharge of important aquifers with surplus surface water supplies.</p>	LTS

Table II-1 *Continued*

Environmental Impacts	Level of Significance Without Mitigation	Mitigation Measures	Level of Significance With Mitigation
<u>HYD-2:</u> Build-out of the Draft General Plan would expose more people and structures flood hazards and may impede or redirect flood flows, resulting in increased flood hazards.	S	<u>HYD-2:</u> None available. While implementation of the policies and actions included in the Draft General Plan would reduce the severity of this impact, under build-out of the Draft General Plan new growth would occur within flood zones. Other than avoiding all development within floodplain areas, which the County does not consider to be practical or feasible, there are no additional mitigation measures available to reduce this impact. Therefore, this impact would remain significant and unavoidable.	SU
<u>HYD-3:</u> Build-out of the Draft General Plan would expose more people and structures flood hazards as a result of climate-induced sea level rise.	S	<u>HYD-3:</u> None available. While implementation of the policies and actions included in the Draft General Plan would reduce the severity of this impact, under build-out of the Draft General Plan new growth would occur within existing and future flood zones under global climate change conditions. There are no additional mitigation measures available to reduce this impact. Therefore, this impact would remain significant and unavoidable.	SU
<b>L. GEOLOGY, SOILS, SEISMICITY AND MINERAL RESOURCES</b>			
<u>GEO-1:</u> Implementation of the Draft General Plan could result in the destruction or modification of a unique geologic feature.	S	<p><u>GEO-1a:</u> The Draft General Plan shall be amended to include the following new policy in the Conservation and Open Space Element. Policy CO-#: The County’s unique geologic or physical features, which include geologic or soil “type localities” and formations or outcrops of special interest, shall be preserved and protected.</p> <p><u>GEO-1b:</u> The Draft General Plan shall be amended to include the following new action in the Conservation and Open Space Element. Action CO-A#: The County’s unique geologic or physical features, which include geologic or soil “type localities” and formations or outcrops of special interest, shall be researched, inventoried, mapped, and data added to the County GIS database.</p>	LTS

Table II-1 *Continued*

Environmental Impacts	Level of Significance Without Mitigation	Mitigation Measures	Level of Significance With Mitigation
<b>M. HAZARDS AND HAZARDOUS MATERIALS</b>			
<p><u>HAZ-1:</u> The public may be exposed to health risks from agricultural chemical residues in soils as a result of redevelopment of former agricultural properties that may occur under the Draft General Plan.</p>	S	<p><u>HAZ-1:</u> Amend Action HS-A47 of the Draft General Plan as follows: Action HS-A47: New development and redevelopment in areas previously used for <u>agricultural</u>, commercial, or industrial uses shall ensure that soils, groundwater, and buildings affected by hazardous material releases from prior land uses, as well as lead paint and/or asbestos potentially present in building materials, will not have the potential to affect the environment or health and safety of future property owners or users, and any affected areas shall be properly abated. A Phase I Environmental Site Assessment (ESA) to American Society for Testing and Materials (ASTM) standards shall be required where <del>appropriate</del> redevelopment may expose sensitive populations to hazardous materials, and a Phase II ESA may be required in certain circumstances based on the recommendations/results of the Phase I. A Phase I ESA will be required for residential and other sensitive development on former industrial, commercial, and agricultural properties, and for commercial development on former industrial properties. <u>Where the Phase I report has identified agricultural cultivation prior to the 1980s, a shallow soil investigation shall be performed at the property in accordance with DTSC guidance for sampling agricultural properties.</u></p>	LTS
<p><u>HAZ-2:</u> New development under the Draft General Plan may impair emergency response during peak traffic periods.</p>	S	<p><u>HAZ-2:</u> None available. While implementation of the policies and actions included in the Draft General Plan would reduce the severity of the impact to emergency responses, no additional feasible mitigation measures are available. Therefore, this impact would remain significant and unavoidable.</p>	SU

Table II-1 *Continued*

Environmental Impacts	Level of Significance Without Mitigation	Mitigation Measures	Level of Significance With Mitigation
<u>HAZ-3</u> : The public may be exposed to safety hazards due to new development near private and informal airstrips.	S	<u>HAZ-3</u> : Amend Policy HS-5.2 of the Draft General Plan as follows: <u>Policy HS-5.2</u> : Ensure that new development <u>near commercial and public use airports</u> is consistent with setbacks, height, and land use restrictions as determined by the Federal Aviation Administration and the Sacramento Area Council of Governments Airport Land Use Commission. <u>Ensure that development proximate to private airstrips addresses compatibility issues.</u>	LTS
<b>N. VISUAL AND SCENIC RESOURCES</b>			
<u>VIS-1</u> : Build-out of the Draft General Plan would result in new growth that degrades the existing visual character and quality of the County.	S	<u>VIS-1</u> : None available. While implementation of the policies and actions included in the Draft General Plan would reduce the severity of this impact to unique visual and scenic resources, no additional feasible mitigation measures are available. Therefore, this impact would remain significant and unavoidable.	SU
<u>VIS-2</u> : Implementation of the Draft General Plan could result in additional uses that would create new sources of substantial light or glare, which could adversely affect nighttime views outside of identified growth areas.	S	<u>VIS-2</u> : Implement Mitigation Measure LU-2b. Implementation of this mitigation measure and the policies in the Draft General Plan will reduce this impact, but the potential impacts that may result are still considered significant and unavoidable.	SU
<b>CUMULATIVE IMPACTS AND MITIGATION MEASURES</b>			
<u>GROWTH INDUCING-1</u> : Build-out of the Draft General Plan would result in growth inducing impacts.	S	<u>GROWTH INDUCING-1</u> : None available.	SU
<u>IRREVERSIBLE CHANGES-1</u> : Build-out of the Draft General Plan would result in significant irreversible changes.	S	<u>IRREVERSIBLE CHANGES-1</u> : None available.	SU
<u>CUMULATIVE LU-1</u> : Build-out of the Draft General Plan in conjunction with other planned development in the region would contribute cumulatively to land use and housing impacts in the region.	S	<u>CUMULATIVE LU-1</u> : None available.	SU
<u>CUMULATIVE AG-1</u> : Build-out of the Draft General Plan in conjunction with other planned development in the region would contribute cumulatively to loss of agricultural land.	S	<u>CUMULATIVE AG-1</u> : None available.	SU

Table II-1 *Continued*

Environmental Impacts	Level of Significance Without Mitigation	Mitigation Measures	Level of Significance With Mitigation
<u>CUMULATIVE CI-1</u> : Build-out of the Draft General Plan in conjunction with other planned development in the region would contribute cumulatively to transportation and circulation impacts in the region.	S	<u>CUMULATIVE CI-1</u> : None available.	SU
<u>CUMULATIVE AIR-1</u> : Build-out of the Draft General Plan, in conjunction with other planned development in the region would contribute cumulatively to air quality impacts in the region.	S	<u>CUMULATIVE AIR-1</u> : None available.	SU
<u>CUMULATIVE NOISE-1</u> : Build-out of the Draft General Plan in conjunction with other planned development in the region would contribute cumulatively to noise impacts in the region.	S	<u>CUMULATIVE NOISE-1</u> : None available.	SU
<u>CUMULATIVE GCC-1</u> : Build-out of the Draft General Plan, in conjunction with other planned development in the region would contribute cumulatively to global climate change.	S	<u>CUMULATIVE GCC-1</u> : None available.	SU
<u>CUMULATIVE UTIL-1</u> : Build-out of the Draft General Plan in conjunction with other planned development in the region would contribute cumulatively to water supply and infrastructure impacts.	S	<u>CUMULATIVE UTIL-1</u> : None available.	SU
<u>CUMULATIVE UTIL-2</u> : Build-out of the Draft General Plan in conjunction with other planned development in the region would contribute cumulatively to energy impacts.	S	<u>CUMULATIVE UTIL-2</u> : None available.	SU
<u>CUMULATIVE BIO-1</u> : Build-out of the Draft General Plan in conjunction with other planned development in the region would contribute cumulatively to biological resources.	S	<u>CUMULATIVE BIO-1</u> : None available.	SU
<u>CUMULATIVE HYDRO-1</u> : Build-out of the Draft General Plan, in conjunction with other planned development in the region would contribute cumulatively to hydrology and water quality impacts.	S	<u>CUMULATIVE HYDRO-1</u> : None available.	SU

Source: LSA Associates, Inc., 2009.

