EIR PRODUCTS AND SCHEDULE AS OF OCTOBER 12, 2009

Key Task/Product	August 22, 2009 Estimated Schedule	Updated Schedule
1. Authorization to begin	Complete	**Complete**
2. Completion of Environmental Setting/ Constraints Analysis	Complete	**Complete**
3. Completion of Preliminary Project Description ("Preferred Alternative")	Complete	**Complete**
4. Completion and Release of NOP/Initial Study		**Complete**
5. Completion of preliminary draft Specific Plan		**Complete**
-- **Initiate Archaeologic Field Study by Holman**	August 21, 2009	**Complete**
6. Receipt of vehicle-miles-traveled and LOS analysis data from Abrams Assoc. for use in noise, air quality and climate change analysis	August 21, 2009	**October 14, 2009**
-- **Receipt of WSA letter from Fairfield**	August 21, 2009	**Received**
7. (a) Receipt of Abrams Assoc. traffic chapter	August 21, 2009	**October 14, 2009**
(b) Receipt of WRA biological resources chapter	August 21, 2009	**Received**
-- **Receipt of Preliminary Holman Report**	End of September 2009	**October 14, 2009**
8. Delivery of Admin. Draft EIR	End of September 2009	**October 29, 2009**
9. Receipt of County staff comments on Admin. Draft EIR	Mid-October 2009	**November 13, 2009**
-- **Receipt of Final Holman Report**	Mid-November 2009	**Mid-November 2009**
10. Delivery of Screencheck Draft EIR	End of October 2009	**November 25, 2009**
11. Receipt of County staff approval of Screencheck Draft EIR	Early November 2009	**December 2, 2009**
12. Delivery of Draft EIR for Public Release (incl. Notice of Completion)	Mid-November 2009	**December 8, 2009**
13. Beginning of 45-day Draft EIR public review period	Mid-November 2009	**December 9, 2009**
14. Public Hearing on Draft Specific Plan and EIR	Early December 2009	**Mid-January 2010**
15. End of 45-day Draft EIR public review period	Late December 2009	**January 25, 2010**
16. Deliver of Admin. Draft Final EIR (Responses to Comments)	Late January 2010	**February 12, 2010**
17. Receipt of County staff comments on Admin. Draft Final EIR(Responses to Comments)	Early February 2010	**February 19, 2010**
18. Delivery of Final EIR for Public Release	Early February 2010	**February 26, 2010**
19. Delivery of Admin. Draft Mitigation Monitoring and Reporting Program (checklist)	Mid-February 2010	**December 16, 2009**
20. Receipt of County staff comments on Admin. Draft Mitigation Monitoring and Reporting Program (checklist)	Mid-February 2010	**January 6, 2010**
21. Delivery of final Mitigation Monitoring and Reporting Program (checklist)	Mid-February 2010	**January 13, 2010**
22. Assist County Resource Management Department staff and Legal Counsel with preparation of CEQA Findings	Mid-February through late February 2010	**Late February through Mid-March 2010**
23. Planning Commission public hearing and action on Final EIR and Specific Plan	Late February 2010	**Mid-March 2010**
24. Board of Supervisors public hearing and action on Final EIR and Specific Plan	Early March 2010	**Late March 2010**

SOLANO COUNTY: MIDDLE GREEN VALLEY SPECIFIC PLAN AND ASSOCIATED EIR UPDATE-CITIZEN'S ADVISORY MEETING

October 19, 2009 (6PM) - Solano County Administrative Bldg., 675 Texas St., Fairfield

PUBLIC MEETINGS

February 9, 2009	CAC Meeting #1-	**Review of Reconnaissnance Info**
March 2, 2009	CAC Meeting #2-	**Open Space Network- Creating the Framework**
March 23, 2009	CAC Meeting #3-	**Cluster Develoment and Character**
April 13, 2009	CAC Meeting #4-	**Creating a Conservation-Based Community: TDRs and Alternative Mechanisms**
May 4, 2009	CAC Meeting #5-	**Infrastructure and Circulation in Middle Green Valley**
May 7, 2009	Planning Commission	
May 12, 2009	Board of Supervisors	
May 18, 2009	CAC Meeting #6-	**Implementation, Phasing & Finance in Middle Green Valley**
June 15, 2009	CAC Meeting #7-	**Specific Plan, Development Agreement and Regulatory Overview**
July 20, 2009	CAC Meeting #8-	**Resource Agency Overview**
August 6, 2009	Planning Commission	
August 31, 2009	CAC Meeting #9-	**Presentation of Specific Plan, Design Guidelines, and Development Standards**
October 19, 2009	CAC Meeting #10-	**Middle Green Valley Specific Plan and EIR Update**
December 7, 2009	CAC Meeting #11-	**Reveiw of Draft EIR**
January 4, 2010	CAC Meeting #12-	**Final CAC Meeting** (Dinner to follow)

ATTENDING:

Solano County Resource Management

Birgitta Corsello (bcorsello@solanocounty.com)
Mike Yankovich (myankovich@solanocounty.com)
Matt Walsh (mwalsh@solanocounty.com)

Citizens Advisory Committee

Craig Gillespie (craiggillespie@sbcglobal.net)
Bob Hager (bhagerjr@yahoo.com)
Herb Hughes (katkreek@comcast.net)
Sarah Lindemann (slinde1744@aol.com)
Bill Mayben (bmayben@comcast.net)
Nancy Nelson (nnelson@oagarchitects.com)
Anthony Russo (arusso@blproperties2.com)
Jim Wiley (agentwiley@comcast.net)

Hart Howerton: (HH) – Planners, Architects & Landscape Architects

Amie MacPhee LEED A.P. (amacphee@harthowerton.com)
Brendan Kelly, AIA, LEED A.P. (bkelly@harthowerton.com)

PRELIMINARY HISTORIC RESOURCE PRIORITIZATION

Preservation Priority *(resources where integrity and significance rely in part on preservation in place)*

RESOURCE	PRIORITATION RATIONALE
Rock Walls (Engell 1; Mason 4; Mason 9; Russo5)	● Engell 1, Mason 4, and Russo 5 correspond to property boundaries depicted on Thompson and West's 1878 map. ● The Central Sonoma County Cultural Heritage Commission (1977) identified Green Valley's rock walls as possessing exceptional architectural significance.

Preservation and Study Priority (*resources which contain extant buildings or objects of potential significance to the interpretation of regional history, as well as potential for archaeological, architectural, and historical study to yield useful information)*

RESOURCE	PRIORITATION RATIONALE
Stone house and shed (Maher 1a & 1b)	● Continuous occupation of the site since 1860 provides the potential for archaeological study to show economic and social change. ● The Central Sonoma County Cultural Heritage Commission (1977) identified Maher 1a as possessing exceptional architectural significance.
Stone building (Mason 2b)	● Continuous occupation of the site by the Mason family since 1862 provides the potential for archaeological study to show economic and social change. ● The Central Sonoma County Cultural Heritage Commission (1977) identified this building as possessing good architectural significance
Water tank (Mason 7)	● Roy Mason's report of this as a pre-1906 reservoir for the Nightingale Ranch. ● At least 72 years old (visible on 1937 aerial photo) ● Seems to be a unique local representative of this type of structure.
House (Volkhardt 1a)	● One building depicted on the 1898 USGS map may correspond to this structure. ● Continuous occupation of the site since the late 19th-century provides potential for archaeological study to show economic and social change.

Study Priority *(resources may lack buildings or structures with integrity, while maintaining potential to provide archaeological information)*

RESOURCE	PRIORITATION RATIONALE
Former Home Site (Russo 4)	● Indication of buildings in this location as early as 1878 (Thompson & West), and the possibility of associated material from the occupation of the reported 1832 adobe (Vallejo/Jones House).
Residential Remains (Dedomenico 1)	● Indication of buildings in this vicinity as early as 1856 (Eaton).
Dry Yard (Russo 3)	● Part of an agricultural complex used at least 72 years ago (visible on 1937 aerial photo, this site may yield useful archaeological information about family-farm scale fruit processing activity in the region.
Barn (Mason 1a)	● Continuous occupation of the site by the Mason family since 1862 provides the potential for archaeological study to show economic and social change.

Source: Cultural Resources Report

TRIP GENERATION CHARACTERISTICS FOR MIDDLE GREEN VALLEY

No.	Land Use	Size	ADT	AM Peak Hour			PM Peak Hour		
				In	Out	Total	In	Out	Total
1	Bed & Breakfast (Resort Hotel rates)	25 rooms	82	7	3	9	5	7	12
2	Single Family Residential	400 units	3,071	74	221	295	235	138	373
3	Second Units (Apartment rates)	100 units	732	11	45	56	44	24	68
4	Commercial/Retail/Farmstand	23,000 sq. ft.	2,153	55	35	90	151	164	315
	Internal Trip Reduction	34 percent	732	19	12	31	51	56	107
	Diverted Linked Trip Reduction	25 percent	538	14	9	23	38	41	79
	Net New Commercial/Retail Trips		883	23	14	37	62	67	129
5	Office Space in RC Residential	10,000 sq. ft.	110	14	2	16	3	12	15
	Internal Trip Reduction	23 percent	25	3	0	4	1	3	3
	Net New Commercial/Retail Trips		85	11	1	12	2	10	11
6	Church (External Trips)	2,000 sq. ft.	61	1	0	1	1	2	2
7	Community Center, Conservancy Office	10,000 sq. ft.	110	14	2	16	3	12	15
	Internal Trip Reduction	70 percent	77	10	1	11	2	9	10
	Net New Public Facility Trips		33	4	1	5	1	4	5
8	Public Elementary School	300 students	930	155	121	276	24	36	60
	Internal Trip Reduction	30 percent	279	47	36	83	7	11	18
	Net New Elementary School Trips		651	109	85	193	17	25	43
9	Agricultural Processing (Light Industrial)	50,000 sq. ft.	349	40	6	46	6	43	49
	Internal Trip Reduction	20 percent	70	8	1	9	1	9	10
	Diverted Linked Trip Reduction	15 percent	52	6	1	7	1	6	7
	Net New Agricultural Processing Trips		227	26	4	30	4	28	32
	Net New Trip Generation		**5,823**	**264**	**374**	**638**	**371**	**304**	**676**

Notes:

1) The trip rates are based on the Institute of Transportation Engineers (ITE) fitted curve equations for the single family detached housing and for the commercial/retail land uses (estimated using the shopping center category). For the bed and breakfast and the agricultural processing land uses the average rates were used.

2) For the trip generation it has been assumed that up to 10 of the residential units in the Elkhorn Neighborhood Rural Mixed-Use (RC) area would ultimately be converted to higher trip generating commercial and office uses (amounting to a maximum of 10,000 square feet of each).

3) There are 400 residential lots planned but 10 of them are proposed to be "compound lots" that could have up to 15,000 square feet of building space. A significant portion of this space would be for agricultural and other ancillary uses and the traffic from these lots has been estimated to be equivalent to the traffic from three standard residential lots. Therefore the trip generation calculations are based on 410 units which accounts for 380 standard lots plus another 30 units to represent the traffic generated by the 10 compound lots and subtracting out 10 units for the above mentioned RC Residential and Office Conversion.

4) The internal/pass-by trip reduction accounts for commercial trips that would either remain within the project or would be made as part of the already estimated trips that would be travelling to and from the project.

5) Diverted linked trips are trips that are already being made on Green Valley Road that would be diverted into the project to stop at the commercial/retail space. These would be considered as new trips on the internal project roadways but they would not be added as new trips to Green Valley Road.

Source: Abrams Associates