
III. CORRECTIONS AND ADDITIONS TO THE REVISED DRAFT EIR

The following corrections have been made to the Rockville Trails Estates Residential Subdivision Project Revised Draft Environmental Impact Report (RDEIR) in response to the comments received during and after the public review period. Changes to the RDEIR are listed by Section and page number. Additions to the RDEIR are identified by underlined text and deletions to the RDEIR are identified by strikethrough text. In addition, all applicable Section IV (Environmental Impact Analysis) impact and mitigation measure revisions reflected below are hereby incorporated into Section II (Summary), Table II-1 (Summary of Environmental Impacts & Mitigation Measures), of the RDEIR.

PROJECT DESCRIPTION

Page III-28

The following revision has been made to the second paragraph under the Parks subheading.

Per Figure III-11 and Figure III-17, the neighborhood park would be located ~~west~~ east of Road A, near the project main entrance. The proposed park site was accommodated within the project site through minor adjustments to adjoining lots and minor grading refinements...

Page III-40

The following information is added above the last partial paragraph on Page III-40.

The Consolidated pond will be enclosed with a fence of appropriate design, including safety signage, as approved by the County, to keep children and animals out.

Previously, a total of 56.3-acre feet of storage was proposed in the series of four wastewater storage ponds (Storage Ponds A through D) to be located along the easterly side of the project in the Agriculture...

AESTHETICS

Page IV.A-20

The following revision has been made to the last paragraph on this page.

...In addition to the open space parcels, large amounts of space on the lots would be maintained in an open natural condition to maximize the total open space of the project. As part of the original EIR analysis, an on-site park was made a condition of approval; therefore, under the modified design, a 7.21-acre neighborhood park with associated landscaping and small parking area would be located ~~west~~ east of Road A, near the project main entrance...

AIR QUALITY

The following Impacts have been renumbered in this section, as there was a duplicate Impact AQ-4 in the RDEIR. This change will be made to all applicable sections of the RDEIR.

<i>Impact AQ-4</i>	<i>CO Emissions</i>
<i>Impact AQ-45</i>	<i>Odors</i>
<i>Impact AQ-56</i>	<i>Toxic Air Contaminants</i>
<i>Impact AQ-67</i>	<i>CO and Related GHG Emissions</i>

BIOLOGICAL RESOURCES

Page IV.C-15

The following supplemental language has been added following the last paragraph under the subheading Special-Status Plant Species on Page IV.C-15.

Although it technically is not a special-status species, oracle oak (*Quercus garryana*), occurs on the site. Oracle oak is a hybrid between black oak and interior live oak, and represents a phenomenon of biological interest. Oracle oaks have been found in the Coast Range, San Bernardino Mountains, lower foothills of the Sierra Nevada, and north into southern Oregon. Substantial concentrations of this hybrid have not been reported. A total of eighteen oracle oaks were observed on the site and their locations mapped during preparation of the previous development application, as indicated in Figure IV.C-2.

Plants that are either federally or state listed or on the CNPS list 1A, 1B or 2 were not observed within the 2008 designated survey areas. The majority of the survey areas was dominated by grassland and had extensive areas of shallow soil and rock outcrops. Two of the areas supported large manzanitas (*Arctostaphylos manzanita*) up to 12 feet tall and 8 inches in diameter. One of the survey areas was dominated by oak woodland and one of the areas supported some species of shrubs: California sagebrush (*Artemisia californica*) and sticky monkey flower (*Mimulus aurantiacus*). This area also supported rock outcrops with numerous herbaceous species such as: fringe pod (*Thysanocarpus curvipes*), tufted poppy (*Eschscholzia caespitosa*), sky lupine (*Lupinus nanus*), poison sanicle (*Sanicula bipinnata*), blue dicks (*Dichelostemma capitatum*), woodland star (*Lithophragma affine*), and others. Additional Blue elderberry (*Sambucus mexicana*) occurrences were encountered in two of the 2008 survey areas.

Plant species observed during the summer 2008 surveys that are to be added to that species list include: oowow bells (*Dichelostemma congestum*), melic grass (*Melica imperfecta*), baby blue eyes (*Nemophila menziesii* var. *integriifolia*), small-flowered claytonia (*Claytonia parviflora*), white hawkweed (*Hieracium albiflorum*), rosin weed (*Calycadenia truncata*), California saxifrage (*Saxifraga californica*), California skullcap (*Scutellaria californica*), and two species of clover (*Trifolium microcephalum*) and (*Trifolium oliganthum*). In addition, a plant that most closely resembles streamside daisy (*Erigeron bioletti*), a

species on the CNPS list 3, was also encountered during the surveys. CNPS list 3 species are on a review list pending the acquisition of additional information pertaining to their taxonomy, distribution, and/or threats. The RDEIR does not consider potential impacts on any species maintained on Lists 3 and 4 of the CNPS Inventory to be significant; hence, mitigation would not be required.

Page IV.C-16

Figure IV.C-2 (Special Status Species Map) has been revised to show the updated data associated with the recently completed 2008 additional rare plant surveys, which are presented in the following report (refer to Appendix B of the RFEIR), *Results of the March/April Rare Plant Survey for Rockville Trails, Solano County*, prepared by LSA Associates, July 29, 2008.

Page IV.C-60

The fourth full bullet under Mitigation Measure BIO-4b has been revised to read:

- ...Prior to approval of ~~at~~ the first Final Map, a Final Tree Mitigation Program shall be prepared and implemented based on the Draft Tree Mitigation Program, which provides for further avoidance and adequate replacement for tree resources impacted by proposed development, including smaller trees. The Final Tree Mitigation Program shall also comply with PRC §21083.4 mitigation standards. The Tree Protection Plan in the Final Tree Mitigation Program shall include a component that identifies the location of all trees ~~65~~ 65 inches or greater in diameter (dbh) and provides for their consideration as part of tree avoidance and protection. Where avoidance of trees with trunk diameters ranging from 65 to less than 18 inches (dbh) is not feasible, as determined by the County, replacement shall be provided at a minimum 1:1 replacement ratio as part of the Tree Revegetation Plan and Monitoring Plan. Similarly, where avoidance of trees with trunk diameters (dbh) of 18 inches or greater is not feasible, as determined by the County, replacement shall be provided at a minimum 3:1 replacement ratio, as part of the Tree Revegetation Plan and Monitoring Plan. Avoidance efforts undertaken as part of refinement of the ~~proposed~~ approved Tentative Map and as part of the Home Site Development Consideration described in the Tree Protection Plan shall give preference to avoidance of trees with trunk diameters of 18 inches (dbh) or ~~great~~ greater because of their age and length of time necessary to replace habitat values. Mitigation ~~would~~ shall entail collecting propagules (acorns) on-site, where possible, and planting replacement trees using 1 and 5-gallon sized specimens, developed from local stock, in buffer zones along roadway corridors and between homes and open space areas. Additional plantings shall be planted in sparsely vegetated grassland areas. Tree plantings ~~would~~ shall be monitored by the subdivider's certified arborist or qualified biologist, who shall additionally prepare and provide annual reports to the County Department of Resource Management, for five ~~seven~~ seven years to determine success of the revegetation. This shall include monitoring of possible establishment of Sudden Oak Death on the site, with appropriate recommendations made to prevent further spread and tree loss if this disease becomes established on the site. The Tree Revegetation Plan and Monitoring Plan describes mitigation site selection, implementation methods, and performance criteria. The Tree Revegetation Plan and Monitoring

Plan assumes that ~~five~~seven years of monitoring would be provided, but does not specify contingency measures if performance criteria are not met. The Final Tree Mitigation Program shall specify contingency measures to ensure success establishment of mitigation plantings.

Page IV.C-62

The third full bullet under Mitigation Measure BIO-4c has been revised to read:

- Define maintenance and monitoring provisions to ensure the successful establishment and long-term viability of native plantings and the control and eradication of highly aggressive non-native French broom, Himalayan blackberry, periwinkle, and other noxious weeds from the site. The maintenance and monitoring program shall be implemented during a minimum ~~five~~seven year monitoring required as part of tree replacement and wetlands mitigation, and shall continue as part of long-term maintenance of open space areas.

CULTURAL RESOURCES

Page IV.D-14

The Mitigation Measure CULT-2a has been revised to read:

Mitigation Measure CULT-2a

~~If avoidance of the CA-SOL-335 is impractical or infeasible, a qualified archaeologist shall be retained to conduct test excavations at the site to determine the extent of its subsurface deposit and its integrity. If it is found to be highly disturbed, lack definable components, or lack significant subsurface deposit, no further work would be necessary. If the site is found to have an intact, significant deposit, a qualified archaeologist would conduct final data recovery to obtain enough information to characterize the site's components and activities before project construction.~~

To ascertain that subsurface deposits do not extend beyond the surface boundaries determined by the test units, deep excavations to underlying sterile sediment shall be required. Depending on access, these excavations could be done with a backhoe, or by hand using shovels or augers. Once boundaries are defined, avoidance during construction shall be assured by fencing to keep equipment outside the archaeological site. Lastly, small portions of renumbered Extensive Agricultural Lots 362-365 contain CA-SOL-335 site area. Deeds for these parcels shall be amended with stipulations for avoidance and preservation of the CA-SOL-335 area, or the portions of those lots that contain the archaeological deposit shall be removed from private ownership and designated as common property.

If avoidance of CA-SOL-335 is not possible, then mitigation of project effects is recommended in the form of sufficient controlled archaeological excavations to exhaust the research potential of the affected site area. The amount of excavation conducted would depend on the area extent of the archaeological site subjected to potentially significant project impacts.

GEOLOGY/SOILS**Page IV.E-27**

Mitigation Measure GEO-9c has been revised to read:

Mitigation Measure GEO-9c

The bottom of the wastewater effluent ~~detention~~ pond shall be designed to adequately mitigate seepage through potentially pervious foundation materials in accordance with applicable state guidelines. This may include lining the pond with a relatively impervious liner system such as heavy duty HDPE liners underlain with a geosynthetic clay liner. Additionally, a system of geonet or geocomposite drainage net shall be installed under the geosynthetic clay liner to drain the ground water around the Pond. This subdrain system shall either be directionally piped through the adjoining hillside for discharge to a lower elevation, or connected to a sump pump that will cycle leaked effluent into the Consolidated Pond. Once the location, geometry, and function of the ponds have been finalized through design level investigations, the final design of the pond liners shall be determined.

NOISE**Page IV.I-20**

Mitigation Measure NOISE-3b has been revised to read:

Mitigation Measure NOISE-3b

Internally audible alarms (inside the building), together with external flashing lights visible to local pedestrians and motorists, shall be ~~considered~~ provided at the proposed fire station site. This approach is frequently used in relatively quiet residential settings, and considered adequate in terms of safety considerations.

Page IV.I-21

Mitigation Measure NOISE-3d has been revised to read:

Mitigation Measure NOISE-3d

Operating procedures shall be ~~considered~~ prepared and implemented by the CFPD regarding sensitive use of external truck-mounted alarms in the vicinity of residences, consistent with state law and applicable District safety procedures. ~~adopting restrictions in the use of external truck mounted alarms until the vehicle reaches Rockville Road. Vehicle mounted flashing lights could be used in lieu of alarms between the station and Rockville Road intersection.~~

TRANSPORTATION/TRAFFIC**Page IV.K-6**

The last paragraph on this page has been revised to read:

Interstate 80 (I-80) is an eight to ten-lane east-west freeway located south of the project site that extends from Teaneck, New Jersey in the east to San Francisco in the west.

Page IV.K-12

The last paragraph on this page has been revised to read:

During the AM peak hour, all study intersections within the County's jurisdiction operate at ~~acceptable~~ LOS C or better, and most of the study intersections with City of Fairfield operate at acceptable LOS; however, the following intersections operate at unacceptable LOS (LOS E or F):

Page IV.K-15

The first full two paragraphs on Page IV.K-15 have been revised to read:

The Solano County Road Improvement Standards and Land Development Requirements (adopted February 2006) establishes LOS C as the LOS standard for intersections within the County's jurisdiction and the City of Fairfield's 2002 General Plan establishes LOS D as the LOS standard for major intersections within the City of Fairfield.

The Suisun Valley Road/Westbound I-80 Ramps, and Green Valley Road/Lopes Road/Westbound I-80/I-680 Ramps ~~and Green Valley Road/Lopes Road/Eastbound I-80/I-680 Ramps~~ intersections will be signalized and widened to facilitate the movement of vehicles to and from the freeways as part of the interchange reconstruction project. The Green Valley Road/Lopes Road/Eastbound I-80/I-680 Ramps intersection was signalized by the City of Fairfield in 2006.

Page IV.K-17

The second to last bullet on Page IV.K-17 has been revised to read:

Circulation and Transportation Policy 5. The cost of on and off-site improvements to County Roads and adjacent city transportation systems to accommodate new development should be borne by the developer.

Page IV.K-20

The first bullet on Page IV.K-20 has been revised to read:

For signalized intersections, cause intersection operations to deteriorate from an acceptable level (LOS C or better for intersections within Solano County and LOS D or better for intersections within Fairfield) to an

unacceptable level (LOS D, E, or F for intersections under Solano County jurisdiction and LOS E or F for intersections within Fairfield). In the City of Fairfield, a minimum 1 percent impact of a development must also be met for an impact to be considered significant.

Page IV.K-35

The first paragraph on Page IV.K-35 has been revised to read:

A STA diagram dated February 11, 2008 (refer to Figure IV.K-10), shows the status of improvement North Connector projects over the next three years lists the East and Central Segments of the North Connector with a planned construction start date of winter 2009. Per the City of Fairfield, the Central segment construction has commenced as of summer 2008. The North Connector project list for Solano County was approved by the STA Board on March 12, 2008 for submittal to the Metropolitan Transportation Commission (MTC) for inclusion in the MTC's 2035 Regional Transportation Plan (RTP). The MTC Board is tentatively scheduled to adopt the draft RTP in July 2008.

Page IV.K-40

The first paragraph on Page IV.K-40 has been revised to read:

The addition of project traffic would contribute to the unacceptable LOS F operations at the unsignalized Abernathy Road/Westbound I-80 Ramp intersection (Intersection # 7) during the AM peak hour. The project traffic contribution is greater than one percent. To date, no improvements have been completed to the Green Valley Road/I WB I-80 WB Ramp intersection. Therefore, the impact is *significant*.

The third paragraph on Page IV.K-40 has been revised to read:

The intersection would operate at LOS B (19 seconds of delay) during the AM peak hour with this improvement, which is considered a less-than-significant level. This intersection is located in the City of Fairfield and this improvement will be implemented as part of the North Connector project, funded by the CFD No. 2007-1. Under Resolution No. 2007-175, Attachment A, as of August 2007, it was confirmed that Mitigation Measure TRANS-4 improvements were associated with the North Connector arterial with funding provided by CFD No. 3 and STA. The project sponsor would contribute to this mitigation measure by paying its fair share (8 percent) of the cost through participation in existing and future programs for funding improvements as determined by Solano County and the City of Fairfield. The proposed Caltrans Ramp Metering project for this location is proposing to add a second southbound left-turn lane at the intersection.

Pages IV.K-40 and 41

The following impact and associated mitigation measure has been revised to read:

Impact TRANS-5 Near-Term (2010)

The addition of project traffic would contribute to the unacceptable LOS F operations at the unsignalized Green Valley Road/Lopes Road/Westbound I-80/I-680 Ramps intersection (Intersection #8) during both AM and PM peak hours. The project traffic contribution is greater than one percent. Therefore, the impact is *significant*. Mitigation Measures were included in the RDEIR that would reduce this impact to a less-than-significant level, such as:

~~The following mitigation measure would reduce the impact described above to a *less-than-significant* level:~~

Mitigation Measure TRANS-5

~~Mitigation of the unacceptable conditions at the Green Valley Road/Lopes Road/Westbound I-80/I-680 Ramps intersection could be achieved by implementing the following improvement:~~

- Signalize the intersection and interconnect the new signal with the existing signal at the Green Valley Road/Business Center Drive intersection.
- Provide an exclusive left-turn lane on the northbound approach.
- Provide a free right-turn lane on the southbound approach.

However, the above improvements have been recently completed; therefore, project impacts at this intersection would be less than significant and no mitigation measures are required.”

~~The intersection would operate at LOS B (11 seconds of delay) during the AM peak hour and LOS C (26 seconds of delay) during the PM peak hour with this improvement, which is considered a less than significant level. This intersection is located in the City of Fairfield and this improvement is programmed by the City of Fairfield, with secured funding through CFD No. 2007-1. As of August 2007, the improvements associated with Mitigation Measure TRANS-5 were partly completed and partly included in the anticipated bond issuance. The project sponsor would contribute to this mitigation measure by paying its fair share (10 percent) of the cost through participation in existing and future programs for funding improvements as determined by Solano County and the City of Fairfield.~~

Page IV.K-43

The first paragraph on Page IV.K-43 of the RDEIR has been revised to read:

The intersection would operate at LOS C (28 seconds of delay) during the AM peak hour and LOS C (26 seconds of delay) during the PM peak hour with this improvement. However, the above improvements were completed per the City of Fairfield in 2007 based on established need and funding.¹ The improvements that Fairfield provided at the Green Valley/Lopes/1-80 EB Ramp intersection only included the signal, and exclusive northbound left-turn lane, a separate southbound right-turn lane and separate left and right turn eastbound lanes. Therefore, as the improvements have already been completed, impacts at this intersection would be less than significant and no mitigation measures are required.

Page IV.K-58 and 59

The Modified Project would cause ~~11~~ **significant** impacts (Impacts TRANS-1 through TRANS-~~4~~7, TRANS-6, TRANS-7 and TRANS-9 through TRANS-13). Regarding Impact TRANS-6, the impact would be less than significant with completion of the North Connector Project (Near Term, 2010) and further reduced with completion of the I-80/I-680/SR 12 Interchange Project improvements (Cumulative, 2030). The ~~additional five~~^{seven} significant intersection impacts under Near-Term (2010) conditions (Impacts TRANS-1 through TRANS-4, and TRANS-7) will be mitigated to less-than-significant levels with the mitigation measures provided in Mitigation Measures TRANS-1 through TRANS-4, and TRANS-7. The significant roadway impact under Near-Term (2010) conditions (Impact TRANS-9) would be mitigated to a less-than-significant level with construction of the I-80/I-680/SR 12 Interchange Project improvements. However, as the phased roadway improvements may not be completed by the time the project is built-out impacts would remain **temporarily significant and unavoidable** until the needed transportation improvements are completed. Impact TRANS-10 would be mitigated to a less-than-significant level with implementation of Mitigation Measure TRANS-10. Impacts TRANS-11 through TRANS-13 would be **less than significant** with the implementation of the mitigation measures outlined above.

All other impacts would be **less than significant**.

UTILITIES & SERVICE SYSTEMS**Page IV.L-16**

Figure IV.L-4 (Change in Water Level (from 11/20/07) at OW-1) has been revised to illustrate a continuous plot of the nine-month static water well testing results for Well #1 (OW-1) between November 20, 2007 and August 20, 2008.

Page IV.L-17

Figure IV.L-5 (Change in Water Level (from 11/20/07) at SID-OW) has been revised to illustrate a continuous plot of the nine-month static water well testing results for Well #2 (SID-OW) between November 20, 2007 and August 20, 2008.

Page IV.L-18

The below text is add subsequent to the last water supply existing conditions paragraph on Page IV.L-18:

Given the findings of the project geotechnical report¹, which show a relatively consistent weathered or fractured bedrock with good permeability throughout the site, it is expected that the five alternative Well #3 locations should produce peak and constant pumping volumes at a range between those documented for Well #1 and Well #2.

Monitoring has subsequently continued without interruption under the observation and analysis of TRC Lowney. The most recent results available as of the publish date of this Revised FEIR are through August 20, 2008, and reflect a total reporting period of nine months. The following discussion provides a summary of the water level monitoring results for both wells over the entire nine month period. RDEIR Figures IV.L-4 and IV-L5 have been updated and illustrate a continuous plot of the water levels for Wells #1 and #2, respectively, between November 20, 2007 and August 20, 2008.

As shown in revised Figure IV.L-4, the water level in Well #1 (OW-1) did not respond rapidly to the rainfall events occurring in the very beginning of January 2008, and again during the last week of January. The depth to water decreased from the starting point and did not start recovering until the end of January. The water level in this well started steadily increasing until the end of March, when it reached a level approximately 0.20 foot above the starting point. It stayed approximately at this level until mid-April, when it started steadily declining. Between about 7:30 PM on June 3rd and 1:38 AM on June 4th, the water level abruptly dropped almost one foot, and then it recovered approximately 0.5 foot by June 10th. The water level in Well #1 subsequently continued its steady declining trend through August 20, 2008, at which point it was 1.35 feet below its starting level.

In contrast to the results reported for Well #1, revised Figure IV.L-5 shows that the water level in Well #2 (SID-OW) increased rapidly in response to rainfall periods in the very beginning of January, late January, and mid-February, reaching a peak of approximately 1.8 feet higher than the starting depth by the beginning of February 2008. The water level in Well #2 then declined by approximately 10 inches over the following two weeks (by mid-February), followed by a slow recovery through the last week in March. The water level in Well #2 was relatively stable during the first three weeks of April, after which it experienced a steady decline. A sudden drop of approximately 0.2 foot in the water level was recorded on June 3-4 in this well, correlating with the observed decline in Well #1. The water level continued to decline steadily after June 3-4, as expected. On August 20, 2008, the water level in Well #2 was 0.45 feet lower than the starting depth.

Monitoring results from Wells #1 and #2 over this extended nine-month period are consistent with deep wells excavated through well-fractured or otherwise permeable rocks, which respond slowly, but consistently to rainfall-induced recovery of the aquifer. As previously noted, the final water level in the two wells at the end of this period in late summer 2008 was between 0.45 feet (just over 5 inches) and 1.35 feet (just over 16 inches) lower than the starting level in late fall of the preceding year. TRC Lowney reports that the gradually declining water level trend in both wells is expected to continue until the winter rains start recharging the aquifer again. The monitoring results demonstrate show that water levels in the two existing deep wells on the project site fluctuate by rises and declines of up to two feet, correlating to seasonal rainfall, and consistent with the permeable soils covering the aquifer.

Based on the abovementioned text, this illustrates that Well #1 has a total depth of just over 650 feet, and encounters saturated aquifer rocks from a depth of 260 feet to the bottom of the well (a documented thickness of over 390 feet). Well #2 has an overall depth of approximately 584 feet below NGVD, and encounters saturated aquifer rocks continuously from a depth of approximately 160 feet to the bottom of the well (a documented thickness of over 500 feet). The large volumes of water pumped from these wells during 24-hour tests (219 gpm and 315 gpm, respectively), together with the relatively strong recovery rates recorded by TRC Lowney, were found to be consistent with the substantial thickness and horizontal permeability of the aquifer. The overall decline in the water table recorded from Wells #1 (1.35 feet) and #2 (0.45 foot) between November 20, 2007 and the end of the 9-month monitoring period (August 20, 2008) therefore represent between one tenth of one percent (0.0009) and 4 tenths of one percent (0.0037) of the saturated thickness of the aquifer documented at these two locations.

Page IV.L-31

Mitigation Measure UTIL-1

To ensure the project has an adequate, maximum day water supply during the most restrictive conditions, prior to the issuance of the first building permit for the project, the operators of the proposed water system (either a state-regulated public utility or a CSD), shall develop and institute a monitoring and reporting program to confirm the aquifer is responding as expected. This program shall be designed and implemented by a professional ground water consultant (~~retained~~ approved by the Solano County Department of Public Works), who would make recommendations as appropriate, in cooperation with regulatory oversight by the CDPH and possibly the CPUC, for long-term operation of the water supply system. This monitoring program shall include a 12-month pre-construction testing and monitoring program that will establish a baseline for determination of future effects from operation of the project wells, as well as long-term monitoring and analysis that shall continue a minimum of 9 years beyond build-out of the project....