CHAPTER 2.0 SUMMARY OF IMPACTS AND MITIGATION MEASURES

CHAPTER 2.0 SUMMARY OF IMPACTS AND MITIGATION MEASURES

2.1 PROJECT UNDER REVIEW

This Draft EIR evaluates the environmental impacts related to implementation of the Cache Creek Resource Management Plan (CCRMP) and Cache Creek Improvement Program (CCIP). The CCRMP addresses a variety of issues relevant to managing the diverse resources within the creek channel in approximately 4,995 acres along a 14.5 mile reach extending from the Capay Dam, downstream to a levied section of the creek near the town of Yolo. The CCRMP governs land use activities and environmental restoration within the present channel banks and 100-year floodplain. It discontinues commercial mining within the active creek channel, and concentrates on improving the stability of the channel, minimizing flood damage, and restoring wildlife. It prescribes standards and regulations for initial channel smoothing and shaping, ongoing maintenance activities, and creek restoration. It seeks to provide year-round flows in many portions of the creek. The CCRMP identifies restoration project areas; including restoration and enhancement of previously mined areas adjoining the active creek channel, and provides buffers for existing and future agriculture from restoration and recreation areas. The CCIP provides structure and authority for a Technical Advisory Committee (TAC) to make recommendations on stream management, defines procedures and methodologies for stream monitoring and maintenance activities, and identifies initial high priority projects for stream stabilization. A complete description of the project is contained in Chapter 3.0, Description of Project and Alternatives.

2.2 AREAS OF CONTROVERSY

Section 15123 of the CEQA Guidelines requires the summary section of an EIR to include "areas of controversy known to the lead agency." The following issues (in no particular order) fit that requirement:

- Relinquishment of existing rights to conduct commercial mining within the active creek channel.
- Channel stability and proximity of mining pits to the active creek channel.
- Ability and practicality of returning the creek to pre-mining conditions.
- Effects of mining and flood control improvements on bridge structures, creek stability, and downstream flooding.

The degree to which vegetation should be reintroduced within the channel.

2.3 ISSUES TO BE RESOLVED

Section 15123 of the CEQA Guidelines requires the summary section of an EIR to include "issues to be resolved including choices among alternatives and whether and how to mitigate significant effects." The following issues fit this requirement:

- Resolution of regional flooding problems associated with the Creek and tributary waters.
- Coordination with the YCFCWCD, the City of Woodland, the U.S. Army Corps of Engineers, the Federal Emergency Management Agency, the Department of Water Resources, and local property owners to manage flood events throughout the creek watershed.
- Ongoing implementation of the Cache Creek Improvement Program for erosion control, channel stabilization, and habitat restoration.
- Creation of an ongoing Technical Advisory Committee to review annual monitoring data and provide recommendations and feedback to the County regarding the conditions of the creek.
- Coordination with YCFCWCD to provide a regular source of surface water within the gaining reaches of the creek, when there is sufficient rainfall.
- Acquisition of Irrevocable Offers of Dedication, conservation easements, and fee ownership of attainable properties along the creek in order to carry out priority Creek Improvement Projects.
- Pursuit of partnerships with various private (for-profit and non-profit), local, state, and federal agencies to implement priority Creek Improvement Projects.
- Development of a Recreation Plan to provide a range of public activities and uses along the creek.
- Dependence on voluntary participation by private parties to carry out channel shaping and habitat restoration activities.

2.4 SUMMARY OF REGULATORY/POLICY CONSISTENCY

Section 15125(b) of the CEQA Guidelines requires the EIR to discuss "any inconsistencies between the proposed project and applicable general plans and regional plans." The CCRMP is a complex project, and its emphasis on comprehensive and integrated resource

management will require consideration by the County of several additional actions for its implementation. These actions will provide the County with a regulatory framework for carrying out the various policies described within the CCRMP. Implementation of both the CCRMP and CCIP will require continuing efforts by the County, including monitoring and technical analysis, and coordination with other agencies of jurisdiction. Discussions of the consistency between the CCRMP, CCIP, and the regulations and plans of other agencies having jurisdiction over Cache Creek are provided in Section 4.2, Land Use, and in the Regulatory Setting sections for each of the topic areas in Chapter 4.0 Environmental Analysis.

2.5 SUMMARY OF IMPACTS

This summary provides an overview of the analysis contained in Chapter 4.0, Environmental Analysis. This summary also includes discussions of: a) effects found not to be significant; b) significant and avoidable impacts; c) mitigation measures to avoid or reduce identified significant impacts; d) unavoidable significant impacts; and e) the environmentally superior alternative.

Effects Found Not to Be Significant

Section 15128 of the CEQA Guidelines requires an EIR to contain a statement briefly indicating the reasons that various possible significant effects of a project were determined not to be significant and were therefore not discussed in detail. The following statements, explaining why various effects of the project on population/housing and energy were found not to be significant, meet this requirement:

Population/Housing

No official regional or local population projections would be exceeded as a result of implementing the CCRMP and CCIP. The project would not induce substantial growth in the planning area either directly or indirectly, or extend major infrastructure. No hiring of additional personnel and therefore no increase in housing demand is expected, and no existing housing would be displaced. An additional discussion of these topics can be found in Section 5.2, Growth-Inducing Impacts.

Energy

Implementation of the CCRMP and CCIP would not conflict with any adopted energy conservation plan. The effects of the project on local and regional energy supplies and on requirements for additional capacity would be minimal. Energy resources would not be used in a wasteful, inefficient, or unnecessary manner. Protection of lands containing identified mineral deposits from the encroachment of incompatible land uses would allow aggregate resources to remain available for future use and thereby reduce transportation energy use requirements.

Effects Found to Be Significant and Avoidable

Under CEQA, a significant effect on the environment is defined as a substantial, or potentially substantial, adverse change in any physical conditions within the area affected by the project. This includes, but is not limited to, concerns such as land, air, water, ambient noise, and objects of aesthetic significance.

Implementation of the project would generate environmental impacts in several areas, as described in Chapter 4 and summarized in Table 2-1.

Mitigation Measures to Avoid or Reduce Identified Significant Impacts

This EIR discusses mitigation measures that should be implemented to address impacts from the CCRMP and the CCIP. Generally, program-level mitigation for the CCRMP include modifications to the plan, or the addition or modification of goals, performance standards, or other requirements. Project-level mitigations for the CCIP include specific procedures, standards, and performance criteria. The mitigations presented form the basis of the proposed Mitigation Monitoring Plan discussed in Section 1.4.

Effects Found to Be Significant and Unavoidable

Under CEQA, a significant and unavoidable effect of the project is one that would cause a substantial adverse effect on the environment and for which no mitigation is available or identified to reduce the impact to a less-than-significant level if the project is approved. Implementation of the proposed project would generate the following significant and unavoidable impact: Impact 4.7-3, Cumulative Effects on Attainment of State and Federal Standards. Additional significant and unavoidable impacts would result from implementation of the project alternatives. All impacts are discussed in Chapter 4.0 of this EIR and summarized in Table 2.1.

2.6 SUMMARY OF ALTERNATIVES ANALYSIS

The following alternatives to the project have been evaluated in Chapter 4.0, Environmental Analysis:

Alternative 1a: No Project (Existing Conditions)

Alternative 1b: No Project (Existing Permits and Regulatory Condition)

Alternative 2: No Mining (Alternative Site)

Alternative 3: Channel Bank Widening (Implement Streamway Influence)

Boundary)

A fourth alternative, Deeper In-Channel Mining (Below Theoretical Thalweg), is described in Chapter 3.0 and rejected as infeasible. A comparative analysis of a fifth alternative, advanced by Gus Yates in 1989, is provided in Section 5.5.

2.7 SUMMARY TABLE

Information in the following table (Table 2-1, Summary of Environmental Impacts and Mitigation Measures) has been organized to correspond with environmental issues discussed in Chapter 4.0 and Chapter 5.0. The summary table is arranged in four basic columns:

- identified environmental impacts;
- projected level of significance without mitigation;
- recommended mitigation measures; and
- projected level of significance after implementation of mitigation measures.

A series of measures are noted where more than one mitigation may be required to reduce the impact to a less-than-significant level. See Chapters 4.0 and 5.0 for complete analysis and full text of mitigation measures.

	18 17 20 - <u>1</u> 3 172 1		e 2-1: SUMMARY OF IMPACTS AND MITIGATION MEASURES	18.86% <u> </u>	
Environmental Impact	Level of Significance Before Mitigation		Mitigation Measures	Level of Significar After Mitigation	
	LS	s		LS	su
Land Use and Planning					
Impact 4.2-1: Consistency with Yolo County General Plan	CCRMP and A-3	A-1a, A-1b, and A-2	Mitigation Measure 4.2-1b (A-1a, A-1b, and A-2) In lieu of adopting the CCRMP, the County shall develop an alternate approach for responding to the requirements of General Plan Conservation Policy 35. An alternate approach would be to amend the General Plan to include Conservation Policies, 42, 43, 44, and 45 as discussed in the text.	CCRMP and A-3	A-1a, A-1b, and A-2
Impact 4.2-2: Consistency with the Yolo County Zoning Ordinance and County Code	CCRMP, A-1a, A-1b, A-2, and A-3		Mitigation Measure 4.2-2a (CCRMP, A-3) None required. However, if the SMARA exemption is approved, it is recommended that Section 8-2.2312(a) of the Zoning Ordinance be amended by deleting reference to in-channel surface mining as follows: Applicability for in-channel surface mining. The Special Sand and Gravel Combining Zone (SC) may be combined with the existing zoning of any land, including A-1 and A-P zoned land, located within a channel as defined by Chapter 3 of Title 10 of this Gode: The use of any land within a channel and designated by the Special Sand and Gravel Combining Zone (SC) for mining purposes shall be allowed only pursuant to Chapter 3 of Title 10 of this Gode entitled 'Interim In-Channel Surface Mining Regulations,' or successors thereto.	CCRMP, A-1a, A-1b, A-2, and A-3	
Impact 4.2-3: Consistency with the State Mining and Reclamation Act (SMARA) and the State Mining and Geology Board Reclamation Regulations	A-2 and A-3	CCRMP, A-1a, and A-1b	Mitigation Measure 4.2-3a (OCMP) None required. However, if the CCRMP is found to be subject to SMARA, the County should submit the Plan, including the CCIP, to Division of Mines and Geology for review and approval as the mining and reclamation plan for the study area of the creek. Mitigation Measure 4.2-3b (A-1a, A-1b) The County shall incorporate mineral resource management policies into its General Plan as required by SMARA and submit the policies to Division of Mines and Geology for review and comment prior to adoption.	CCRMP, A-1a, A-1b, A-2, and A-3	
Impact 4.2-4: Compatibility with Existing and Planned Land Uses	CCRMP and A-2	A-1a, A-1b, and A-3	Mitigation Measure 4.2-4b (A-1a, A-1b, A-3) None available.	CCRMP, A-2	A-1a, A-1b, and A-3

	Level of Si		Mitigation Measures	Level of Significan After Mitigation	
Environmental Impact	Before M	S		LS	SU
Impact 4.2-5: Change in Land Use Intensity	CCRMP, A-1a, A-1b, A-2, and A-3		None required.	CCRMP, A-1a, A-1b, A-2, and A-3	
Impact 4.2-6: Land Use Incompatibility Due to Changes in the Creek Boundary	CCRMP, A-1a, A-1b, A-2, and A-3		None required.	CCRMP, A-1a, A-1b, A-2, and A-3	
Impact 4.2-7: Establishment of a Conceptual Planning Framework for the Long-Term Preservation and Development of Open Space and Recreational Opportunities in the Lower Cache Creek Area.	CCRMP, A-1a, A-1b, A-2, and A-3		None required.	CCRMP, A-1a, A-1b, A-2, and A-3	
Geology and Soils					
Impact 4.3-1: Impacts of Sediment Deposition and Removal Potentially Affecting Creek Stability and Causing Lateral Erosion of the Channel Bed or Banks, Resulting in Loss of Agricultural Lands or Other Valuable Improvements, Such as Roads, Bridges, or Other Structures		CCRMP, A-1a, A-1b, A-2 and A-3	Mitigation Measure 4.3-1a (CCRMP) The CCRMP shall be amended to include the following additional or modified actions and performance standards: Action 2.4-2: Limit the amount of aggregate removed from the channel to the average amount of sand and gravel deposited during the previous year (approximately 200,000 tons on average as estimated by the TAC based on channel morphology data), except where bank excavation is necessary to widen the channel as a part of implementing the Test 3 Run Boundary, or where potential erosion and flooding problems exist. The amount and location of in-channel aggregate removal shall be carried out according to the ongoing recommendations of the Technical Studies and the Technical Advisory Committee, with the voluntary cooperation of the landowners involved. Action 2.4-15: Present a request to the State Mining and Geology Board to grant an exemption from the requirements of SMARA for all channel improvement projects approved under the Cache Creek Improvement Program.	CCRMP, A-1a, A-1b, and A-2	A-3
			Action 2.4-16: Draft the County In-channel Ordinance to prohibit commercial mining with the CCRMP planning area and specify that aggregate extraction within the area shall be limited to activities necessary to complete channel improvement projects.		

Environmental Impact		Level of Significance Before Mitigation				gnific tigati
	LS	s		LS		
			Action 6.4-4: Provide a mechanism for the widening and ongoing maintenance of Cache Creek by not including any sand and gravel removed from the channel as a part of an operation's maximum annual production. Draft the County In-channel Ordinance to require that, upon revocation of existing in-channel mining permits, the tonnage of aggregate removed by an aggregate mining operator in completion of approved channel improvement projects is excluded from the operator's permitted maximum annual production. These market incentives would ensure that the necessary work would be accomplished at little cost to the County. while generating royalties for the owner of any property where excavation takes place Action 6.4-5: Develop agreements with the Provide technical support through the TAC to mining operators, property owners, and government agencies involved with Cache Creek to allow for channel maintenance and repair. These agreements would permit to facilitate the removal of channel deposits that affect property and structures, the construction of flood protection and erosion control measures, and the provision of emergency labor, equipment, and materials during and/or after flood events. PS. 2.5-6: Require all channel improvement projects to comply with the requirements of the CCIP and implementing regulations Gounty channel improvement ordinance.			
			Mitigation Measure 4.3-1b (CCRMP)			
			The CCRMP shall be amended to include the CCIP and the following additional or modified Performance Standards:			
			PS. 2.5-7: Require the TAC to annually prepare a list of priority channel improvement projects which will be identified and described in an annual report to the Board of Supervisors. Channel improvements which could improve channel stability at the location of bridges or other structures shall maintain a high priority until implementation. Following review approved by the Board, the TAC shall contact individual landowners to explain recommended channel improvements for their property and describe available resources for design and implementation of the projects.			
			PS. 6.5-9: In-channel haul roads shall be located along the toe of the streambank, in order to provide additional bank stabilization and to minimize disturbance of the low-flow channel. <u>Construction of the haul roads shall not result in excavation of the toe of the streambank.</u> Each operation may have no more than two (2) haul roads that cross the low-flow channel. Haul roads			

Environmental Impact	Level of Significance Before Mitigation		Mitigation Measures	Level of Significa After Mitigation	
	LS	s		LS	su
			PS. 6.5-10: No exeavation shall take place within thirty (30) feet of the top of the channel bank, in order to protect riparian vegetation and to prevent undermining of the bank toe. Approved channel improvement projects requiring excavation of channel banks and removal of riparian vegetation shall revegetate upon completion of excavation activities or shall develop similar habitat at a suitable off-site location. PS. 6.5-6: Final slopes for in-channel excavations shall conform with the channel slope and sinuosity guidelines shown in Figure 12 [of the CCRMP]. Excavations shall be sloped in a downstream direction, toward the low-flow channel. When recommended by the TAC, alternate grading plans may be approved. PS. 6.5-7: In-channel excavations shall generally conform with the cross-section profiles shown in Figures 13 through 17 [of the CCRMP]. When recommended by the TAC, alternate grading plans may be approved. PS. 6.5-12: Where gravel bars are to be excavated, aggregate removal shall be limited to the downstream portion of the deposit and may not exceed seventy-five (75) percent of the length of the bar. Twenty-five (25) percent of the upstream portion of the gravel bar shall be retained, in order to allow for the establishment of riparian vegetation. Complete removal of gravel bars may be recommended by the TAC only if hydraulic conditions related to the bar are recognized to threaten structures and property. PS. 6.5-14: Proposed off-channel excavations located within the streamway influence boundary shall be set back a minimum of seven-hundred (700) feet from the existing channel bank, unless an engineering analysis demonstrates that a smaller distance will not adversely affect channel stability within the reach. If the proposed engineering measures are demonstrated to be feasible, then the minimum setback distance shall be no less than two-hundred (200) feet.		

Environmental Impact	Level of Significance Before Mitigation		Mitigation Measures	Level of Significand After Mitigation	
	LS	s		LS	su
			Approval of any off-channel mining project located within 700 feet of the existing channel bank shall be contingent upon an enforceable agreement which requires the project operator to participate in the completion of channel improvement projects. The agreement shall also require that the operator provide a bond or other financial instrument for maintenance during the mining and reclamation period of any bank stabilization features approved for the mining project. The agreement shall also require that a deed restriction be placed on the underlying property which requires maintenance of the streambank protection by future owners of the property. Maintenance of the bank stabilization on features following completion of reclamation shall be the responsibility of the property owner. PS. 4.5-23: The TAC shall evaluate the vegetative cover within the CCRMP on an annual basis. At a minimum of once every five years, the existing hydraulic model of the Cache Creek channel shall be updated based on current conditions, including estimates of channel roughness. If sensitivity analysis indicates that the existing vegetation is contributing to adverse channel roughness, the TAC shall recommend removal of vegetation within selected areas of the channel. Mitigation Measure 4.3-1c (A-1a, A-1b, A-2) All development projects, including in-channel mining operations, which result in modification of the 100-year flood hazard zones along Cache Creek shall be required to submit applications for Floodplain Development Permits. The applications shall be reviewed by the Yolo County Community Development Agency and the Department of Public Works. Applications for projects that are determined to present conditions, which could cause or contribute to channel instability, shall not be approved. Mitigation Measure 4.3-1d (A-3)		
mpact 4.3-2: Modifications of the Channel During Improvement Projects Could Potentially Result in Unstable Conditions Upstream or Downstream of the Projects	A-3	CCRMP, A-1a, A-1b, and A-2	Mitigation Measure 4.3-2a (CCRMP) The CCRMP shall be modified to include the following performance standard: PS. 2.5-8: The review by the TAC of all Floodplain Development Permit applications for Cache Creek channel improvement projects within the CCRMP area shall include an evaluation of potential upstream and downstream effects of the proposed channel modifications. The TAC shall evaluate data on hydraulic conditions presented in the permit application. The TAC shall also examine aerial photographs and perform a reconnaissance investigation of the site and surrounding areas to identify potential upstream and downstream effects.	CCRMP, A-1a, A-1b, A-2, and A-3	

Environmental Impact	Level of Significance Before Mitigation		Mitigation Measures	Level of Significand After Mitigation	
Zivii oliii oliizi iliipaot	LS	s	- mitigation measures	LS	su
			Mitigation Measure 4.3-2b (A-1a, A-1b, A-2) The Yolo County Community Development Agency shall require analysis of potential changes in hydraulic conditions within 1,000 feet upstream and downstream of the proposed project boundaries for all Floodplain Development Permits along Cache Creek. The analysis shall be performed by a qualified licensed engineer and shall include evaluation of the 2-year, 50-year, and 100-year flood stage and average flow velocities before and after implementation of the proposed project using HEC-2, or equivalent model. The hydraulic analysis shall be reviewed by the Department of Public Works prior to issuance of a permit.		
Impact 4.3-3: Channel Instability Within the CCRMP Planning Area Could Be Affected by Significant Changes in Upstream or Downstream Portions of the Watershed	CCRMP and A-3	A-1a, A-1b, and A-2	Mitigation Measure 4.3-3b (A-1a, A-1b, A-2) The Yolo County Community Development Agency, in conjunction with the Yolo County Public Works Department, shall evaluate potential impacts of proposed projects within the Cache Creek watershed on hydraulic conditions of the Cache Creek channel within the CCRMP planning area to ensure that adverse hydraulic conditions do not develop and appropriate restoration projects are implemented.	CCRMP, A-1a, A-1b, A-2, and A-3	
Hydrology and Water Quality					
Impact 4.4-1: Potential Impacts Associated with Flooding Outside the Planning Area	A-1a and A-1b	CCRMP, A-2, and A-3	Mitigation Measure 4.4-1a (CCRMP) Action 2.3-10 of the CCRMP shall be modified: Action 2.3-10: The County shall manage collection of Moniter and collect the information necessary to make informed decisions about the management of Cache Creek, including: regular water and sediment discharge data at Capay and Yolo gauge sites, water and sediment discharge data at other sites during high flow events, and topographic data showing the erosion, aggradation, and the alignment of the low-flow channel within the creek. This data should be maintained in the County Geographic Information System, so that staff and the Technical Advisory Committee can coordinate this information with the results of other monitoring programs to develop a comprehensive and integrated approach to resource management. Monitoring may, at the discretion of the County, be conducted by either consultants or trained volunteers, including landowners, public interest groups, the aggregate industry, and students, as a part of future public education programs associated with Cache Creek. However, the County shall maintain responsibility for collection of high quality data.	CCRMP, A-1a, A-1b, and A-3	A-2

Environmental Impact	Level of Significance Before Mitigation Mitigation Measures LS S	Mitigation Measures		Level of Significance After Mitigation	
		LS	su		
		The following performance standard shall be added to the CCRMP:			
		Existing flooding problems near Woodland shall not be exacerbated by activities conducted under the CCRMP or CCIP.			
		PS. 2.5-5: The Technical Advisory Committee shall review topographic data and such other information as is appropriate, to determine the amount and location of aggregate to be removed from the channel. Aggregate removal from the channel shall only be recommended in order to provide flood control, protect existing structures, minimize bank erosion, or implement the Test 3 Run Boundary. Except for bank excavation to widen the channel, annual aggregate removal shall not exceed the amount of sand and gravel deposited the previous year, as determined by aerial photography analysis.			
		Recommendations shall take into consideration the desires of the property owner where excavation is to take place, as well as the concerns of property owners in the immediate vicinity.			
		The provisions of the draft Cache Creek Improvements Program shall be implemented by the County Resource Management Coordinator, with the assistance of the Technical Advisory Committee, for review and approval of the County Board of Supervisors. The CCIP shall contain provisions to ensure that 100-year flood protection is maintained within the planning area and the existing flooding problems downstream are not exacerbated by channel reshaping. This shall be accomplished by annual monitoring of channel geomorphology, distribution and density of plant material within the channel, and modeling to forecast changes in base flood elevations. When modeling indicates that the channel is approaching loss of 100-year conveyance capacity (or has already lost this capacity) the TAC should prescribe action to reestablish 100-year capacity with adequate tolerances.			
		The County shall review and monitor removal of aggregate and/or plant material, as prescribed by the TAC. The County, at its discretion, may enlist the aid of gravel mining operators, other private property owners, or conduct the maintenance activities using County resources.			
		Figure 2 of the CCRMP shall be modified as shown on Figure 4.4-7 to more accurately identify areas of potential flood hazard.			

Environmental Impact	Level of Signific Before Mitigat		Mitigation Measures	Level of Significa After Mitigation	
	LS	S		LS	s
			Action 2.4-6 shall be modified as follows:		
			Action 2.4-6: Work with other agencies having jurisdiction over Cache Creek including, but not limited to, the Yolo County Flood Control and Water Conservation District, the U.S. Army Corps of Engineers, the State Reclamation Board, <u>State Department of Water Resources</u> , and the Federal Emergency Management Agency in developing a coordinated solution for managing flood events throughout the watershed of Cache Creek.		
			As a part of this effort, the County should coordinate with the U.S. Army Corps to make appropriate sedimentation and channel stability assessments in conjunction with the development of flood control alternatives near the downstream end of the study area. This would ensure that both agencies are using the same sets of assumptions when making recommendations about the management of Cache Creek.		
			The County Resource Management Coordinator shall maintain contact with the specified agencies. Interagency contact shall be initiated at least annually. The Resource Management Coordinator shall encourage coordination between the County and other agencies.		
			Action 3.4-2 shall be modified as follows:		
			Action 3.4-2: <u>The County Resource Management Coordinator</u> , and other appropriate County staff, shall negotiate cooperative agreements with the Yolo County Flood Control and Water Conservation District, U.S. Army Corps of Engineers, <u>Regional Water Quality Control Board</u> , Yolo County Resource Conservation District, and U.S. Bureau of Land Management, among others, to extend the provisions of the CCRMP outside of the plan area and incorporate the requirements of other agencies of jurisdiction into the County's planning efforts. <u>Interagency contact shall be initiated at least twice per year</u> .		
			Mitigation Measure 4.4-1c (A-2, A-3)		
			Elimination of mining and in-channel maintenance will result in loss of 100-year protection. This is a significant and unavoidable impact for Alternative 2. Alternative 3 requires acquisition of floodplain easements for levee overtopping.		

Environmental Impact	Level of Significance Before Mitigation		Mitigation Measures	Level of Sign After Mitig	
	LS	s	- minigation incasures	LS	su
Impact 4.4-2: Potential Impacts Associated with Inconsistencies Between the FEMA Designated 100- Year Flood Zone and More Recent Hydraulic Analyses	A-1a and A-1b	CCRMP, A-2, and A-3	Mitigation Measure 4.4-2a (CCRMP, A-3) Action 2.4-7 shall be revised as follows: Action 2.4-7: Manage activities and development within the floodplain to avoid hazards and adverse impacts on surrounding properties. This shall be accomplished through enforcement of the County Flood Ordinance and ensuring that new development complies with the requirements of the State Reclamation Board. The County Floodplain Administrator shall file for a Letter of Map Revision with FEMA to update the FIRMs affected by channel reshaping within the planning area every ten years, or as needed. Mitigation Measure 4.4-2c (A-2) The County Floodplain Administrator shall file for a Letter of Map Revision with FEMA, to update the FIRMs affected by channel aggradation within the planning area every ten years, or as needed.		
Impact 4.4-3: Potential Impacts to Water Quality		CCRMP, A-1a, A-1b, A-2, and A-3	Mitigation Measure 4.4-3a (CCRMP, A-3) Action 3.4-1 shall be modified as follows: Action 3.4-1: Discourage activities that impact the surface water quality of Cache Creek. Although surface mining operations are regulated, other land uses along the creek are not. The County shall work with the U.S. Natural Resource Conservation Service and the Yolo County Resource Conservation District to promote alternative soil and water management practices that improve local water resources. The County Resource Management Coordinator shall initiate contact with resource conservation agencies at least annually twice each year. Pesticides and herbicides shall be used within the channel boundary planning area only under the direction of a certified pesticide/herbicide applicator. These chemicals shall not be applied prior to forecasted rainfall. Action 3.4-3 shall be modified as follows: Action 3.4-3: Provide for an annual testing or more frequent (if necessary) of the surface water quality at various sites along of Cache Creek at Capay and Yolo. The sample collection and testing should be conducted in the fall or early winter so that the "first flush" of runoff is evaluated for water quality. The County should, when appropriate, enlist the assistance of other government agencies in carrying out the measurements, to reduce costs and provide accurate information.	CCRMP, A-1a, A-1b, A-2, and A-3	

Environmental Impact	Level of Significance Before Mitigation		Mitigation Measures	Level of Significanc After Mitigation	
	LS	s		LS	SU
			Testing should include, but not be limited to, such components as pH, TDS, temperature, turbidity, total and fecal coliform, mercury, total petroleum hydrocarbons, dissolved oxygen, nitrogen, phosphorus, herbicides and insecticides pesticides (EPA Methods 8140 and 8150), suspended and floating matter, odor, and color. This information would impreve assist in habitat restoration efforts and allow the County to monitor petential water quality trends within the planning area. The County Resource Management Coordinator should be responsible for collection, management, and distribution of all water quality data. Mitigation Measure 4.4-3b (A-1a, A-1b, A-2) The County shall work with the U.S. Natural Resource Conservation Service and the Yolo County Resource Conservation District to promote alternative soil and water management practices that improve local water resources. The County Resource Management Coordinator shall initiate contact with resource conservation agencies at least twice each year.		
Impact 4.4-4: Potential Impacts Associated with Water Supply for Biotic Restoration	A-1a, A-1b, A-2, and A-3	CCRMP	Mitigation Measure 4.4-4a (CCRMP) The following modifications shall be made to Performance Standard 4.5-11: PS. 4.5-11: Existing hydrologic conditions (as described in Figure 4.4-1, the technical studies, and Jones and Stokes (1995)) shall be assumed for all proposed biotic reclamation activities. If an agreement were reached between the County and the YCFCWCD regarding maintenance of year-round flow in the creek, additional water would be available for restoration activities. The TAC would be responsible for identifying and implementing new restoration opportunities resulting from the increased water availability. All plantings should be carefully selected based on the existing hydrology and water availability of the reclamation area. Irrigation may be necessary for the first one or two summers in drier sites to allow the roots to develop sufficiently to tap into the summer groundwater level. A drip irrigation system may be necessary at least twice per month during dry periods for the first two years. The party undertaking restoration shall be responsible for acquisition of water supply, design, construction, and operation of the irrigation systems.	CCRMP, A-1a, A-1b, A-2, and A-3	

Environmental Impact	Level of Significance Before Mitigation		Mitigation Measures	Level of Significan After Mitigation	
Environmental impact	LS	s	miligation measures	LS	su
Impact 4.4-5: Potential Impacts Associated with Groundwater Recharge and Surface Water Supplies.	A-1a, A-1b, an d A-2	CCRMP and A-3	Mitigation Measure 4.4-5a (CCRMP, A-3) Action 3.4-5 shall be eliminated from the CCRMP. Objective 3.3-1 of the CCRMP shall be revised as follows: The County shall encourage the development of a groundwater recharge program, where appropriate, within the Cache Creek basin. The program may specify use of reclaimed mining pits and open lakes to the greatest extent feasible, while maintaining consistency with the other goals, objectives, actions, and performance standards of the OCMP and CCRMP.	CCRMP, A-1a, A-1b, A-2, and A-3	
Agriculture					
Impact 4.5-1: Potential Permanent Loss of Agricultural Land	CCRMP	A-1a, A-1b, A-2, and A-3	Mitigation Measure 4.5-1a (CCRMP) None required. Mitigation Measure 4.5-1b (CCRMP, A-1a, A-1b, A-2) Any mining occurring off-channel shall be required to comply with OCMP policies. Mitigation Measure 4.5-1c (A-3) None available.	CCRMP, A-1a, A-1b, and A-2	A-3
mpact 4.5-2: Potential Impacts of Habitat Restoration on Agricultural Productivity	A-1a, A-1b, and A-2	CCRMP and A-3	Mitigation Measure 4.5-2a (CCRMP, A-3) The CCRMP shall be amended to include the following performance standard: PS. 7.5-4: The Yolo County Community Development Agency, in consultation with the Yolo County Resource Conservation District Board, and with approval by the Board of Supervisors, shall present a request to the California Department of Fish and Game to initiate a "Safe Harbor" program for the CCRMP/OCMP planning area, or develop a functionally equivalent program. Mitigation Measure 4.5-2b (CCRMP, A-3) The following performance standard shall be included in the CCRMP:	CCRMP, A-1a, A-1b, A-2, and A-3	

Environmental Impact	Level of Significance Before Mitigation		Mitigation Measures	Level of Significa After Mitigation	
·	LS	s	•	LS	su
			PS. 7.5-6: All habitat restoration, creation, or enhancement plans proposed within the CCRMP channel boundary shall be reviewed by the County Agricultural Commissioner, if requested by proponents of channel modification projects. The Agricultural Commissioner shall to identify and recommend appropriate vegetative buffers between habitat areas and agricultural fields and effective management of site water resources (including appropriate integration of agricultural drainage features into habitat planning). Buffers that would result in partial or secondary loss of agricultural land shall not be recommended by the Agricultural Commissioner.		
Impact 4.5-3: Potential Impacts of Agricultural Activities on the Success of Habitat Restoration	A-1a, A-1b, and A-2	CCRMP and A-3	Mitigation Measure 4.5-3a (CCRMP, A-3) Implementation of policies contained in the CCRMP and Mitigation Measures 4.5-2a and 4.5-2b would mitigate potential impacts of agriculture on habitat.	CCRMP, A-1a, A-1b, A-2, and A-3	
Impact 4.5-4: Incremental Increases to Cumulative Losses of Agricultural Land and Productivity over Time	A-1a, A-1b, and A-2	CCRMP and A-3	Mitigation Measure 4.5-4a (CCRMP) Implementation of Mitigation Measures 4.5-1a and 4.5-1b would reduce the impact of cumulative loss of agricultural land. Mitigation Measure 4.5-4c (A-3) None possible. The mitigation would preclude any erosion management or agricultural reclamation of lands lost to erosion.	CCRMP, A-1a, A-1b, and A-2	A-3
Biological Resources					
Impact 4.6-1: Impact on Existing Vegetative Cover	A-1a, A-1b, and A-2	CCRMP and A-3	Mitigation Measure 4.6-1a (CCRMP, A-3) The following revisions shall be made to Performance Standard 4.5-11. 4.5-11 Irrigation of tree and shrub plantings may be necessary for the first ene er two or three summers in drier sites to allow the roots to develop sufficiently to tap into the summer ground water level. A drip Irrigation system may be necessary at least twice per month during dry periods for the first twe three years of establishment, preferably using a drip system. Water requirements of young plantings should be evaluated as part of routine monitoring, with adjustments to the frequency and duration of irrigation made in response to indications of stress. Mitigation Measure 4.6-1b (A-1a, A-1b, A-2) None required.	CCRMP, A-1a, A-1b, A-2, and A-3	

Environmental Impact	Level of Si Before N		Mitigation Measures	Level of Significand After Mitigation	
	LS	s	9	LS	SU
Impact 4.6-2: Impact on Sensitive Natural Community Types		CCRMP, A-1a, A-1b, A-2, and A-3	Mitigation Measure 4.6-2a (CCRMP, A-3) The following shall be included as an additional action in Chapter 4 of the CCRMP: 4.4-12 Performance standards identifying appropriate species and planting densities for marshland, oak woodland, and riparian woodland restoration efforts should be considered guidelines. Variations from these guidelines shall be acceptable if alternative restoration plans have been prepared by a qualified biologist, consistent with the policies of the CCRMP, and approved by the Resource Management Coordinator or Planning Commission, depending on the magnitude of the proposed modification. Performance Standard 4.5-13(g) shall be revised to eliminate creeping wild rye, slender wheatgrass, reed canary grass, and yerba mansa from the planting list for marsh restoration plans. Mitigation Measure 4.6-2b (A-1a, A-1b, A-2) None available.	CCRMP and A-3	A-1a, A-1b, A-2
Impact 4.6-3: Disturbance to Wildlife Habitat and Wildlife Movement Corridors	A-2	CCRMP, A-1a, A-1b, and A-3	Mitigation Measure 4.6-3a (CCRMP, A-3) The following shall be incorporated as additional action in Chapters 4 and 5 of the CCRMP: 4.4-13 and 5.4-8. Avoid disturbance to important wildlife habitat features such as nest trees, colonial breeding locations, elderberry host plants for VELB, and essential cover associated with riparian forest and oak woodland habitat. This should include sensitive siting of haul-roads, maintenance access, trails, and recreational facilities away from these features. Goal 5.2-3 of the CCRMP shall be revised as follows: 5.2-3 Ensure the compatibility of recreational facilities with surrounding land uses and sensitive wildlife habitat, in order to minimize adverse impacts. Mitigation Measure 4.6-3c (A-1a, A-1b) None available. Mitigation Measure 4.6-3a (A-2) None required.	CCRMP, A-2, and A-3	A-1a and A-1b

Environmental Impact	Level of Significance Before Mitigation		Mitigation Measures	Level of Significant After Mitigation	
•	LS	s		LS	SU
Impact 4.6-4: Impact on Special-Status Species		CCRMP, A-1a, A-1b, A-2, and A-3	Mitigation Measure 4.6-4a (CCRMP, A-3) The new Action (4.4-13) required in Mitigation Measure 4.6-3a would provide protection of essential habitat features for special-status species. The following shall be included as an additional action in Chapter 4 of the CCRMP: 4.4-14. A biological data base search shall be completed prior to implementation of priority project. The data base shall compile existing information on occurrences of special-status species and areas supporting sensitive natural communities which should be considered for preservation. Where detailed information is not available, the data base shall be supplemented by reconnaissance-level field surveys to confirm the presence or absence of populations of special-status species, location of elderberry shrubs, and extent of sensitive natural communities along the previously unsurveyed creek segment. Essential habitat for special-status species shall be protected and enhanced as part of restoration efforts, or replaced as part of mitigation plans prepared by a qualified biologist. The following revisions shall be made to Performance Standard 4.4-4 of the CCRMP: 4.4-4 Coordinate with the Cache Creek Conservancy, the H.A.W.K program, the Yolo County Flood Control and Water Conservation District, the California Department of Fish and Game, the U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service, and the U.S. Army Corps of Engineers to ensure that habitat restoration projects proposed by these and other entities are consistent with the Cache Creek Resources Management Plan. Ensure that revegetation Restoration plans shall compliment be are eensistent with the preservation and enhancement measures in efforts of the Yolo County Habitat Management Program Conservation Plan. Mitigation Measure 4.6-4b (A-1a, A-1b, A-2)	CCRMP and A-3	A-1a, A-1b, and A-2
Impact 4.6-5: Modifications to Jurisdictional Wetlands or Other Waters A-1a, A-1b, and A-2	, ,	CCRMP and A-3	Mitigation Measure 4.6-5a (CCRMP, A-3) The following shall be included as an additional action in Chapter 4 of the CCRMP: 4.4-15. Coordinate with jurisdictional agencies to establish "blanket" permits and agreements to ensure a consistent multi-agency approach to managing the creek. Mitigation Measure 4.6-5 (A-1a, A-1b, A-2) None required (beyond existing regulatory requirements)	CCRMP, A-1a, A-1b, A-2, and A-3	

Environmental Impact	Level of Si Before M		Mitigation Measures	Level of Signific After Mitigati	
•	LS	s		LS	SU
Impact 4.6-6: Compatibility and Consistency of Restoration Provisions	A-1a, A-1b, A-2	CCRMP and A-3	Mitigation Measure 4.6-6a (CCRMP, A-3) The following shall be included as an additional action in Chapter 4 of the CCRMP: 4.4-16 Modifications to the in-channel areas shall be reviewed and approved by the Technical Advisory Committee to ensure that sensitive biological resources are protected and enhanced, that restoration plans are consistent with the policies of the CCRMP, and that the various habitat restoration projects are compatible. Action 4.4-4 shall be revised as recommended in Mitigation Measure 4.4-6a. Mitigation Measure 4.6-5b (A-1a, A-1b, A-2) None required.	CCRMP, A-1a, A-1b, A-2, and A-3	
Air Quality		<u> </u>			
Impact 4.7-1: Potential Emissions of PM-10	CCRMP, A-1a, A-2, and A-3	A-1b	Mitigation Measure 4.7-1b (A-1b) Wherever practical and economically feasible, portable or movable conveyor systems shall be used to transport raw materials and overburden instead of diesel-powered equipment.	CCRMP, A-1a, A-2, and A-3	A-1b
Impact 4.7-2: Potential Emissions of Ozone Precursors (ROG and Nox)	CCRMP, A-1a, A-2, and A-3	A-1b	Mitigation Measure 4.7-2a (CCRMP) None required, however, the following is recommended. The following new performance standard should be included in the CCRMP: All internal combustion engine driven equipment and vehicles shall be kept tuned according to the manufacturers specifications and properly maintained to minimize the leakage of oils and fuels. No vehicles or equipment shall be left idling for a period of longer than 5 minutes. Mitigation Measure 4.7-2b (A-1a, A-2, A-3) None required. Mitigation Measure 4.7-2c (A-1b) Implement Mitigation Measure 4.7-1b	CCRMP, A-1a, A-2, and A-3	A-1b

Environmental Impact		ignificance litigation	Mitigation Measures	Level of Significar After Mitigation	
Environmental impact	LS	s	miugation measures	LS	su
Impact 4.7-3: Cumulative Effects on Attainment of State and Federal Standards		CCRMP, A-1a, A-1b, A-2, and A-3	Mitigation Measure 4.7-3a (CCRMP, A-1a, A-1b, A-2, A-3) Implement Mitigation Measures for Impacts 4.7-1a and 4.7-2b.		CCRMP, A-1a, A-1b, A-2, and A-3
Traffic and Circulation					
Impact 4.8-1: Potential Increase in Vehicle Trips	CCRMP, A-1a, A-1b, A-2, and A-3		None required.	CCRMP, A-1a, A-1b, A-2, and A-3	
Impact 4.8-2: Potential for Traffic Impacts During Bridge Reconstruction	CCRMP, A-1a, A-1b, and A-2	A-3	Mitigation Measure 4.8-2a (A-3) The following performance standard shall be added to the CCRMP: The County shall develop a detailed traffic management plan to identify the routing of traffic during construction of each bridge structure. The plan shall be designed to ensure adverse traffic impacts are minimized, specifically addressing the routing of auto and truck travel, as well as transit, school bus operations and emergency vehicle access. For the Interstate 505 bridge, the County shall coordinate closely with Caltrans and obtain their approval for the construction and traffic management plan in conjunction with the encroachment permit process.	CCRMP, A-1a, A-1b, A-2, and A-3	
Impact 4.8-3: Potential Change in LOS at the State Route 16/Road 98/Main Street Intersection	CCRMP, A-1a, A-1b, A-2, and A-3		None required.	CCRMP, A-1a, A-1b, A-2, and A-3	
Impact 4.8-4: Potential change in LOS at the State Route 16/Road 89 Intersection	CCRMP, A-1a, A-1b, A-2, and A-3		None required.	CCRMP, A-1a, A-1b, A-2, and A-3	
Impact 4.8-5: Potential Impacts to the Non-Standard Segment of Road 19, West of Interstate 505	CCRMP, A-1a, A-1b, A-2, and A-3		None required.	CCRMP, A-1a, A-1b, A-2, and A-3	
Impact 4.8-6: Potential Impacts to the Non-Standard Segment of State Route 16 Between I-505 and the Entrance to the Solano Concrete Plant	CCRMP, A-1a, A-1b, A-2, and A-3			CCRMP, A-1a, A-1b, A-2, and A-3	

LS = less than significant S = significant SU = significant and unavoidable CCRMP = Cache Creek Resources Management Plan (and CCIP)

		Table	e 2-1: SUMMARY OF IMPACTS AND MITIGATION MEASURES		
Environmental Impact	Level of Significance Before Mitigation		Mitigation Measures	Level of Sign After Mitig	
	LS	s		LS	SU
Impact 4.8-7: Potential Impacts to the Non-Standard Segment of Road 14, West of Interstate 505	CCRMP, A-1a, A-1b, A-2, and A-3		None required.	CCRMP, A-1a, A-1b, A-2, and A-3	
Impact 4.8-8: Potential Impacts to the Non-Standard Pavement Segment of Road 14, West of Interstate 505	CCRMP, A-1a, A-1b, A-2, and A-3		None required.	CCRMP, A-1a, A-1b, A-2, and A-3	
Impact 4.8-9: Potential Impacts to Two Non-Standard Bridges on Road 89, North of State Route 16	CCRMP, A-1a, A-1b, A-2, and A-3		None required.	CCRMP, A-1a, A-1b, A-2, and A-3	
Impact 4.8-10: Potential Impacts to a Non-Standard Bridge on Road 19, West of Interstate 505	CCRMP, A-1a, A-1b, A-2, and A-3		None required.	CCRMP, A-1a, A-1b, A-2, and A-3	
Impact 4.8-11: Potential Impacts to a Non-Standard Bridge on Road 85, North of Road 16A	CCRMP, A-1a, A-1b, A-2, and A-3		None required.	CCRMP, A-1a, A-1b, A-2, and A-3	V
Impact 4.8-12: Potential Impacts to a Non-Standard Bridge on Road 14, West of Interstate 505	CCRMP, A-1a, A-1b, A-2, and A-3		None required.	CCRMP, A-1a, A-1b, A-2, and A-3	
Impact 4.8-13: Potential Impacts to the Non-Standard Curve Radii at the Road 85 / Road 14 Intersection	CCRMP, A-1a, A-1b, A-2, and A-3		None required.	CCRMP, A-1a, A-1b, A-2, and A-3	
Impact 4.8-14: Potential Impacts to the Non-Standard Curve Radii at the State Route 16 / Road 89 Intersection	CCRMP, A-1a, A-1b, A-2, and A-3		None required.	CCRMP, A-1a, A-1b, A-2, and A-3	
Impact 4.8-15: Potential Impacts to the Non-Standard Curve Radii at the Road 20 / Road 96 Intersection	CCRMP, A-1a, A-1b, A-2, and A-3		None required.	CCRMP, A-1a, A-1b, A-2, and A-3	
Impact 4.8-16: Potential for Accelerated Pavement Deterioration	CCRMP, A-1a, A-1b, A-2, and A-3		None required.	CCRMP, A-1a, A-1b, A-2, and A-3	vini.

LS = less than significant S = significant SU = significant and unavoidable CCRMP = Cache Creek Resources Management Plan (and CCIP)

	Level of Significance			Level of Sig	nificance
Environmental Impact	Before N	Mitigation	Mitigation Measures	After Mitigation	
	LS	s		LS	su
Noise					
Impact 4.9-1: Exposure to Unacceptable Noise Levels from Channel Stabilization and Erosion Control	CCRMP, A-1a, A-1b, A-2, and A-3		None required.	CCRMP, A-1a, A-1b, A-2, and A-3	
Impact 4.9-2: Exposure to Unacceptable Increases in Traffic Noise	CCRMP, A-1a, A-1b, A-2, and A-3		None required.	CCRMP, A-1a, A-1b, A-2, and A-3	
Impact 4.9-3: Exposure to Noise from Future Passive Use of Open Space Areas along the Creek	A-1a, A-1b, A-2, and A-3	CCRMP	Mitigation Measure 4.9-3a (CCRMP) The following shall be added to the CCRMP as a new performance standard: 5.5-9: Noise analyses shall be conducted for proposed recreational uses where medium to large groups would congregate in common use areas. The study shall identify likely sources of noise and ways to reduce levels to minimize annoyance at adjacent properties.	CCRMP, A-1a, A-1b, A-2, and A-3	
Impact 4.9-4: Exposure to Cumulative Noise Impacts	CCRMP, A-1a, A-1b, A-2 and A-3		None required.	CCRMP, A-1a, A-1b, A-2, and A-3	
Aesthetics					
Impact 4.10-1: Effects on the Visual Character and Quality of Cache Creek.	CCRMP	A-1a, A-1b, A-2, and A-3	Mitigation Measure 4.10-1b (A-1a, A-1b, A-2, A-3) None available.	CCRMP	A-1a, A-1b, A-2, and A-3
Impact 4.10-2: Introduction of New Sources of Light and Glare	CCRMP, A-1a, A-1b, A-2, and A-3		None required.	CCRMP, A-1a, A-1b, A-2, and A-3	
Impact 4.10-3: Consistency with Yolo County General Plan Policies	CCRMP, A-1a, A-1b, A-2, and A-3		None required.	CCRMP, A-1a, A-1b, A-2, and A-3	

Environmental Impact Impact 4.10-4: Contribution to Cumulative Changes in Regional Visual Quality	Level of Significance Before Mitigation		Mitigation Measures	Level of Significance After Mitigation	
	LS	s	9	LS	su
	CCRMP	A-1a, A-1b, A-2, and A-3	Mitigation Measure 4.10-4a (A-1a, A-1b, A-2, A-3) None available.	CCRMP	A-1a, A-1b, A-2, and A-3
Cultural Resources					
Impact 4.11-1: Potential Impacts to Cultural Resources	A-2	CCRMP, A-1a, A-1b, and A-3	Mitigation Measure 4.11-1a (CCRMP, A-3) Performance Standard 6.5-2 of the CCRMP shall be modified as follows: If human skeletal remains are encountered during excavation, all work within seventy-five (75) feet shall immediately stop, and the County Coroner shall be notified within twenty-four (24) hours. If remains are of Native American origin, the appropriate Native American community identified by the Native American Heritage Commission shall be contacted, and an agreement for treating or disposing, with appropriate dignity, of the remains and associated grave goods shall be developed. If any cultural resources such as chipped or ground stone, historical debris, building foundations, or paleontological materials are encountered during excavation, then all work within seventy-five (75) feet shall immediately stop and the Director shall be notified at once. Any cultural resources found on the site shall be recorded by a qualified archaeologist and the information shall be submitted to the County. An additional performance standard shall be added to the CCRMP as follows: Damaging effects on cultural resources shall be avoided whenever possible. If avoidance is not feasible, the importance of the site shall be evaluated by a qualified professional prior to commencement of excavation operations. If a cultural resource is determined not to be important, both the resource and the effect on it shall be reported to the County, and the resource need not be considered further. If avoidance of an important cultural resource is not feasible, a mitigation plan shall be prepared and implemented. The mitigation plan shall explain the importance of the resource, describe the proposed approach to mitigate destruction or damage to the site, and demonstrate how the proposed mitigation would serve the public interest. Mitigation Measure 4.11-1b (A-1a, A-1b) Impacts to cultural resources within areas where mining currently is permitted shall be mitigated as recommended in the environmental studies completed for permit appro	CCRMP, A-1a, A-1b, A-2, and A-3	

Environmental Impact	Level of Significance Before Mitigation		e Mitigation Measures	Level of Significance After Mitigation	
	LS	s		LS	SU
Hazards					
Impact 4.12-1: Potential Human Health and/or Environmental Impacts from the Accidental Release of Petroleum Products and Other Chemicals Used during Channel Stabilization, Erosion Control, Weed Eradication, and Habitat Restoration.	A-1a, A-1b, A-2, and A-3	CCRMP	Mitigation Measure 4.12-1a (CCRMP) An objective shall be added to Chapter 3 of the CCRMP to support Goal 3.2-4, as follows: Obj. 3.3-5: Promote safe hazardous materials use and handling procedures during creek management activities. Mitigation Measure 4.12-1b (CCRMP) An action shall be added to Chapter 3 of the CCRMP as follows: Action 3.4-6: Establish operating standards for the use and handling of hazardous materials in and near the Cache Creek channel. Mitigation Measure 4.12-1c (CCRMP) Performance Standard 3.5-1 shall be revised as follows: PS 3.5-1: All heavy equipment used for the channel improvement projects shall be kept in good working order to reduce emissions and preclude the leakage of oils and fuels. Fueling and maintenance activities shall not occur within 100 feet of the active channel. All procedures for handling, storage, and disposal of hazardous materials shall be described in a Storm Water Pollution Prevention Plan if required for the projects.	CCRMP, A-1a, A-1b, A-2, and A-3	
Impact 4.12-2: Historic and Future Pesticide Use May Affect the Environment and the Health and Safety of Workers Engaged in Creek Management Activities	A-1a, A-1b, A-2, and A-3	CCRMP	Mitigation 4.12-2a (CCRMP) The following objective and performance standard shall be added to the CCRMP. In addition to these additions, Action 3.4-3 has been revised in Section 4.4, Hydrology to include the analysis of pesticides for annual water monitoring activities. Objective 3.3-5: Eliminate water quality impacts from the use of pesticides, fertilizers, and other soil amendments in the channel. Performance Standard 3.5-5: Water quality data collected from Cache Creek shall be regularly evaluated annually by a trained professional to determine whether the use of chemicals in the habitat restoration areas is affecting water quality. If chemicals are used and a correlation between use and degradation of water quality is established, use of chemicals in the habitat restoration areas shall be reevaluated.	CCRMP, A-1a, A-1b, A-2, and A-3	

Environmental Impact	Level of Significance		2-1: SUMMARY OF IMPACTS AND MITIGATION MEASURES	Level of Significance	
		litigation	Mitigation Measures	After Mitigation	
	LS	s		LS	SU
Impact 4.12-3: Open Bodies of Water May Become Breeding Areas for Mosquitoes. An Increase in the Mosquito Population Could Adversely Affect the Public Health		CCRMP, A-1a, A-1b, A-2, and A-3	Mitigation Measure 4.12-3a (CCRMP) None required. While the impacts associated with this alternative would be less than significant, it is recommended that the CCRMP be amended to include the following policies in Chapter 3 as follows: Goal 3.2-5: Provide habitat restoration without increasing generation of mosquitoes. Objective 3.3-6: Minimize mosquito generating potential in habitat restoration areas. Action 3.4-6: Coordinate all habitat restoration efforts with the Sacramento-Yolo Mosquito and Vector Control District.	CCRMP, A-1a, A-1b, A-2, and A-3	
Public Services and Utilities					
Impact 4.13-1: Potential Increase in Demand for Public Services	CCRMP, A-1a, A-1b, A-2, and A-3		Mitigation Measure 4.13-1a (CCRMP) None required, however, the following is recommended: The County shall identify the costs of implementing the policies contained in the CCRMP, and determine a fair-share cost program for reimbursement by gravel operators and any other affected parties.	CCRMP, A-1a, A-1b, A-2, and A-3	