EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

Purpose

This Draft Environmental Impact Report (Draft EIR) is prepared in accordance with the California Environmental Quality Act (CEQA) to evaluate the potential environmental impacts associated with the implementation of Environmental Education and Sustainability Park Project (State Clearinghouse No. 2012072038). This document is prepared in conformance with CEQA (California Public Resources Code, Section 21000, et seq.) and the CEQA Guidelines (California Code of Regulations, Title 14, Section 15000, et seq.).

The purpose of this Draft EIR is to inform decision makers, representatives of affected and responsible agencies, the public, and other interested parties of the potential environmental effects that may result from implementation of the proposed project. This Draft EIR describes potential impacts relating to a wide variety of environmental issues and methods by which these impacts can be mitigated or avoided.

Project Summary

Project Location

The project consists of two separate sites: the Grasslands site, and the Beamer/Cottonwood site. The regional location of each site is provided in Exhibit 2-1.

Grasslands Site

The Grasslands site is located at 30475 County Road 104, approximately 2.5 miles south of the City of Davis (Exhibit 2-1). The Grasslands site consists of approximately 41 acres of undeveloped land within the 156.49-acre Assessor's Parcel Number (APN) 033-130-03. The Grasslands site is located within the 323-acre Yolo County's Grasslands Regional Park at the southeastern corner of the intersection of Mace Boulevard/County Road 104 and County Road 35 (Exhibit 2-2).

Beamer/Cottonwood Site

The Beamer/Cottonwood site is located at southeastern corner of Ashley Drive and Woodland Avenue in the City of Woodland. The Beamer/Cottonwood site consists of approximately 6.53 acres of APN 064-010-32 (Exhibit 2-3). The solar facility would be located on the eastern 2 acres of the Beamer/Cottonwood site.

Project Description

The project consists of the development of a 5-megawatt (MW) photovoltaic (PV) solar array on approximately 21 acres at the Grasslands site and a 0.8-MW PV solar array on approximately 2 acres at the Beamer/Cottonwood Site. The Grasslands site will also consist of multiple components that

constitute the Environmental Education and Sustainability Park, including an environmental education center (EEC) to be used for educational fieldtrips for K-12 students of Yolo County.

Project Objectives

The objectives of the proposed project are to:

- Construct a solar energy facility that would assist the State in meeting its Renewable Portfolio Standard and goals aimed at reducing greenhouse gas (GHG) emissions
- Further the State's efforts to achieve its goals for renewable energy generating capacity within its total energy portfolio.
- Assist in meeting the utility peak power load by adding solar power capacity, which has peak generation on sunny, hot summer days.
- Assist in achieving the State's 33-percent Renewable Energy Portfolio Standard and greenhouse gas emissions reduction objectives to the maximum extent possible based on the existing capacity of existing transmission line facilities.
- Locate solar power plant facilities as near as possible to electrical transmission facilities with anticipated capacity and reserved queue position.
- To the extent feasible, site the projects on disturbed or previously degraded land to avoid or minimize impacts to special-status species or habitat.
- Provide a permanent buffer area adjacent to the burrowing owl preserve located within the Grasslands Regional Park.
- Use a proven and available solar photovoltaic technology that qualifies as an Eligible Renewable Energy Resource pursuant to Public Utilities Code Section 399.12, Public Resources Code Section 25741, and the California Energy Commission's "Renewable Portfolio Standard: Eligibility Guidebook" (CEC, 2008).
- Construct solar facilities totaling 5.8MWs in size to meet the financial goals of a zero capital investment, annual revenue of approximately $250,000, and lifetime revenue of nearly $42 million over 35 years (Vernon, pers. comm.).
- Accommodate a mix of agricultural and non-agricultural uses by making the land underneath and between the solar panel array available for sheep grazing by undertaking a commercial sheep-grazing operation or other compatible agricultural crop production.
- Produce economic benefit by creating temporary construction jobs and reducing energy costs.
- Develop a unique education center for K-12 students to learn about environmental conservation and sustainability.

- Utilize a currently underutilized portion of the Grasslands Regional Park.
- Generate electricity to be used by Yolo County offices to reduce long-term electrical utility costs.

Significant Unavoidable Adverse Impacts

The proposed project would not result in any significant unavoidable impacts.

Summary of Project Alternatives

Below is a summary of the alternatives to the proposed project considered in Section 5, Alternatives to the Proposed Project.

- **No Project Alternative:** Both project sites would remain in their existing conditions and no new development would occur.
- **25-Percent Reduction Alternative:** The total MW output at both sites would be reduced by 25 percent. The Grasslands site would include a 3.75-MW PV facility. The environmental education center at the Grasslands site would also be constructed but reduced in size by 25 percent, resulting in a 1,500-square-foot modular building and a 375-square-foot park host building. The Beamer/Cottonwood site would include a 0.6-MW PV facility.
- **PV Facility Only Alternative:** The proposed project would consist of a 5-MW PV facility at the Grasslands site and a 0.8-MW PV facility at the Beamer/Cottonwood site; the environmental education center would not be developed.

Areas of Controversy

Pursuant to CEQA Guidelines Section 15123(b), a summary section must address areas of controversy known to the lead agency, including issues raised by agencies and the public, and it must also address issues to be resolved, including the choice among alternatives and whether or how to mitigate the significant effects.

A Notice of Preparation (NOP) for the proposed project was issued on July 20, 2012. The NOP described the concept for the project and issues to be addressed in the EIR and was distributed to the State Clearinghouse, responsible agencies, and other interested parties for a 30-day public review period extending from July 20, 2012 through August 20, 2012. Additionally, a public scoping meeting was held on July 30, 2012 in the County Administration Building's Atrium Training Room to solicit input on the scope of the EIR. The NOP identified the potential for significant impacts on the environment related to the following topical areas:

- Aesthetics, Light, and Glare
- Agricultural Resources
- Air Quality
- Biological Resources
- Cultural Resources
- Geology, Soils, and Seismicity
- Greenhouse Gas Emissions
- Hazards and Hazardous Materials
- Hydrology and Water Quality
- Land Use and Planning
- Noise
- Public Services
- Recreation
- Utilities and Service Systems

Potentially Controversial Issues

Below are a list of potentially controversial issues that may be raised during the public review and hearing process of this Draft EIR.

- Aesthetics, Light, and Glare
- Biological Impacts
- Cultural Resources
- Land Use
- Construction Noise
- Recreational Impacts

Public Review of the Draft EIR

Upon completion of the Draft EIR, the Yolo County filed a Notice of Completion (NOC) with the State Office of Planning and Research to begin the public review period (Public Resources Code, Section 21161). Concurrent with the NOC, this Draft EIR has been distributed to responsible and trustee agencies, other affected agencies, surrounding cities, and interested parties, as well as all parties requesting a copy of the Draft EIR in accordance with Public Resources Code 21092(b)(3). A Notice of Availability was provided to public agencies and interested parties pursuant to See CEQA Guidelines Sections 15085, 15087(c). During the public review period, the Draft EIR, including the technical appendices, is available for review at the Yolo County Department of General Services, the Woodland Public Library and the Mary L. Stephens Davis Branch Library. The address for each location is provided below:

Yolo County Department of General Services
120 W. Main Street, Suite C
Woodland, CA 95695

Hours:
Monday–Friday: 9 a.m. to 5 p.m.

Woodland Public Library
250 First Street
Woodland, CA 95695

Hours:
Monday–Thursday: 9 a.m. to 7 p.m.
Friday: Closed
Saturday: 12 p.m. to 4 p.m.
Sunday: Closed

Mary L. Stephens Davis Branch Library
315 E. 14th Street
Davis, CA 95616

Hours:
Monday: 1 p.m. to 9 p.m.
Tuesday–Thursday: 10:00 a.m. to 9 p.m.
Friday and Saturday: 10:00 a.m. to 5:30 p.m.
Sunday: 1 p.m. to 5 p.m.

Agencies, organizations, and interested parties have the opportunity to comment on the Draft EIR during the 45-day public review period. Written comments on this Draft EIR should be addressed to:

Terry Vernon, Deputy Director
Yolo County Department of General Services
120 W. Main Street, Suite C
Woodland, CA 95695
Phone: 530.406.4870
Fax: 530.668.1801
Email: terry.vernon@yolocounty.org

Submittal of electronic comments in Microsoft Word or Adobe PDF format is encouraged. Upon completion of the public review period, written responses to all significant environmental issues raised will be prepared and made available for review by the commenting agencies at least 10 days prior to the public hearing before the decision makers on the project, at which the certification of the Final EIR will be considered. Comments received and the responses to comments will be included as part of the record for consideration by decision makers for the project.

Executive Summary Matrix

Table ES-1 below summarizes the impacts, mitigation measures, and resulting level of significance after mitigation for the relevant environmental issue areas evaluated for the proposed project. The table is intended to provide an overview; narrative discussions for the issue areas are included in the corresponding section of this EIR. Table ES-1 is included in the EIR as required by CEQA Guidelines Section 15123(b)(1).

Table ES-1: Executive Summary Matrix

Impacts	Mitigation Measures	Level of Significance After Mitigation
Section 3.1 - Aesthetics, Light, and Glare		
Impact AES-1: The project would not create a substantial adverse effect on a scenic vista.	*Grasslands Site:* No mitigation is necessary. *Beamer/Cottonwood Site:* No mitigation is necessary.	Less than significant impact.
Impact AES-2: The proposed project would not degrade the existing visual character or quality of the site and its surroundings.	*Grasslands Site:* No mitigation is necessary. *Beamer/Cottonwood Site:* No mitigation is necessary.	Less than significant impact.
Impact AES-3: The project may create a new source of substantial light or glare which would adversely affect day or nighttime views in the area.	*Grasslands Site:* No mitigation is necessary. *Beamer/Cottonwood Site:* No mitigation is necessary.	Less than significant impact.
Section 3.2 – Agricultural Resources		
Impact AG-1: The project would not convert Prime Farmland, Unique Farmland, or Farmland of Statewide Importance to non-agricultural use.	*Grasslands Site:* No mitigation is necessary. *Beamer/Cottonwood Site:* No mitigation is necessary.	Less than significant impact.
Impact AG-2: The project would not conflict with existing zoning for agricultural use, or a Williamson Act contract.	*Grasslands Site:* No mitigation is necessary. *Beamer/Cottonwood Site:* No mitigation is necessary.	Less than significant impact.

Table ES-1 (cont.): Executive Summary Matrix

Impacts	Mitigation Measures	Level of Significance After Mitigation
Section 3.3 - Air Quality		
Impact AIR-1: The project would not conflict with or obstruct implementation of the applicable air quality plan.	*Grasslands Site:* No mitigation is necessary. *Beamer/Cottonwood Site:* No mitigation is necessary.	Less than significant impact.
Impact AIR-2: The project may violate an air quality standard or contribute substantially to an existing or projected air quality violation.	*Grasslands Site:* **MM AIR-2** The following construction best management practices shall be implemented during earth-moving construction activities: • Water all active construction sites at least twice daily. Frequency should be based on the type of operation, soil, and wind exposure. • Plant native grassland ground cover in disturbed areas as soon as possible. • Sweep streets if visible soil material is carried out from the construction site. • Treat accesses to a distance of 100 feet from the paved road with a 6-inch layer of gravel. *Beamer/Cottonwood Site* • Implement Mitigation Measure AIR-2.	Less than significant impact.
Impact AIR-3: The project may result in a cumulatively considerable net increase of criteria pollutants for which the project region is non-attainment under an applicable federal or state ambient air quality standard (including releasing emissions, which exceed quantitative thresholds for ozone precursors).	*Grasslands Site:* Implement Mitigation Measure AIR-2. *Beamer/Cottonwood Site:* No mitigation is necessary.	Less than significant impact.

Table ES-1 (cont.): Executive Summary Matrix

Impacts	Mitigation Measures	Level of Significance After Mitigation
Impact AIR-4: The project may expose sensitive receptors to substantial air pollutant concentrations.	*Grasslands Site:* Implement Mitigation Measure AIR-2. *Beamer/Cottonwood Site* Implement Mitigation Measure AIR-2.	Less than significant impact.
Section 3.4 - Biological Resources		
Impact BIO-1: The proposed project will have a less than significant effect, either directly or through habitat modifications, on species identified as candidate, sensitive, or special-status species in local or regional plans, policies, or regulations, or by the California Department of Fish and Game or U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service.	*Grasslands Site:* **MM BIO-1a**: To offset impacts to suitable foraging habitat for Swainson's hawk the County of Yolo shall implement one of the following two options: a. Pursuant to the Solar Facility Ordinance of Yolo County, if more than 2.5 acres of Swainson's hawk foraging habitat is impacted, a Minor Use Permit shall be required and include conditions for mitigation for the permanent loss of such habitat as required under the Yolo Natural Heritage Program. The Yolo National Heritage Program reviews applications for development within the planning area, and it collects acreage-based mitigation fees for development of the lands, which are sufficient to fund the acquisition, enhancement, and long-term management of 1 acre of Swainson's hawk foraging habitat for every 1 acre of foraging habitat lost to development. b. Prior to any ground disturbance, the County of Yolo shall place and record one or more Conservation Easements within Grasslands Regional Park that meet the acreage requirements of California Department of Fish and Game's Swainson's hawk foraging habitat mitigation guidelines. The conservation easement(s) shall be executed by the County of Yolo and Conservation operator. The conservation easement(s) shall be reviewed and approved in writing by the California Department of Fish and Game prior to recordation for the purpose of confirming consistency. The purpose of the conservation easement(s) shall be to preserve the value of the land as foraging habitat for the Swainson's hawk.	Less than significant impact.

Table ES-1 (cont.): Executive Summary Matrix

Impacts	Mitigation Measures	Level of Significance After Mitigation
	MM BIO-1b: Since suitable burrowing owl habitat occurs on the project site, and burrowing owls may migrate onto the site, a pre-construction clearance survey shall be conducted to determine if burrowing owls currently occupy the project site. The pre-construction clearance survey shall be conducted within 14 days prior to ground-disturbing activities. Survey methodology shall be consistent with the new California Department of Fish and Game 2012 Staff Report on Burrowing Owl Mitigation. Since no suitable burrows were discovered during the initial biological reconnaissance survey, the pre-construction survey shall consist of a one-day survey effort within all suitable habitat and within 500 feet of the project site. If burrowing owls are observed onsite, Mitigation Measure BIO-1c shall be implemented to reduce any potential project impact. **MM BIO-1c:** If burrowing owl(s) are observed onsite during the pre-construction clearance survey, consultation with CDFG shall occur to determine the next appropriate steps. Additional focused surveys may be warranted as determined by CDFG to determine the quantity and location of nesting/migrating burrowing owls. Areas currently occupied by burrowing owls shall be avoided for the duration of residing onsite and/or nesting period. If burrowing owls cannot be avoided by the proposed project, implementation of Mitigation Measure BIO-1d shall be warranted to reduce any potential project-related impacts to less than significant. **MM BIO-1d:** If burrowing owls are determined to occupy the project site prior to construction activities and these occupied areas cannot be avoided, then additional measures such as passive relocation during the non-breeding season may be utilized to reduce any potential impacts. Burrow exclusion involves the installation of one-way doors in burrow openings during the non-breeding season to temporarily exclude burrowing owls, or permanently exclude burrowing owls and close burrows after verifying burrows are empty by site monitoring and scoping. Existing or artificial burrows situated less than 75 meters from the project site is the ideal scenario for successful passive relocation. Additional factors for successful passive relocation are included in the California Department of Fish and Game 2012 Staff Report on Burrowing Owl Mitigation. When a qualified biologist is able to determine that burrowing owls are no longer occupying the project site and passive relocation deemed successful, construction activities may continue.	

Table ES-1 (cont.): Executive Summary Matrix

Impacts	Mitigation Measures	Level of Significance After Mitigation
	MM BIO-1e: Pursuant to the Migratory Bird Treaty Act and California Department of Fish and Game Code, removal of any trees, shrubs, or any other potential nesting habitat shall be conducted outside of the avian nesting season. The nesting season generally extends from early February through August, but can vary slightly from year to year based upon seasonal weather conditions. Construction generally occurs during the dry season in the spring and summer months (during nesting season) to avoid inclement weather. If construction is planned during the nesting season (between February and August), the County will be required to conduct pre-construction presence/absence surveys to determine if any birds or raptors are nesting within or adjacent to the project site. A qualified biologist shall conduct a pre-construction survey for nesting migratory birds and raptors within all suitable habitat on the project site, and within 500 feet of the project site. The pre-construction survey shall be conducted within 30 days of ground-disturbing activities if construction occurs within the breeding season. If an active nest is discovered during the pre-construction survey, no construction activities should encroach within a 500-foot buffer from the active nest, until the nestlings have fledged. If construction activities must occur within 500 feet of the active nest, a biological monitor will be required to be onsite during the construction phase to ensure no direct or incidental take of the active nest occurs. If the biological monitor determines that construction activities will result in take of the active nest, then all construction activities must halt within the established buffer for the nest. *Beamer/Cottonwood Site:* Implement Mitigation Measures BIO-1a, BIO-1b, BIO-1c, BIO-1d, and BIO-1e, and the following: **MM BIO-1f:** Prior to any ground-disturbing or construction activities within 100 feet of the identified elderberry shrub, the County shall consult with the U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service. The County shall install and maintain a 4-foot-high construction fence around the perimeter of the elderberry shrub. No grading or any other ground-disturbing activities shall be conducted within the fenced protected area without prior	

Table ES-1 (cont.): Executive Summary Matrix

Impacts	Mitigation Measures	Level of Significance After Mitigation
	verification that the requirements of the United States Fish and Wildlife Service have been satisfied including the issuance of any necessary permits. The County shall avoid and protect the Valley elderberry longhorn beetle (VELB) habitat (elderberry stalks 1 inch in diameter or greater) where feasible. Complete avoidance may be assumed for VELB if activities occur outside of a 100-foot buffer of the plant found onsite. Where avoidance is infeasible, the County shall develop and implement a VELB mitigation plan in accordance with the most current USFWS mitigation guidelines for unavoidable take of VELB habitat pursuant to either Section 7 or Section 10(a) of the Federal Endangered Species Act. The mitigation plan shall include but not be limited to relocation of elderberry shrubs, planting of elderberry shrubs, and monitoring of relocated and planted elderberry shrubs.	
Impact BIO-2: The proposed project will not have a substantial adverse effect on any riparian habitat or other sensitive natural community identified in local or regional plans, policies, and regulations or by the California Department of Fish and Game or the U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service.	*Grasslands Site:* **MM BIO-2:** Because the seasonal wetland swale is outside of the United States Army Corps of Engineers' jurisdiction, regulation of the swale falls under the State of California's Porter-Cologne Water Quality Control Act. As such, filling the seasonal wetland swale requires coordination with the Regional Water Board for the issuance of either individual or general waste discharge requirements. In addition, the Yolo County General Plan allows for loss of individual wetlands as long as the loss is fully mitigated. In order to achieve this goal, General Plan Policies CO-2.1, CO-2.2, and CO-2.3 will be implemented. To replace the impacted seasonal wetland on the project site, a habitat restoration plan shall be developed prior to the approval of grading plans and building permits and would identify appropriate mitigation areas onsite based on underlying soils and local hydrology. This data would be used to prioritize sites for enhancement or seasonal wetland creation (such as the relocation of the seasonal wetland swale) within another portion of Grasslands Regional Park. Habitat shall be restored or replaced at a minimum ratio of 1:1 acre of habitats permanently impacted. *Beamer/Cottonwood Site:* No mitigation is necessary.	Less than significant impact.

Table ES-1 (cont.): Executive Summary Matrix

Impacts	Mitigation Measures	Level of Significance After Mitigation
Impact BIO-3: The proposed project would not have a substantial adverse effect on federally protected wetlands as defined by Section 404 of the Clean Water Act (including but not limited to marsh, vernal pool, coastal, etc.) through direct removal, filling, hydrological interruption, or other means.	*Grasslands Site:* No mitigation is necessary. *Beamer/Cottonwood Site:* No mitigation is necessary.	Less than significant impact.
Impact BIO-4: The proposed project would not substantially interfere with the movement of any native resident or migratory fish or wildlife species or with established native resident or migratory wildlife corridors, or impede the use of wildlife nursery sites.	*Grasslands Site:* No mitigation is necessary. *Beamer/Cottonwood Site:* No mitigation is necessary.	Less than significant impact.
Impact BIO-5: The proposed project will not conflict with local policies or ordinances protecting biological resources, such as a tree preservation policy or ordinance.	*Grasslands Site:* No mitigation is necessary. *Beamer/Cottonwood Site:* No mitigation is necessary.	Less than significant impact.
Impact BIO-6: The proposed project would not conflict with the provisions of an adopted Habitat Conservation Plan, Natural Community Conservation Plan, or other approved local, regional, or state habitat conservation plan.	*Grasslands Site:* No mitigation is necessary. *Beamer/Cottonwood Site:* No mitigation is necessary.	Less than significant impact.
Section 3.5 - Cultural Resources		
Impact CUL-1: Subsurface construction activities associated with the proposed project may damage or destroy previously undiscovered historic resources.	*Grasslands Site:* **MM CUL-1:** If a potentially significant cultural resource is encountered during subsurface earthwork activities for the project, all construction activities within a 50-foot radius of the find shall cease until a qualified archaeologist determines whether the resource requires further study. The County shall include a standard inadvertent discovery clause in every construction contract to inform contractors of this requirement. Any previously undiscovered resources found during construction shall be recorded on appropriate Department of Parks and Recreation (DPR) forms and evaluated for significance in terms of California Environmental	Less than significant impact.

Table ES-1 (cont.): Executive Summary Matrix

Impacts	Mitigation Measures	Level of Significance After Mitigation
	Quality Act criteria by a qualified archaeologist. Potentially significant cultural resources consist of, but are not limited to stone, bone, glass, ceramics, fossils, wood, or shell artifacts, or features including hearths, structural remains, or historic dumpsites. If the resource is determined significant under CEQA, the qualified archaeologist shall prepare and implement a research design and archaeological data recovery plan that will capture those categories of data for which the site is significant. The archaeologist shall also perform appropriate technical analyses, prepare a comprehensive report and file it with the appropriate Information Center, and provide for the permanent curation of the recovered materials. *Beamer/Cottonwood Site:* Implement Mitigation Measure CUL-1.	
Impact CUL-2: Subsurface construction activities associated with the proposed project may damage or destroy previously undiscovered archaeological resources.	*Grasslands Site:* **MM CUL-2:** If areas of prehistoric or historic archaeological resources are encountered during subsurface excavation, all work within 100 feet of the discovery shall cease until a qualified archaeologist can determine the significance of the find. The discoveries shall be evaluated for their CR and NRHP eligibility and recommendations made. The identified resources or resource area shall be avoided by project activities during evaluation. The County of Yolo shall include a standard inadvertent discovery clause in every construction contract to inform contractors of this requirement. Upon completion of the archaeologist's evaluation, a report shall be prepared documenting the methods and results, and offering recommendations. The report shall be submitted to the County of Yolo, the Northwest Information Center, and the State Historic Preservation Officer (SHPO), if required. *Beamer/Cottonwood Site:* Implement Mitigation Measure CUL-2.	Less than significant impact.

Table ES-1 (cont.): Executive Summary Matrix

Impacts	Mitigation Measures	Level of Significance After Mitigation
Impact CUL-3: Subsurface construction activities associated with the proposed project may damage or destroy previously undiscovered paleontological resources.	*Grasslands Site:* **MM CUL-3:** If plant or animal fossils are encountered during subsurface excavation activities, all work within 50 feet of the discovery shall cease until a qualified paleontologist has determined the significance of the find and provides recommendations. Project personnel shall not collect or remove any paleontological material. If the paleontological finds are found to be significant, the area shall be avoided by project activities. The recommendations of the paleontologist shall be incorporated into construction plans. *Beamer/Cottonwood Site:* Implement Mitigation Measure CUL-3.	Less than significant impact.
Impact CUL-4: Subsurface construction activities associated with the proposed project may damage or destroy previously undiscovered human remains.	*Grasslands Site:* **MM CUL-4:** In the event of the accidental discovery or recognition of any human remains, CEQA Guidelines Section 15064.5; Health and Safety Code Section 7050.5; Public Resources Code Section 5097.94 and Section 5097.98 must be followed. If during the course of project development there is accidental discovery or recognition of any human remains, the following steps shall be taken: 1. There shall be no further excavation or disturbance of the site or any nearby area reasonably suspected to overlie adjacent human remains until the County Coroner is contacted to determine if the remains are Native American and if an investigation of the cause of death is required. If the coroner determines the remains to be Native American, the coroner shall contact the Native American Heritage Commission (NAHC) within 24 hours, and the NAHC shall identify the person or persons it believes to be the "most likely descendant" (MLD) of the deceased Native American. The MLD may make recommendations to the landowner or the person responsible for the excavation work within 48 hours, for means of treating or disposing of, with appropriate dignity, the human remains and any associated grave goods as provided in PRC Section 5097.98. 2. Where the following conditions occur, the landowner or the landowner's authorized representative shall rebury the Native American human	Less than significant impact.

Table ES-1 (cont.): Executive Summary Matrix

Impacts	Mitigation Measures	Level of Significance After Mitigation
	remains and associated grave goods with appropriate dignity either in accordance with the recommendations of the most likely descendant or on the project site in a location not subject to further subsurface disturbance: • The NAHC is unable to identify a most likely descendent or the most likely descendent failed to make a recommendation within 48 hours after being notified by the commission. • The descendant identified fails to make a recommendation. The landowner or the landowner's authorized representative rejects the recommendation of the descendant, and mediation by the NAHC fails to provide measures acceptable to the landowner. *Beamer/Cottonwood Site:* Implement Mitigation Measure CUL-4	
Section 3.6 - Geology, Soils, and Seismicity		
Impact GEO-1: The project would not expose people or structures to potential substantial adverse effects, including the risk of loss, injury, or death involving: ii) Strong seismic ground shaking iii) Seismic-related ground failure, including liquefaction	*Grasslands Site:* No mitigation is necessary. *Beamer/Cottonwood Site:* No mitigation is necessary.	Less than significant impact.
Impact GEO-2: The project would not result in substantial soil erosion or the loss of topsoil.	*Grasslands Site:* No mitigation is necessary. *Beamer/Cottonwood Site:* No mitigation is necessary.	Less than significant impact.
Impact GEO-3: The project would not be located on a geologic unit or soil that is unstable, or that would become unstable as a result of the project, and potentially result in on- or off-site landslide, lateral spreading, subsidence, liquefaction, or collapse.	*Grasslands Site:* No mitigation is necessary. *Beamer/Cottonwood Site:* No mitigation is necessary.	Less than significant impact.

Table ES-1 (cont.): Executive Summary Matrix

Impacts	Mitigation Measures	Level of Significance After Mitigation
Impact GEO-4: The project could potentially be located on expansive soil, as defined in Table 18-1-B of the Uniform Building Code (1994), creating substantial risks to life or property.	*Grasslands Site:* No mitigation is necessary. *Beamer/Cottonwood Site:* No mitigation is necessary.	Less than significant impact.
Impact GEO-5: The project would not be located on soils incapable of adequately supporting the use of a septic tank or alternative wastewater disposal system.	*Grasslands Site:* No mitigation is necessary. *Beamer/Cottonwood Site:* No mitigation is necessary.	Less than significant impact.
Section 3.7 – Greenhouse Gas Emissions		
Impact GHG-1: The project would generate greenhouse gas emissions; however, these emissions would not result in a significant impact on the environment.	*Grasslands Site:* No mitigation is necessary. *Beamer/Cottonwood Site:* No mitigation is necessary.	Less than significant impact.
Impact GHG-2: The project would not conflict with any applicable plan, policy or regulation of an agency adopted for the purpose of reducing the emissions of greenhouse gases.	*Grasslands Site:* No mitigation is necessary. *Beamer/Cottonwood Site:* No mitigation is necessary.	Less than significant impact.
Section 3.8 - Hazards and Hazardous Materials		
Impact HAZ-1: The project would not create a significant hazard to the public or the environment through the routine transport, use, or disposal of hazardous materials.	*Grasslands Site:* No mitigation is necessary. *Beamer/Cottonwood Site:* No mitigation is necessary.	Less than significant impact.

Table ES-1 (cont.): Executive Summary Matrix

Impacts	Mitigation Measures	Level of Significance After Mitigation
Impact HAZ-2: The project would not create a significant hazard to the public or the environment through reasonably foreseeable upset and accident conditions involving the likely release of hazardous materials into the environment.	*Grasslands Site:* No mitigation is necessary. *Beamer/Cottonwood Site:* No mitigation is necessary.	Less than significant impact.
Impact HAZ-3: The project would not emit hazardous emissions or handle hazardous or acutely hazardous materials, substances, or waste within one-quarter mile of an existing or proposed school.	*Grasslands Site:* No mitigation is necessary. *Beamer/Cottonwood Site:* No mitigation is necessary.	Less than significant impact.
Impact HAZ-4: The project would not expose people or structures to a significant risk of loss, injury, or death involving wildland fires, including where wildlands are adjacent to urbanized areas or where residences are intermixed with wildlands.	*Grasslands Site:* No mitigation is necessary. *Beamer/Cottonwood Site:* No mitigation is necessary.	Less than significant impact.
Section 3.9 - Hydrology and Water Quality		
Impact HYD-1: Construction activities associated with the proposed project would not have the potential to degrade water quality in downstream water bodies.	*Grasslands Site:* No mitigation is necessary. *Beamer/Cottonwood Site:* No mitigation is necessary.	Less than significant impact.
Impact HYD-2: Operational activities associated with the proposed project would not have the potential to degrade water quality in downstream water bodies.	*Grasslands Site:* No mitigation is necessary. *Beamer/Cottonwood Site:* No mitigation is necessary.	Less than significant impact.
Impact HYD-3: The proposed project would not deplete groundwater supplies or substantially interfere with groundwater recharge.	*Grasslands Site:* No mitigation is necessary. *Beamer/Cottonwood Site:* No mitigation is necessary.	Less than significant impact.

Table ES-1 (cont.): Executive Summary Matrix

Impacts	Mitigation Measures	Level of Significance After Mitigation
Impact HYD-4: The proposed project would not expose people or structures to a significant risk of loss, injury or death involving flooding, including flooding as a result of the failure of a levee or dam.	*Grasslands Site:* No mitigation is necessary. *Beamer/Cottonwood Site:* No mitigation is necessary.	Less than significant impact.
Section 3.10 – Land Use and Planning		
Impact LU-1: The proposed project would be consistent with applicable provisions of the Yolo County General Plan and City of Woodland General Plan.	*Grasslands Site:* No mitigation is necessary. *Beamer/Cottonwood Site:* No mitigation is necessary.	Less than significant impact.
Impact LU-2: The proposed project would not conflict with any of the applicable provisions of the Yolo County Municipal Code.	*Grasslands Site:* Implement Mitigation Measure BIO-1a**.** *Beamer/Cottonwood Site:* No mitigation is necessary.	Less than significant impact.
Impact LU-3: The proposed project would not conflict with any of the applicable provisions of the Grasslands Park Master Plan.	*Grasslands Site:* No mitigation is necessary. *Beamer/Cottonwood Site:* No mitigation is necessary.	Less than significant impact.
Impact LU-4: The proposed project would not conflict with the provisions of an adopted Habitat Conservation Plan, Natural Community Conservation Plan, or other approved local, regional, or state habitat conservation plan.	*Grasslands Site:* No mitigation is necessary. *Beamer/Cottonwood Site:* No mitigation is necessary.	Less than significant impact.

Table ES-1 (cont.): Executive Summary Matrix

Impacts	Mitigation Measures	Level of Significance After Mitigation
Section 3.11 – Noise		
Impact NOI-1: The project may result in exposure of persons to or generation of noise levels in excess of standards established in the local general plan or noise ordinance, or applicable standards of other agencies.	*Grasslands Site:* **MM NOI-1a:** Active hours of construction at the Grasslands project site, including transporting of construction material, shall be limited to between the hours of 7 a.m. and 7 p.m., Monday through Saturday. No construction shall occur on Sundays or holidays. **MM NOI-1b:** Construction equipment shall be properly maintained in accordance with manufacturers' specifications and shall be fitted with the best available noise suppression devices (e.g., mufflers, silencers, wraps). All impact tools shall be shrouded or shielded, and all intake and exhaust ports on power equipment shall be muffled or shielded. **MM NOI-1c:** Construction equipment shall not idle for extended periods of time (no more than 5 minutes) near adjacent land uses. **MM NOI-1d:** Stationary equipment (compressors, generators, and cement mixers) shall be located as far from the residential uses as feasible. **MM NOI-1e:** During pile installation, the contractor must use a moveable acoustic curtain (made of barrier septum composite (BSC)-13-2" acoustical material that consists of a combination of 2-inch-thick, vinyl-faced, quilted fiberglass sound absorber and reinforced loaded vinyl noise barrier [1 pound per square foot] that are bonded together). The curtain must be of a size and shape that will surround the hammer and steel pile on three sides when properly placed. The curtain is constructed of a steel frame with acoustic material fastened to the steel framework. The moveable curtain must also be long enough to cover the pile driver and steel pile when they are at the highest point at the beginning of a drive. The curtain must be moveable so that it can be relocated as the active pile driving point progresses along the site. It will be hung on the crane's second cable or attached to another crane (such as boom crane) for proper placement. *Beamer/Cottonwood Site:* Implement MM NOI-1b through MM NOI-1e and the following: **MM NOI-1f:** Active hours of construction at the Beamer/Cottonwood project site, including transporting of construction material, shall be limited	Less than significant impact.

Table ES-1 (cont.): Executive Summary Matrix

Impacts	Mitigation Measures	Level of Significance After Mitigation
	to between the hours of 7 a.m. and 6 p.m., Monday through Saturday, and 9 a.m. to 6 p.m. on Sunday (unless permitted by the City of Woodland Building Inspector).	
Impact NOI-2: The project would not result in expose persons to or generation of excessive groundborne vibration or groundborne noise levels.	*Grasslands Site:* No mitigation is necessary. *Beamer/Cottonwood Site:* No mitigation is necessary.	Less than significant impact.
Impact NOI-3: The project would not result in a substantial permanent increase in ambient noise levels in the project vicinity above levels existing without the project.	*Grasslands Site:* No mitigation is necessary. *Beamer/Cottonwood Site:* No mitigation is necessary.	Less than significant impact.
Impact NOI-4: The project would result in a substantial temporary or periodic increase in ambient noise levels in the project vicinity above levels existing without the project.	*Grasslands Site:* Implement Mitigation Measures NOI-1a through -NOI-1e. *Beamer/Cottonwood Site:* Implement Mitigation Measures NOI-1b through MM-NOI-1f and, **MM NOI-4:** Pile driving activities at the Beamer/Cottonwood Site shall be limited to three days, for a maximum of eight hours per day. Properties within 500 feet of the project boundary shall be notified by mail at least 1 week prior to pile driving activities, and provided with the name and telephone number of an onsite contact person in the event of noise complaints. In addition, notices regarding the pile-driving activities and contact information shall be posted at the project site in publicly visible and accessible locations 1 week prior to commencement of pile driving activities.	Less than significant impact.
Section 3.12 – Public Services		
Impact PS-1: The proposed project would not result in a need for new or expanded fire protection facilities that would have physical impacts on the environment.	*Grasslands Site:* No mitigation is necessary. *Beamer/Cottonwood Site:* No mitigation is necessary.	Less than significant impact.

Table ES-1 (cont.): Executive Summary Matrix

Impacts	Mitigation Measures	Level of Significance After Mitigation
Impact PS-2: The proposed project would not contribute to a need for new or expanded police protection facilities that would have physical impacts on the environment.	*Grasslands Site:* No mitigation is necessary. *Beamer/Cottonwood Site:* No mitigation is necessary.	Less than significant impact.
Impact PS-3: The proposed project would not result in a need for new or physically altered park facilities that would have a physical impact on the environment.	*Grasslands Site:* No mitigation is necessary. *Beamer/Cottonwood Site:* No mitigation is necessary.	Less than significant impact.
Section 3.13 – Recreation		
Impact REC-1: The project would not increase the use of existing neighborhood and regional parks or other recreational facilities such that substantial physical deterioration of the facility would occur or be accelerated.	*Grasslands Site:* No mitigation is necessary. *Beamer/Cottonwood Site:* No mitigation is necessary.	Less than significant impact.
Impact REC-2: The project's recreational facilities would not result in an adverse physical effect on the environment.	*Grasslands Site:* No mitigation is necessary. *Beamer/Cottonwood Site:* No mitigation is necessary.	Less than significant impact.
Section 3.14 – Utilities and Service Systems		
Impact USS-1: The proposed project would not exceed the wastewater treatment requirements of the applicable Regional Water Quality Control Board.	*Grasslands Site:* No mitigation is necessary. *Beamer/Cottonwood Site:* No mitigation is necessary.	Less than significant impact.
Impact USS-2: The project would result in the construction of new water and wastewater treatment facilities, the construction of which would not cause significant environmental effects.	*Grasslands Site:* No mitigation is necessary. *Beamer/Cottonwood Site:* No mitigation is necessary.	Less than significant impact.

Table ES-1 (cont.): Executive Summary Matrix

Impacts	Mitigation Measures	Level of Significance After Mitigation
Impact USS-3: Sufficient water supplies will be available to serve the project from existing entitlements and resources, and new or expanded entitlements would not be needed.	*Grasslands Site:* No mitigation is necessary. *Beamer/Cottonwood Site:* No mitigation is necessary.	Less than significant impact.
Impact USS-4: The proposed project would not result in a determination that the wastewater treatment provider has an inadequate capacity to serve the project's projected demand in addition to the provider's existing commitments.	*Grasslands Site:* No mitigation is necessary. *Beamer/Cottonwood Site:* No mitigation is necessary.	Less than significant impact.