FINAL

SUPPLEMENTAL ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACT REPORT

(RESPONSE TO COMMENTS)

YOLO FLYWAY FARMS RESTORATION PROJECT

MARCH 2016

SCH #: 2011032001

YOLO COUNTY PLANNING, PUBLIC WORKS AND ENVIRONMENTAL SERVICES DEPARTMENT

Taro Echiburú, AICP
DIRECTOR

County of Yolo

DEPARTMENT OF PLANNING, PUBLIC WORKS AND ENVIRONMENTAL SERVICES

292 West Beamer Street
Woodland, CA 95695-2598
530) 666-8775 FAX (530) 666-8156
www.yolocounty.org

Environmental Health
137 N. Cottonwood St, Ste 2400
Woodland, CA 95695
(530) 666-8646

Integrated Waste Management
44090 CR 28 H
Woodland, CA 95776
(530) 666-8852

NOTICE OF AVAILABILITY AND PUBLIC HEARING for the FINAL SUPPLEMENTAL ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACT REPORT on the YOLO FLYWAY FARMS RESTORATION PROJECT

DATE: March 1, 2016

TO: Interested Agencies and Individuals

FROM: Yolo County Planning, Public Works, and Environmental Services Department

The Final Supplemental Environmental Impact Report (FSEIR) (SCH #2011032001) for the above project is now available for review. The County will consider the information in the FSEIR when deliberating the project. Following certification of the Final SEIR, the County may take action to adopt the proposed project.

This FSEIR, as well as the DSEIR, are available for review on the County website at http://www.yolocounty.org/community-services/planning-public-works/planning-division/current-projects and at the public counter of the County Planning Division at 292 West Beamer Street, Woodland, CA 95696. The documents are available for purchase in hard copy or in electronic format (CD ROM).

A public hearing at the Yolo County Planning Commission will be held on March 10, 2016 in the Board of Supervisors Chambers (Room 206) at 625 Court Street, Woodland, to accept oral comments on the FSEIR and the project itself. Following the public hearing, the Planning Commission may adopt recommendations to the Board of Supervisors, who will make the final decision on the project, following another public hearing.

The FSEIR includes responses to all comments received on the previously issued Draft Supplemental Environmental Impact Report, as well as a Mitigation Monitoring and Reporting Program (MMRP). The FSEIR incorporates the DSEIR and any errata, the responses to comments, and the MMRP. The Draft Supplemental Environmental Impact Report was previously subject to a 45-day public comment period which ended on January 29, 2016. Five comment letters or e-mails were received during the comment period. In accordance with the California Environmental Quality Act, the FSEIR has been issued at least 10 days prior to the public hearing and has been mailed to the commenters.

Information about the proposed project is provided below.

The Yolo Flyway Farms Restoration Project is one component part of the larger Lower Yolo Restoration Project proposed by the State and Federal Contractors Water Agency (SFCWA) on behalf of the California Department of Water Resources and the U.S. Bureau of Reclamation. The Lower Yolo

Restoration Project has been approved but not yet implemented. The primary purpose of the Lower Yolo Restoration Project is to restore tidal interaction and associated wetland habitats to enhance and create habitat on 1,770 acres for special-status fish in the lower Yolo Bypass.

As a part of the larger project, the proposed Yolo Flyway Farms Restoration Project is a habitat restoration project that would restore and enhance approximately 278 acres of tidal freshwater wetlands on a 362-acre parcel. The project is designed to support delta smelt recovery; provide rearing habitats for out-migrating salmonids; and support other aquatic and wetland-dependent species, including Sacramento splittail.

The Yolo Flyway Farms Restoration Project was previously analyzed as a portion of Phase 2 in the Environmental Impact Report certified for the Lower Yolo Restoration Project (State Clearinghouse No. 2011032001) pursuant to CEQA and the CEQA Guidelines (14 Cal. Code Regs. §§ 15000 et seq.). Yolo Flyway Farms is the northeastern-most parcel within the Lower Yolo Restoration Project. SFCWA determined in 2011 that Yolo Flyway Farms would not be included within the initial work plan and was included within a proposed Phase 2 of the project. Flyway Farms was included and analyzed as part of the overall project in the Final Environmental Impact Report (Final EIR) (SFCWA 2013). However because of the interest on the part of the landowner in undertaking restoration activities on the 362 acre Yolo Flyway Farms now and the uncertainty of future implementation of Phase 2 of the Lower Yolo Restoration Project, the landowner is pursuing an independent course with Yolo County.

As a result, Yolo County has prepared this separate Draft Supplemental Environmental Impact Report (Draft Supplemental EIR), pursuant to CEQA, which addresses the impacts of the Yolo Flyway Farms Restoration Project. In doing so, Yolo County has incorporated by reference major sections of the adopted Lower Yolo Restoration Project Final EIR and has modified the analysis as needed for the Yolo Flyway Farms Restoration Project. A Final Supplemental EIR responding to comments will be prepared following public review and comment. The County will consider this information when deliberating the project. Following certification of the Final SEIR, the County may take action to adopt the proposed project.

The Draft Supplemental EIR analyzes impacts in the areas of Agricultural Resources, Air Quality and Greenhouse Gases, Terrestrial Biological Resources, Aquatic Biological Resources, Cultural Resources, Hazards and Hazardous Materials, Hydrology, Water Quality, and Energy.

For more specific questions about the project please contact Eric Parfrey, Principal Planner at (530) 666-8043 or eric.parfrey@yolocounty.org.

As noted above, a public hearing at the Yolo County Planning Commission will be held on February 18, 2016 in the Board of Supervisors Chambers (Room 206) at 625 Court Street, Woodland, to accept oral comments on the FSEIR and the project. There will be no transcription of oral comments at these meetings. Those who wish to have their verbatim comments incorporated into the record must submit their comments in writing. Following the public hearing, the Planning Commission may adopt recommendations to the Board of Supervisors, who will make the final decision on the project, following another public hearing.

In compliance with the Americans with Disabilities Act, if you are a disabled person and you need a disability-related modification or accommodation to participate in these hearings, please contact the County Planning, Public Works, and Environmental Services Department at (530) 666-8811. Please make your request as early as possible and at least one-full business day before the start of the meeting.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

1.0 INTRODUCTION

This document contains all comments received during the public review period on the Draft Supplemental Environmental Impact Report (DSEIR) for the Yolo Flyway Farms Restoration Project (the "project") and provides responses to each comment.

1.1 BACKGROUND AND PROJECT DESCRIPTION

The Yolo Flyway Farms Restoration Project is a part of the larger 3,795-acre Lower Yolo Restoration Project proposed by the State and Federal Contractors Water Agency (SFCWA) on behalf of the California Department of Water Resources and the U.S. Bureau of Reclamation. The primary purpose of the Lower Yolo Restoration Project is to restore tidal interaction and associated wetland habitats to enhance and create habitat for special-status fish in the lower Yolo Bypass. A Final Environmental Impact Report (Final EIR) for the Lower Yolo Restoration Project was prepared and adopted by the water contractors (SFCWA) in 2013. (The Final EIR along with this Supplemental EIR, is available for public review on the County website at http://www.yolocounty.org/community-services/planning-public-works/planning-division/current-projects, and at the public counter of the County Planning Division at 292 West Beamer Street, Woodland, CA 95696.)

The Final EIR studied environmental issues of the entire 3,795-acre Lower Yolo Restoration Project site, including Flyway Farms, and considered Flyway Farms to be a future Phase 2 of the project. The portion of the Lower Yolo Restoration Project that is under the ownership of the SFCWA has not yet begun construction.

Yolo Flyway Farms, owned by the Reynier Fund, LLC of Davis, California consists of approximately 440 acres in the northeastern portion of the Lower Yolo Restoration Project. Because of the interest on the part of the landowner in undertaking restoration activities on the 362 acre Yolo Flyway Farms and the uncertainty of future implementation of Phase 2 of the Lower Yolo Restoration Project, the landowner is pursuing an independent course with Yolo County to proceed with this portion of the larger project. As a result, Yolo County has prepared this separate Supplemental Environmental Impact Report that addresses the impacts of the Yolo Flyway Farms Restoration Project not addressed in the Final EIR.

The proposed Yolo Flyway Farms Restoration Project would restore and enhance approximately 278 acres of tidal freshwater wetlands on a 362-acre parcel. The Flyway Farms project site consists of two separate parcels that are zoned for agricultural uses, located approximately 9.4 miles southeast of the City of Davis. The 362-acre parcel (APN: 033-390-002) has historically been managed as a duck hunting club and, recently, is used for seasonal pasture. The nearby 80-acre parcel (APN: 033-220-049), proposed for stockpiling excess soils, is in idle agricultural use. The properties are under separate Williamson Act contracts and contain flood easements for the Central Valley Flood Protection Board.

Current land uses on the 362-acre unit are dominated by summertime flood irrigation of reclaimed rice fields used as pasture for cattle grazing. The 362-acre unit contains many historically wet areas (including approximately 27.5 acres of the Toe Drain) and has been managed in winter for waterfowl and duck hunting. The 80-acre unit has historically been used for rice production and is currently fallow.

The design plan would restore tidal flows to the portions of the site that are already within the intertidal range (+2.0 to +6.5 feet), but which are currently managed as winter waterfowl hunting through the use of water control structures (not with excavation). It would maintain existing topography, except that areas excavated to form channel networks would be graded to subtidal elevations. The intent of the design is to mimic the natural tidal flooding of the land without resorting to major excavation to lower the elevation by a few feet.

The design for the Flyway Farms portion of the larger Lower Yolo project requires the excavation of approximately 67,000 cubic yards of soil. The excavated soils will be placed on the upland areas of the adjacent 80-acre parcel. This excess soil will be trucked to the 80-acre site on existing farm roads and deposited and spread in the idle field, adding approximately 0.5 feet of elevation to the field. It is anticipated that the project site will continue to be dedicated to agriculture upon completion of restoration activities.

1.2 PUBLIC REVIEW

The County released the Draft Supplemental Environmental Impact Report (DSEIR) and Notice of Availability on December 11, 2015. The Notice of Availability was sent to a wide group of interested parties via e-mail at that time, alerting all parties that the documents were posted on the County Web site. The interested parties included all of the County's Citizens Advisory Committees and each committee's interested parties lists; and many other community organizations such as the Farm Bureau and environmental groups. Hard copies of the Notice of Availability were sent to all adjacent property owners. The County also submitted the DSEIR to the Governor's Office of Planning and Research, State Clearinghouse. The State Clearinghouse coordinates state level review of California Environmental Quality Act (CEQA) documents. A public hearing before the Planning Commission was held on January 14, 2016 to receive oral comments on the DSEIR; however, no members of the public offered comments.

1.3 RESPONSES TO COMMENTS

The County received six written comment letters on the DSEIR and one e-mail response. Chapter 2.0 provides a list of all commenters. Responses to the written responses are provided in Chapter 3.0. No verbal or written comments were received on the project at the January 14, 2016 public hearing before the Planning Commission, other than questions and comments about the project from the project applicant and Commissioners.

Text Changes to the DSEIR are presented in Chapter 4.0 of this Response to Comments document. Text changes include minor clarifications to update the text in a number of locations.

2.0 LIST OF COMMENTERS

The table below identifies all comment letters and e-mails received on the DSEIR. Each letter is numbered, and the author, agency, and date of receipt are provided.

Comment Letter/ E-Mail	Commenter	Date of Comment
1	Central Valley Flood Protection Board	December 30, 2015
2	Yocha Dehe Wintun Nation Cultural Resources	January 11, 2016
e-mail	Anthony Flores, Yocha Dehe Cultural Resources	January 18 , 2016
3	Central Valley Regional Water Quality Control Board	January 20 , 2016
4	Delta Stewardship Council	January 27 , 2016
5	State & Federal Contractors Water Agency	January 28, 2016
6	Delta Protection Commission	January 29, 2016

3.0 COMMENTS AND RESPONSES

STATE OF CALIFORNIA – CALIFORNIA NATURAL RESOURCES AGENCY EDMUND G. BROWN JR., GOVERNOR

CENTRAL VALLEY FLOOD PROTECTION BOARD
3310 El Camino Ave., Rm. 151
SACRAMENTO, CA 95821
(916) 574-0609 FAX: (916) 574-0682

December 30, 2015

Mr. Eric Parfrey
Yolo County
292 W. Beamer Street
Woodland, California 95695

Subject: CEQA Comments: Yolo Flyway Farms Restoration Project
Supplemental EIR, SCH No.: 2011032001

Location: Yolo County

Dear Mr. Parfrey:

Central Valley Flood Protection Board (Board) staff has reviewed the subject document and provides the following comments:

The proposed project is within the Sacramento Deep Water Channel and the Yolo Bypass which are regulated streams under Board jurisdiction, and may require a Board permit prior to construction.

The Board's jurisdiction covers the entire Central Valley including all tributaries and distributaries of the Sacramento and San Joaquin Rivers, and the Tulare and Buena Vista basins.

Under authorities granted by California Water Code and Public Resources Code statutes, the Board enforces its Title 23, California Code of Regulations (Title 23) for the construction, maintenance, and protection of adopted plans of flood control, including the federal-State facilities of the State Plan of Flood Control, regulated streams, and designated floodways.

Pursuant to Title 23, Section 6 a Board permit is required prior to working within the Board's jurisdiction for the placement, construction, reconstruction, removal, or abandonment of any landscaping, culvert, bridge, conduit, fence, projection, fill, embankment, building, structure, obstruction, encroachment, excavation, the planting, or removal of vegetation, and any repair or maintenance that involves cutting into the levee.

Permits may also be required to bring existing works that predate permitting into compliance with Title 23, or where it is necessary to establish the conditions normally imposed by permitting. The circumstances include those where responsibility for the works has not been clearly established or ownership and use have been revised.

Other federal (including U.S. Army Corps of Engineers Section 10 and 404 regulatory permits), State and local agency permits may be required and are the applicant's responsibility to obtain.

Board permit applications and Title 23 regulations are available on our website at http://www.cvfpb.ca.gov/. Maps of the Board's jurisdiction are also available from the California Department of Water Resources website at http://gis.bam.water.ca.gov/bam/.

Should you have any questions, feel free to contact Mr. James Herota of my staff at by phone at (916) 574-0651, or via email at james.herota@water.ca.gov .

Sincerely,

Eric Butler, Chief
Projects and Environmental Branch

cc: Governor's Office of Planning and Research
State Clearinghouse
1400 Tenth Street, Room 121
Sacramento, California 95814

Letter 1: Central Valley Flood Protection Board

Response to Letter 1:

The Central Valley Flood Protection Board staff submitted a letter that is a standard recital of the permitting requirements for development projects that are under the jurisdiction of the Board.

The proposed Flyway Farms Restoration Project will be required to apply, and receive approval, for encroachment and other permits from the Board, as noted on page 63 (Required Approvals) of the DSEIR.

The letter includes no comments on the specific details of the proposed project, or on the environmental analysis or mitigation measures include in the DSEIR. No issues regarding the adequacy of the DSEIR are made in this comment and no further response is necessary.

YOCHA DEHE
CULTURAL RESOURCES

January 11th, 2016

Eric Parfrey
County of Yolo
292 W. Beamer Street
Woodland, CA 95695

RE: Yolo Flyway Farms Restoration Project

Dear Mr. Parfrey:

Thank you for your comment request letter dated December 14, 2015 regarding the proposed Yolo Flyway Farms Restoration Project, Yolo County, CA. We appreciate your effort to contact us.

The Cultural Resources Department has reviewed the project and concluded that it is within the aboriginal territories of the Yocha Dehe Wintun Nation. Therefore, we have cultural interest and authority in the proposed project area.

Based on the information provided, Yocha Dehe Wintun Nation is not aware of any known cultural resources near this project. However, we would like you to consider the potential impacts of cultural resources in the area during your planning phase. We would also like to schedule a site visit to the project area to evaluate our cultural concerns.

We would like more information on your project. Have you completed a CHRIS record study? Please send us the results. Did the pedestrian survey cover the entire property? Did you review historic maps determine old waterway locations?

Should you have any questions, please feel free to contact the following individual:

Mr. Anthony Flores
Cultural Resources Site Protection Manager
Yocha Dehe Wintun Nation
Office: (530) 796-3400, Email: aflores@yochadehe-nsn.gov

Please refer to identification number YD – 12162015-02 in any correspondences concerning this project.

Thank you for providing us with this notice and the opportunity to comment.

Sincerely,

James Kinter
Tribal Secretary
Tribal Historic Preservation Officer

Yocha Dehe Wintun Nation
PO Box 18 Brooks, California 95606 p\ 530.796.3400 f\ 530.796.2143 www.yochadehe.org

Eric Parfrey

From: Eric Parfrey
Sent: Friday, January 22, 2016 1:48 PM
To: 'Anthony Flores'
Cc: Alexander Tengolics
Subject: RE: cultural resources studies for Flyway Farms

Mr. Flores:

In my e-mail response, I suggested you review the original EIR, not the Supplemental EIR. The Supplemental EIR does not have any background setting, which is included in the 2013 original EIR which is posted on our Web site at the address I noted below. The original 2013 EIR summarizes and notes all the surveys that have been conducted on the properties.

Eric Parfrey, Principal Planner, AICP
Yolo County Planning, Public Works and Environmental Services Dept.
(530) 666-8043
eric.parfrey@yolocounty.org

From: Anthony Flores [mailto:AFlores@yochadehe-nsn.gov]
Sent: Wednesday, January 20, 2016 11:06 AM
To: Eric Parfrey
Cc: Alexander Tengolics
Subject: RE: cultural resources studies for Flyway Farms

Mr. Parfrey,

I reviewed the Supplemental EIR before the letter was sent to you. The questions in the last paragraph were not answered in the EIR document. Could you read the questions again and provide answers?

Anthony Flores
Cultural Site Protection Manager

Tewe Kewe Cultural Center
PO Box 18 | Brooks, CA 95606
p 530.796.3400 | c. 530.723.3477 | f 530.796.2143
aflores@yochadehe-nsn.gov
www.yochadehe.org

From: Eric Parfrey [Eric.Parfrey@yolocounty.org]
Sent: Tuesday, January 19, 2016 3:16 PM
To: Anthony Flores
Cc: Alexander Tengolics
Subject: cultural resources studies for Flyway Farms

Mr. Flores:

In response to your letter of January 11, 2016 (attached), a number of cultural resource assessments have been conducted for the entire Lower Yolo Restoration Project site (which includes the Flyway Farms property). These studies are summarized in the Lower Yolo Restoration Project Final EIR – Volume 1, which is posted on our Current Planning Projects Web site at http://www.yolocounty.org/community-services/planning-public-works/planning-division/current-projects.

See pages of the 4.7-1 through 4.7-14 for a summary of the cultural studies and mitigation measures. All of these measures were incorporated in the Supplemental EIR prepared for the Flyway Farms project (see pages 139 -142), also posted at the above Web site.

Eric

Eric Parfrey, Principal Planner, AICP
Yolo County Planning, Public Works and Environmental Services Dept.
(530) 666-8043
eric.parfrey@yolocounty.org

2

Letter 2: Yocha Dehe Wintun Nation Cultural Resources and E-mail 1: Anthony Flores, Yocha Dehe Cultural Resources

The letter from the Tribal Historic Preservation Officer notes that Yocha Dehe Wintun Nation is not aware of any known cultural resources near this project. The letter asks whether a CHRIS (California Historical Resources Information System) record survey was completed, whether a pedestrian survey covered the property, and whether historic maps were studied.

A response was sent by County staff to the tribal contact indicating that a number of cultural resource assessments have been conducted for the entire Lower Yolo Restoration Project site (which includes the Flyway Farms property). These studies are summarized in the Lower Yolo Restoration Project Final EIR – Volume 1, which is posted on the Current Planning Projects Web site at http://www.yolocounty.org/community-services/planning-public-works/planning-division/current-projects.

Pages 4.7-1 through 4.7-14 of the Lower Yolo Restoration Project EIR summarized the cultural studies completed and mitigation measures. All of these measures were incorporated in the Supplemental EIR prepared for the Flyway Farms project (see pages 139 -142).

The Lower Yolo Restoration Project EIR lists the studies conducted on page 4.7-1:

> A records search was conducted at the Northwest Information Center (NWIC) of the California Historical Resources Information System. The geographic scope of this literature review encompassed the Project site, along with an approximate one-mile radius beyond the site identified as the study area. Additionally, other resources were reviewed:
>
> - Historic Properties Directory (California Office of Historic Preservation (OHP) 2011).
> - California Register of Historical Resources (CRHR) (California Department of Parks and Recreation (DPR) 1998 and updates).
> - California Points of Historical Interest (DPR 1998 and updates).
> - California Historical Landmarks (DPR 1998 and updates).
> - Directory of Properties in the Historical Resources Inventory (OHP 2011).
> - NWIC Historic Resources Map (U.S. Geological Survey [USGS] 1979, *Liberty Island* Quad).
> - 1859-1885 General Land Office Plat Maps.
>
> Based on this review, no prehistoric or historic archaeological resources are known to occur inside the study area.

The Lower Yolo Restoration Project FEIR also notes on page 4.7-1 that consultation efforts were conducted with the Native American Heritage Commission (NAHC) and Most Likely Descendants (MLD) of the Patwin Group of Native Americans (Yocha Dehe Wintun Nation) during 2010 (Holman & Associates 2010). NAHC and the MLD did not provide any data indicating the existence of cultural resources (e.g., burial sites, sacred lands, or other resources) in the study area.

In addition, a pedestrian reconnaissance of the project area was conducted August 16 – 20, 2010 (Holman & Associates 2010). No prehistoric archaeological resources were identified during the pedestrian survey, consistent with the results of previous studies completed near the study area and pre-field research that indicated much of the Project site and study area was historically and currently susceptible to flooding and therefore uninhabitable during part of the year.

20 January 2016

Eric Parfrey
Yolo County
292 West Beamer Street.
Woodland, CA 95695

CERTIFIED MAIL
91 7199 9991 7035 8419 1866

COMMENTS TO REQUEST FOR REVIEW FOR THE SUPPLEMENTAL ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACT REPORT, YOLO FLYWAY FARMS RESTORATION PROJECT, SCH# 2011032001, YOLO COUNTY

Pursuant to the State Clearinghouse's14 December 2015 request, the Central Valley Regional Water Quality Control Board (Central Valley Water Board) has reviewed the *Request for Review for the Supplemental Environment Impact Report* for the Yolo Flyway Farms Restoration Project, located in Yolo County.

Our agency is delegated with the responsibility of protecting the quality of surface and groundwaters of the state; therefore our comments will address concerns surrounding those issues.

I. Regulatory Setting

Basin Plan

The Central Valley Water Board is required to formulate and adopt Basin Plans for all areas within the Central Valley region under Section 13240 of the Porter-Cologne Water Quality Control Act. Each Basin Plan must contain water quality objectives to ensure the reasonable protection of beneficial uses, as well as a program of implementation for achieving water quality objectives with the Basin Plans. Federal regulations require each state to adopt water quality standards to protect the public health or welfare, enhance the quality of water and serve the purposes of the Clean Water Act. In California, the beneficial uses, water quality objectives, and the Antidegradation Policy are the State's water quality standards. Water quality standards are also contained in the National Toxics Rule, 40 CFR Section 131.36, and the California Toxics Rule, 40 CFR Section 131.38.

The Basin Plan is subject to modification as necessary, considering applicable laws, policies, technologies, water quality conditions and priorities. The original Basin Plans were adopted in 1975, and have been updated and revised periodically as required, using Basin Plan amendments. Once the Central Valley Water Board has adopted a Basin Plan amendment in noticed public hearings, it must be approved by the State Water Resources Control Board (State Water Board), Office of Administrative Law (OAL) and in some cases, the United States Environmental Protection Agency (USEPA). Basin Plan amendments

only become effective after they have been approved by the OAL and in some cases, the USEPA. Every three (3) years, a review of the Basin Plan is completed that assesses the appropriateness of existing standards and evaluates and prioritizes Basin Planning issues.

For more information on the *Water Quality Control Plan for the Sacramento and San Joaquin River Basins*, please visit our website:
http://www.waterboards.ca.gov/centralvalley/water_issues/basin_plans/.

Antidegradation Considerations

All wastewater discharges must comply with the Antidegradation Policy (State Water Board Resolution 68-16) and the Antidegradation Implementation Policy contained in the Basin Plan. The Antidegradation Policy is available on page IV-15.01 at:
http://www.waterboards.ca.gov/centralvalleywater_issues/basin_plans/sacsjr.pdf

In part it states:

> *Any discharge of waste to high quality waters must apply best practicable treatment or control not only to prevent a condition of pollution or nuisance from occurring, but also to maintain the highest water quality possible consistent with the maximum benefit to the people of the State.*
>
> *This information must be presented as an analysis of the impacts and potential impacts of the discharge on water quality, as measured by background concentrations and applicable water quality objectives.*

The antidegradation analysis is a mandatory element in the National Pollutant Discharge Elimination System and land discharge Waste Discharge Requirements (WDRs) permitting processes. The environmental review document should evaluate potential impacts to both surface and groundwater quality.

II. Permitting Requirements

Construction Storm Water General Permit

Dischargers whose project disturb one or more acres of soil or where projects disturb less than one acre but are part of a larger common plan of development that in total disturbs one or more acres, are required to obtain coverage under the General Permit for Storm Water Discharges Associated with Construction Activities (Construction General Permit), Construction General Permit Order No. 2009-009-DWQ. Construction activity subject to this permit includes clearing, grading, grubbing, disturbances to the ground, such as stockpiling, or excavation, but does not include regular maintenance activities performed to restore the original line, grade, or capacity of the facility. The Construction General Permit requires the development and implementation of a Storm Water Pollution Prevention Plan (SWPPP).

For more information on the Construction General Permit, visit the State Water Resources Control Board website at:
http://www.waterboards.ca.gov/water_issues/programs/stormwater/constpermits.shtml.

Phase I and II Municipal Separate Storm Sewer System (MS4) Permits[1]
The Phase I and II MS4 permits require the Permittees reduce pollutants and runoff flows from new development and redevelopment using Best Management Practices (BMPs) to the maximum extent practicable (MEP). MS4 Permittees have their own development standards, also known as Low Impact Development (LID)/post-construction standards that include a hydromodification component. The MS4 permits also require specific design concepts for LID/post-construction BMPs in the early stages of a project during the entitlement and CEQA process and the development plan review process.

For more information on which Phase I MS4 Permit this project applies to, visit the Central Valley Water Board website at:
http://www.waterboards.ca.gov/centralvalley/water_issues/storm_water/municipal_permits/.

For more information on the Phase II MS4 permit and who it applies to, visit the State Water Resources Control Board at:
http://www.waterboards.ca.gov/water_issues/programs/stormwater/phase_ii_municipal.shtml

Industrial Storm Water General Permit
Storm water discharges associated with industrial sites must comply with the regulations contained in the Industrial Storm Water General Permit Order No. 2014-0057-DWQ.

For more information on the Industrial Storm Water General Permit, visit the Central Valley Water Board website at:
http://www.waterboards.ca.gov/centralvalley/water_issues/storm_water/industrial_general_permits/index.shtml.

Clean Water Act Section 404 Permit
If the project will involve the discharge of dredged or fill material in navigable waters or wetlands, a permit pursuant to Section 404 of the Clean Water Act may be needed from the United States Army Corps of Engineers (USACOE). If a Section 404 permit is required by the USACOE, the Central Valley Water Board will review the permit application to ensure that discharge will not violate water quality standards. If the project requires surface water drainage realignment, the applicant is advised to contact the Department of Fish and Game for information on Streambed Alteration Permit requirements.

[1] Municipal Permits = The Phase I Municipal Separate Storm Water System (MS4) Permit covers medium sized Municipalities (serving between 100,000 and 250,000 people) and large sized municipalities (serving over 250,000 people). The Phase II MS4 provides coverage for small municipalities, including non-traditional Small MS4s, which include military bases, public campuses, prisons and hospitals.

If you have any questions regarding the Clean Water Act Section 404 permits, please contact the Regulatory Division of the Sacramento District of USACOE at (916) 557-5250.

Clean Water Act Section 401 Permit – Water Quality Certification
If an USACOE permit (e.g., Non-Reporting Nationwide Permit, Nationwide Permit, Letter of Permission, Individual Permit, Regional General Permit, Programmatic General Permit), or any other federal permit (e.g., Section 10 of the Rivers and Harbors Act or Section 9 from the United States Coast Guard), is required for this project due to the disturbance of waters of the United States (such as streams and wetlands), then a Water Quality Certification must be obtained from the Central Valley Water Board prior to initiation of project activities. There are no waivers for 401 Water Quality Certifications.

Waste Discharge Requirements – Discharges to Waters of the State
If USACOE determines that only non-jurisdictional waters of the State (i.e., "non-federal" waters of the State) are present in the proposed project area, the proposed project may require a Waste Discharge Requirement (WDR) permit to be issued by Central Valley Water Board. Under the California Porter-Cologne Water Quality Control Act, discharges to all waters of the State, including all wetlands and other waters of the State including, but not limited to, isolated wetlands, are subject to State regulation.

For more information on the Water Quality Certification and WDR processes, visit the Central Valley Water Board website at:
http://www.waterboards.ca.gov/centralvalley/help/business_help/permit2.shtml.

Dewatering Permit
If the proposed project includes construction or groundwater dewatering to be discharged to land, the proponent may apply for coverage under State Water Board General Water Quality Order (Low Risk General Order) 2003-0003 or the Central Valley Water Board's Waiver of Report of Waste Discharge and Waste Discharge Requirements (Low Risk Waiver) R5-2013-0145. Small temporary construction dewatering projects are projects that discharge groundwater to land from excavation activities or dewatering of underground utility vaults. Dischargers seeking coverage under the General Order or Waiver must file a Notice of Intent with the Central Valley Water Board prior to beginning discharge.

For more information regarding the Low Risk General Order and the application process, visit the Central Valley Water Board website at:

http://www.waterboards.ca.gov/board_decisions/adopted_orders/water_quality/2003/wqo/wqo2003-0003.pdf

For more information regarding the Low Risk Waiver and the application process, visit the Central Valley Water Board website at:

http://www.waterboards.ca.gov/centralvalley/board_decisions/adopted_orders/waivers/r5-2013-0145_res.pdf

Regulatory Compliance for Commercially Irrigated Agriculture
If the property will be used for commercial irrigated agricultural, the discharger will be required to obtain regulatory coverage under the Irrigated Lands Regulatory Program. There are two options to comply:

1. **Obtain Coverage Under a Coalition Group.** Join the local Coalition Group that supports land owners with the implementation of the Irrigated Lands Regulatory Program. The Coalition Group conducts water quality monitoring and reporting to the Central Valley Water Board on behalf of its growers. The Coalition Groups charge an annual membership fee, which varies by Coalition Group. To find the Coalition Group in your area, visit the Central Valley Water Board's website at: http://www.waterboards.ca.gov/centralvalley/water_issues/irrigated_lands/app_approval/index.shtml; or contact water board staff at (916) 464-4611 or via email at IrrLands@waterboards.ca.gov.

2. **Obtain Coverage Under the General Waste Discharge Requirements for Individual Growers, General Order R5-2013-0100**. Dischargers not participating in a third-party group (Coalition) are regulated individually. Depending on the specific site conditions, growers may be required to monitor runoff from their property, install monitoring wells, and submit a notice of intent, farm plan, and other action plans regarding their actions to comply with their General Order. Yearly costs would include State administrative fees (for example, annual fees for farm sizes from 10-100 acres are currently $1,084 + $6.70/Acre); the cost to prepare annual monitoring reports; and water quality monitoring costs. To enroll as an Individual Discharger under the Irrigated Lands Regulatory Program, call the Central Valley Water Board phone line at (916) 464-4611 or e-mail board staff at IrrLands@waterboards.ca.gov.

Low or Limited Threat General NPDES Permit

If the proposed project includes construction dewatering and it is necessary to discharge the groundwater to waters of the United States, the proposed project will require coverage under a National Pollutant Discharge Elimination System (NPDES) permit. Dewatering discharges are typically considered a low or limited threat to water quality and may be covered under the General Order for *Dewatering and Other Low Threat Discharges to Surface Waters* (Low Threat General Order) or the General Order for *Limited Threat Discharges of Treated/Untreated Groundwater from Cleanup Sites, Wastewater from Superchlorination Projects, and Other Limited Threat Wastewaters to Surface Water* (Limited Threat General Order). A complete application must be submitted to the Central Valley Water Board to obtain coverage under these General NPDES permits.

For more information regarding the Low Threat General Order and the application process, visit the Central Valley Water Board website at:
http://www.waterboards.ca.gov/centralvalley/board_decisions/adopted_orders/general_orders/r5-2013-0074.pdf

For more information regarding the Limited Threat General Order and the application process, visit the Central Valley Water Board website at: http://www.waterboards.ca.gov/centralvalley/board_decisions/adopted_orders/general_orders/r5-2013-0073.pdf

If you have questions regarding these comments, please contact me at (916) 464-4644 or Stephanie.Tadlock@waterboards.ca.gov.

Stephanie Tadlock

Stephanie Tadlock
Environmental Scientist

cc: State Clearinghouse unit, Governor's Office of Planning and Research, Sacramento

Letter 3: Central Valley Regional Water Quality Control Board

Response to Letter 3:

The Central Valley Regional Water Quality Control Board staff submitted a letter that is a standard recital of the permitting requirements for development projects that are under the jurisdiction of the Board.

The proposed Flyway Farms Restoration Project will be required to apply, and receive approval, for encroachment and other permits from the Board, as noted on page 63 (Required Approvals) of the Draft Supplemental EIR.

The letter includes no comments on the specific details of the proposed project, or on the environmental analysis or mitigation measures include in the DSEIR. No issues regarding the adequacy of the DSEIR are made in this comment and no further response is necessary.

DELTA STEWARDSHIP COUNCIL
A California State Agency

980 NINTH STREET, SUITE 1500
SACRAMENTO, CALIFORNIA 95814
HTTP://DELTACOUNCIL.CA.GOV
(916) 445-5511

January 27, 2016

Eric Parfrey, Principal Planner
Yolo County, Public Works and Environmental Services
292 West Beamer Street
Woodland, CA 95695
Eric.Parfrey@yolocounty.org

RE: Supplemental Environmental Impact Report for the Yolo Flyway Farms Restoration Project, SCH# 2011032001

Dear Mr. Parfrey:

Thank for you for the opportunity to comment on the Supplemental Environmental Impact Report (SEIR) for the Yolo Flyway Farms Restoration Project. The Yolo Flyway Farms Restoration Project was originally analyzed as a portion of Phase 2 in the Environmental Impact Report for the Lower Yolo Restoration Project completed by the State and Federal Contractors Water Agency (SFCWA) in 2013. Given the current uncertainty of implementation of the Lower Yolo Restoration Project and the continuing interest of the landowner in pursuing tidal wetland restoration of the Flyway Farms property, the SEIR analyzes the effects of the Flyway Farms Restoration Project regardless of whether or not SFCWA eventually proceeds with the Lower Yolo Restoration Project.

As you know, the Delta Stewardship Council (Council) is a state agency created by the California Legislature through the Delta Reform Act of 2009 to develop and implement a legally enforceable long-term management plan for the Delta. The Delta Plan applies a common sense approach based on the best available science to achieve the coequal goals of protecting and enhancing the Delta ecosystem and providing for a more reliable water supply for California in a manner that protects and enhances the unique cultural, recreational, natural resource, and agricultural values of the Delta as an evolving place.

As recognized in the SEIR, it is the state or local agency approving, funding, or carrying out the project that must determine if that project is a "covered action" subject to Delta Plan regulations, and if so, file a certification of consistency that describes whether the covered action is consistent with the Delta Plan. Council staff is available for early consultation to help guide Yolo County through the covered action process. Below we have highlighted a few key regulatory policies from the Delta Plan that are particularly germane to the Yolo Flyway Farms Restoration Project.

"Coequal goals" means the two goals of providing a more reliable water supply for California and protecting, restoring, and enhancing the Delta ecosystem. The coequal goals shall be achieved in a manner that protects and enhances the unique cultural, recreational, natural resource, and agricultural values of the Delta as an evolving place."

– CA Water Code §85054

Delta Plan Regulations

Best Available Science and Adaptive Management

Delta Plan Policy **G P1** (23 California Code of Regulations [CCR] Section 5002) states that covered actions must document use of best available science. Best available science should be consistent with the criteria listed in the table in Appendix 1A of the Delta Plan regulations, available at http://deltacouncil.ca.gov/docs/appendix-1a. This policy also calls for ecosystem restoration projects to include adequate provisions for continued implementation of adaptive management, appropriate to the scope of the action. This requirement can be satisfied through the development of an adaptive management plan that is consistent with the framework described in Appendix 1B of the Delta Plan (http://deltacouncil.ca.gov/docs/appendix-1b), along with documentation of adequate resources to implement the proposed adaptive management process. We want to offer the assistance of our Adaptive Management Liaisons from the Delta Science Program who can provide further guidance to help the landowner and Yolo County with documentation of use of best available science and preparation of an adaptive management plan. Please contact Darcy Austin (darcy.austin@deltacouncil.ca.gov) of the Delta Science Program to arrange those discussions.

The SEIR mentions that a long-term management plan and associated monitoring program is currently being developed in coordination with CDFW staff and in alignment with the Tidal Marsh Work Group. We support the decision of the landowner to hold off on completion of a long-term management plan for the Yolo Flyway Farms project so that it can better align with the Interagency Ecological Program (IEP) Tidal Wetlands Monitoring Framework, currently in development. In doing so, the Flyway Farms Project will help contribute to a standardized regional monitoring program that will help inform on the effectiveness of tidal marsh restoration projects across the region.

Mitigation Measures

Delta Plan Policy **G P1** also requires that actions not exempt from CEQA and subject to Delta Plan regulations must include applicable feasible mitigation measures consistent with or more effective than those identified in the Delta Plan EIR. These mitigation measures can be found in the Delta Plan Mitigation and Monitoring Reporting Program (MMRP) document available at http://bit.ly/DeltaPlanMMRP.

Invasive Species

Invasive species are a major obstacle to successful restoration because they affect the survival, health, and distribution of native wildlife and plant species. Although there is little chance of eradicating most established invasive species, management can be designed to reduce their abundance. Delta Plan Policy **ER P5** (23 CCR Section 5009) states, "The potential for new introductions of or improved habitat conditions for nonnative invasive species,

striped bass, or bass must be fully considered and avoided or mitigated in a way that appropriately protects the ecosystem."

One mitigation measure we specifically recommend you considering incorporating into the SEIR is Delta Plan Program EIR's **Biological Resources Mitigation Measure 4-1**, which calls for an invasive species management plan to be developed and implemented for any projects that could lead to introduction or facilitation of invasive species establishment. The plan must ensure that invasive plant species and populations are kept below preconstruction abundance and distribution levels and be based on best available science and developed in consultation with Department of Fish and Wildlife and local experts (e.g., UC Davis, California Invasive Plant Council). This mitigation requirement also calls for the plan to include the following elements:

- Nonnative species eradication methods (if eradication is feasible)
- Nonnative species management methods
- Early detection methods
- Notification requirements
- Best management practices for preconstruction, construction, and post construction periods
- Monitoring, remedial actions and reporting requirements
- Provisions for updating the target species list over the lifetime of the project as new invasive species become potential threats to the integrity of the local ecosystems

Habitat Restoration

Delta Plan Policy **ER P2** (23 CCR Section 5006) states that habitat restoration must occur at appropriate elevations, and be consistent with Appendix 3 of the Delta Plan regulations, which is an excerpt from the 2011 Draft Ecosystem Restoration Program Conservation Strategy. Since the Flyway Farms property is located either around or above intertidal elevation, it appears able to support freshwater tidal marsh habitat that is closely connected to upland transition habitat; this latter type of habitat is rare in the Delta and will allow for the restored tidal wetland to migrate up in elevation in response to future sea level rise.

The Conservation Strategy though states that a major concern for tidal marsh restoration is the risk for this habitat to be colonized by non-native species (e.g., invasive aquatic vegetation) which would in turn limit its benefits for native species. Design of the constructed subtidal channels to have appropriate water depths and velocities that help prevent colonization by invasive aquatic vegetation and post-construction maintenance (e.g., monitoring and regular removal of pervasive terrestrial and aquatic weeds) will be important to help reduce this risk.

Respect Local Land Use

Delta Plan Policy **DP P2** (23 CCR Section 5011) calls for habitat restoration projects to avoid or reduce conflicts with existing uses and to consider comments from local agencies and the Delta Protection Commission (DPC). As such we ask that you consult with the DPC to ensure that the Flyway Farms project is consistent with its Land Use and Resource Management Plan for the Primary Zone of the Delta. This plan was last revised in 2010 and is current being updated.

General Comments

We encourage you to make a few corrections in the SEIR for Flyway Farms to reflect significant changes in Delta planning processes and objectives since SFCWA finalized the EIR for the Lower Yolo Restoration Project in 2013.

- Please remove all references to the "pending Bay Delta Conservation Plan" (see page 161 of SEIR). The Bay Delta Conservation Plan (BDCP) is no longer being pursued as a habitat conservation plan and as a result, there is currently no longer a target for restoration 65,000 acres of tidal aquatic habitat in the Delta and Suisun Marsh. Consider referencing the Governor's EcoRestore program, which is currently pursuing a target of at least 30,000 acres of habitat projects (including floodplain, tidal marsh, and carbon sequestration/subsidence reversal) in the Delta and Suisun Marsh by 2020.
- Please note that CDFW finished construction of the Calhoun Cut-Lindsey Slough Tidal Habitat Restoration Project in 2014 (see SEIR Figure 3-1 on page 49, page 161, and page 165).
- Please clarify in the SEIR that the 2009 NMFS Biological Opinion (BiOp) calls for restoration of 17,000-20,000 acres of seasonal floodplain habitat in the lower Sacramento Valley, while the 2008 USFWS BiOp for delta smelt calls for restoration of 8,000 acres of intertidal and associated subtidal habitat (see page 162 and 187 of SEIR). The SEIR sometimes conflates the habitat restoration targets of these two separate BiOps.
- Please make revisions to the SEIR to acknowledge that the Delta Stewardship Council is the successor to CALFED and the Delta Plan is not in draft, but was adopted in 2013 (see page 108 of SEIR). Similarly, please correct the citation on page 194 which references the 2012 Final Draft Delta Plan instead of the Delta Plan adopted by the Delta Stewardship Council in May 2013, available on our website at http://deltacouncil.ca.gov/delta-plan-0.

Final Remarks

Overall, we are supportive of the landowner's and Yolo County's initiative to proceed with the Yolo Flyway Farms restoration project, regardless of whether or not SFCWA is able to proceed with implementation of the larger Lower Yolo Restoration Project. We look forward to working

with the Yolo County on this project and providing assistance to you in filing a Delta Plan consistency determination. I encourage you to contact Daniel Huang at Daniel.Huang@deltacouncil.ca.gov or 916-445-5339 if you have any questions.

Sincerely,

Jessica Davenport
Acting Deputy Executive Officer
Delta Stewardship Council

cc Jim Starr, California Department of Fish and Wildlife

Letter 4: Delta Stewardship Council

Response to Letter 4:

Comment 1: The letter notes that "As recognized in the SEIR, it is the state or local agency approving, funding, or carrying out the project that must determine if that project is a 'covered action' subject to Delta Plan regulations, and if so, file a certification of consistency that describes whether the covered action is consistent with the Delta Plan. Council staff is available for early consultation to help guide Yolo County through the covered action process. Below we have highlighted a few key regulatory policies from the Delta Plan that are particularly germane to the Yolo Flyway Farms Restoration Project."

The DSEIR addresses this issue on page 63 and 64. The DSEIR describes the requirements that the lead agency determine whether a project is a "covered action" and, if so, to submit a written certification of consistency. The County has not yet determined if the proposed Flyway Farms Restoration Project is a covered action. The DSEIR notes that "If the Flyway Farms restoration project is approved, the lead agency will make a determination whether the project, based on all information in the administrative record at the time of approval, is a 'Covered Action.' This determination and a filing of consistency certification, if required, will be completed prior to the issuance of any grading or building permits for the project, if it is approved.

As a basis for preparing the consistency certification, State law implementing the Delta Plan (22CCR Section 5002(b)(2)) requires the following:

(b) Certifications of consistency must include detailed findings that address each of the following requirements:

(2) Covered actions not exempt from CEQA must include applicable feasible mitigation measures identified in the Delta Plan's Program EIR (unless the measure(s) are within the exclusive jurisdiction of an agency other than the agency that files the certification of consistency), or substitute mitigation measures that the agency that files the certification of consistency finds are equally or more effective.

If the proposed project is determined by the County to be a "covered action," the County will submit a certification of consistency as required by the Delta Plan regulations prior to the issuance of any grading or building permits.

Comment 2: The letter identifies five specific policies of the Delta Plan that are germane to the proposed Flyway Farms Restoration Project. The project's consistency or relationship with each of these cited policies is discussed below.

Best Available Science and Adaptive Management

Delta Plan Policy G P1 states that covered actions must document use of best available science. This policy also calls for ecosystem restoration projects to include adequate provisions for

continued implementation of adaptive management, appropriate to the scope of the action. This requirement can be satisfied through the development of an adaptive management plan that is consistent with the framework described in the Delta Plan.

The Lower Yolo Restoration Project, including the Flyway Farms project which is a part of the larger project, has been designed by a team of applicants and consultants that have employed the best available science related to wetland restoration and creation of habitat for listed aquatic species. The list of studies and consultations with professional biologists, hydrologists, and federal and state wildlife and fishery agencies is documented in the lengthy bibliography for the certified Final Environmental Impact Report for the Lower Yolo Restoration Project (the bibliography is reprinted and augmented in the Draft Supplemental EIR for the Flyway Farms project.

Regarding the requirement to develop an adaptive management plan, the letter notes the discussion in the SElR that a long-term management plan and associated monitoring program for the Flyway Farms project is currently being developed in coordination with California Department of Fish and Wildlife staff and in alignment with the Tidal Marsh Work Group. The letter states that the DSC "supports the decision of the landowner to hold off on completion of a long-term management plan for the Yolo Flyway Farms project so that it can better align with the Interagency Ecological Program (IEP) Tidal Wetlands Monitoring Framework, currently in development. In doing so, the Flyway Farms Project will help contribute to a standardized regional monitoring program that will help inform on the effectiveness of tidal marsh restoration projects across the region." No further response is required.

Mitigation Measures

Delta Plan Policy G P1 also requires that actions not exempt from CEQA and subject to Delta Plan regulations must include applicable feasible mitigation measures consistent with or more effective than those identified in the Delta Plan EIR. A lengthy table has been prepared that lists all of the relevant Delta Plan EIR mitigation measures and describes the consistency of the Flyway Farms project with the measures. The table is included as Appendix A.

lnvasive Species

Delta Plan Policy ER P5 states that "The potential for new introductions of or improved habitat conditions for nonnative invasive species, striped bass, or bass must be fully considered and avoided or mitigated in a way that appropriately protects the ecosystem." The Delta Plan Program EIR contains a mitigation measure which calls for an invasive species management plan to be developed and implemented to ensure that invasive plant species and populations are kept below preconstruction abundance and distribution levels and be based on best available science and developed in consultation with Department of Fish and Wildlife and local experts (e.g., UC Davis, California lnvasive Plant Council).

Potential impacts of the Flyway Farms project related to invasive species are analyzed on pages 109 and 110 in the DSEIR. The analysis states:

> [T]he project would have "built in" aquatic habitat features designed to favor native fish species, while discouraging the establishment and colonization by non-native, piscivorous fish. The tidal channel geometry would be excavated to depths approximately two to six feet below local mean lower low water (MLLW) to minimize the potential for colonization by aquatic vegetation, which can provide habitat for piscivorous fish. Channels also would be sized to promote peak tidal flow velocities of about three feet per second, which would minimize invasive Brazilian waterweed (*Egeria densa*) from becoming established onsite…

The DSEIR also notes that "Further offsetting predation losses would be the rearing benefits of the seasonal floodplain habitat demonstrated to benefit juvenile Chinook salmon and Sacramento splittail. An increase in seasonal floodplain wetland habitat and high food productivity provided by the Project would result in robust growth rates and increased production of these fish, thereby further increasing their chances to survive predation."

The DSEIR concludes that "The project would not substantially increase predation that would have population-level effects on special-status or other native fish, due to the offsets and relatively vast distributions of native fish populations represented onsite. Thus, predation impacts would be less than significant. No mitigation would be required."

Regarding invasive plant species, the constructed channels within the restoration area of the project site are designed to discourage conditions that encourage colonization by aquatic weeds, i.e., shallow, slow moving or stagnant water. The channels are designed to create high peak water velocities (approaching 3 meters/second) during periods of tidal exchange and will also be excavated several feet to a subtidal depth that will create open water conditions which do not favor aquatic weeds.

The following text is added to the Final SEIR on page110 under the heading "Alterations in Habitat Composition due to Increases in Colonizing Invasive Plant Species," following the second sentence:

"An Invasive Species Plan will be included in the long term management plan for the project that will be prepared at a later date in coordination with the Department of Water Resources. The following steps will be included in the Invasive Species Plan:

<u>Mapping.</u> The site manager will map the presence of non-native invasive terrestrial and aquatic plant species on regular basis to provide a baseline and follow trends in weed growth. Mapping will utilize GIS, aerial photography and biological survey data as necessary.

<u>Survey.</u> A qualified biologist will conduct an annual survey and offer a qualitative assessment of observed noxious weeds or other unwanted terrestrial or aquatic plants and recommend

measures to control such plants that may be adversely impacting the achievement of site biological goals. The land manager shall respond to such recommendations in the annual report.

Control. Control techniques available to control terrestrial species include hand or mechanical removal, chemical treatment, and targeted livestock grazing. For aquatic plants, techniques are limited to hand or mechanical removal and chemical treatment. Only chemicals approved for use for such purposes in California may be employed in any control action. Because funding and time to get to an infestation site may be limiting factors, monitoring may be done simultaneously with treatments to save time.

Follow-up monitoring will occur at the time of year and frequency sufficient to detect change in the populations of invasive plants and the effects of any treatments.

The California Invasive Plant Council provides guidance for weed mapping field protocols and treatment plans. Particular attention should be given to species rated with a high negative ecological impact in California. High-impact invasive plant species known to occur in Delta wetlands and floodplain habitats include, but are not limited to:

Brazilian waterweed, *Egeria densa* (submerged aquatic vegetation)
Water hyacinth, *Eichronia crassipes* (floating aquatic vegetation)
Water primrose, *Ludwigia hexapetela* (submerged aquatic vegetation)
Perennial pepperweed, *Lepidium latifolium* (facultative wetland)

Targeted grazing for control of invasive weeds may be used in the restoration. Targeted grazing defines the application of a specific kind of livestock at a determined season, duration, and intensity to accomplish defined vegetation goals. The major difference between traditional grazing management and targeted grazing is that targeted grazing refocuses outputs of grazing from livestock production to vegetation management and landscape enhancement. Specific targeted grazing regimes will need to be developed on a case by case basis as infestations of invasive weeds are identified. Livestock will be excluded from areas of the restoration site not targeted for grazing with temporary livestock fencing."

Habitat Restoration

Delta Plan Policy ER P2 states that habitat restoration must occur at appropriate elevations, and be consistent with Delta Plan regulations. The letter notes that "Since the Flyway Farms property is located either around or above intertidal elevation, it appears able to support freshwater tidal marsh habitat that is closely connected to upland transition habitat; this latter type of habitat is rare in the Delta and will allow for the restored tidal wetland to migrate up in elevation in response to future sea level rise."

However, the DSC letter expresses concern for the risk that the newly created habitat on the project could be colonized by non-native species (e.g., invasive aquatic vegetation) which would

in turn limit its benefits for native species. This issue has been addressed in the previous response, above.

Respect Local Land Use

Delta Plan Policy DP P2 calls for habitat restoration projects to avoid or reduce conflicts with existing uses and to consider comments from local agencies and the Delta Protection Commission (DPC).

The DSEIR discusses potential conflicts with Yolo County policies and with policies of the DPC's Land Use and Resource Management Plan on pages through . The analysis concludes that the Flyway Farms project would not create any conflicts, after appropriate mitigation is implemented, and that the project is generally consistent with the relevant DPC LURMP policies. In addition, the DPC has submitted a letter. In response to the DPC letter, additional discussion of the LURMP policies is proposed to be inserted on page 123 of the DSEIR (see response to DPC letter).

Comment 3: The letter requests that the County correct and update a number of references in the DSEIR to reflect significant changes in Delta planning processes and objectives since SFCWA finalized the FEIR for the Lower Yolo Restoration Project in 2013. These corrections include:

- Remove all references to the "pending Bay Delta Conservation Plan" and reference the Governor's EcoRestore program;
- Note that CDFW finished construction of the Calhoun Cut-Lindsey Slough Tidal Habitat Restoration Project in 2014;
- Clarify that the 2009 NMFS Biological Opinion (BiOp) calls for restoration of 17,000-20,000 acres of seasonal floodplain habitat in the lower Sacramento Valley, while the 2008 USFWS BiOp for delta smelt calls for restoration of 8,000 acres of intertidal and associated subtidal habitat; and
- Revise the DSEIR to acknowledge that the Delta Stewardship Council is the successor to CALFED and the Delta Plan is not in draft, but was adopted in 2013.

All of these corrections have been accepted and made. The corrected text is included in Section 4.0 of this Final SEIR (Draft SEIR Text Changes).

SFCWA
State & Federal Contractors Water Agency
1121 L Street, Suite 806, Sacramento, CA 95814

January 28, 2016

Mr. Eric Parfrey, Principal Planner
Yolo County Planning and Public Works Department
292 W. Beamer Street
Woodland, CA 95695

RE: Supplemental EIR for Yolo Flyway Farms Restoration Project

Dear Mr. Parfrey:

The State and Federal Contractors Water Agency certified a Final EIR for the Lower Yolo Ranch Restoration Project. As noted in the subject supplemental EIR, restoration on the Flyway Farms property was incorporated in our EIR as it was contemplated that this property would be restored concurrent with the Lower Yolo Ranch Project. The Flyway Farms project has independent utility as a habitat restoration project and we believe it remains consistent with the Lower Yolo Ranch project, which we expect will ultimately be constructed as well.

SFCWA supports completion of the CEQA process for the Flyway Farms project.

Sincerely,

Byron M. Buck
Executive Director

1

Letter 5: State & Federal Contractors Water Agency

Response to Letter 5:

The letter from the Executive Director of the State & Federal Contractors Water Agency states that the proposed Flyway Farms Restoration Project is consistent with Yolo Ranch Project and expresses support for completion of the CEQA process. No issues regarding the adequacy of the DEIR are made in this comment and no further response is necessary.

STATE OF CALIFORNIA – NATURAL RESOURCES AGENCY EDMUND G. BROWN, JR., *Governor*

DELTA PROTECTION COMMISSION
2101 Stone Blvd., Suite 210
West Sacramento, CA 95691
(916) 375-4800 / FAX (916) 376-3962
www.delta.ca.gov

January 29, 2016

Eric Parfrey
Principal Planner
Yolo County Department of Planning, Public Works, and Environmental Services
292 West Beamer Street
Woodland, CA 95695-2598

Re: Yolo Flyway Farms Restoration Project (ZF #2014-0016, State Clearinghouse #2011032001)

Dear Mr. Parfrey:

Thank you for providing the Delta Protection Commission (Commission) the opportunity to review the Yolo Flyway Farms Restoration Project Supplemental Environmental Impact Report (Project). The Project was previously analyzed as part of the Lower Yolo Restoration Project EIR. The Supplemental EIR is assessing the environmental effects of changes to the project, including using an adjacent 80-acre parcel as a soil deposit site and reassessing the overall impacts of the Project on agricultural resources.

The Project is subject to the Commission's land use jurisdiction because it is located in the Primary Zone of the Legal Delta and meets the definition of "development" as described in Public Resources Codes Section 29723(a). State law requires local government general plans in the Primary Zone to be consistent with the Commission's Land Use and Resource Management Plan (LURMP). The Commission has found the Yolo County General Plan to be consistent with the LURMP. Local government actions concerning development projects in the Primary Zone can be appealed to the Commission.

The Commission urges the County to review the Project for compliance with LURMP policies, particularly those related to conversion of agricultural lands to other uses, acquisition of agricultural conservation easements, protection of natural resources, and compatibility between agricultural and natural habitat uses, in the Final EIR. The County may want to consider mitigation measures to address potential noise impacts on nearby residents.

Thank you for the opportunity to provide input. Please contact Blake Roberts, Senior Environmental Planner, at (916) 375-4237 for any questions regarding the comments provided.

Sincerely,

Erik Vink
Executive Director

cc: Oscar Villegas, Yolo County Board of Supervisors

Letter 6: Delta Protection Commission

Response to Letter 6:

Comment 1: The letter from the Executive Director of the Delta Protection Commission (DPC) "urges the County to review the Project for compliance with LURMP policies, particularly those related to conversion of agricultural lands to other uses, acquisition of agricultural conservation easements, protection of natural resources, and compatibility between agricultural and natural habitat uses, in the Final EIR."

The Flyway Farms Supplemental EIR incorporates by reference all of the "Setting" discussions that were included in the original 2013 Lower Yolo Restoration Project EIR. That EIR did include a summary of relevant goals and policies of the DPC's Land Use Resource Management Plan (LURMP) (pages 4.5-9 and 4.5-10) and concluded that the larger Lower Yolo Restoration Project was "generally consistent" with the LURMP policies.

The Supplemental EIR updates some of the 2013 "Setting" discussion to correct inaccuracies in the characterization of Yolo County plans and ordinances in the 2013 FEIR, and includes a brief description of the LURMP. However, the DSEIR does not include an updated discussion of the project's consistency with the LURMP policies.

Thus, the following additional discussion of the LURMP is proposed to be inserted on page 123 of the DSEIR following the single paragraph under the title "Delta Protection Commission's Land Use Resource Management Plan":

The LURMP goals and policies that are relevant to the proposed project are listed below.

Land Use Policies

P-3. New non-agriculturally oriented residential, recreational, commercial, habitat, restoration, or industrial development shall ensure that appropriate buffer areas are provided by those proposing new development to prevent conflicts between any proposed use and existing adjacent agricultural parcels. Buffers shall adequately protect integrity of land for existing and future agricultural uses and shall not include uses that conflict with agricultural operations on adjacent agricultural lands. Appropriate buffer setbacks shall be determined in consultation with local Agricultural Commissioners, and shall be based on applicable general plan policies and criteria included in Right-to-Farm Ordinances adopted by local jurisdictions.

P-8. Local government policies regarding mitigation of adverse environmental impacts under the California Environmental Quality Act may allow mitigation beyond county boundaries, if acceptable to reviewing fish and wildlife agencies and with approval of the recipient jurisdiction, for example in approved mitigation banks or in the case of agricultural loss to mitigation. Mitigation in the Primary Zone for loss of agricultural lands in the Secondary Zone may be appropriate if the mitigation program supports continued farming in the Primary Zone.

California Government Code Section 51256.3 specifically allows an agricultural conservation easement located within the Primary or Secondary Zone of the Delta to be related to Williamson Act contract rescissions in any other portion of the secondary zone without respect to County boundary limitations.

Agricultural Policies

P-1. Support and encourage agriculture in the Delta as a key element in the State's economy and in providing the food supply needed to sustain the increasing population of the State, the Nation, and the world.

P-2. Conversion of land to non-agriculturally-oriented uses should occur first where productivity and agricultural values are lowest.

P-6. Encourage acquisition of agricultural conservation easements from willing sellers as mitigation for projects within each county. Promote use of environmental mitigation in agricultural areas only when it is consistent and compatible with ongoing agricultural operations and when developed in appropriate locations designated on a countywide or Deltawide habitat management plan.

P-7. Encourage management of agricultural lands which maximize wildlife habitat seasonally and year-round, through techniques such as fall and winter flooding, leaving crop residue, creation of mosaic of small grains and flooded areas, wildlife friendly farming, controlling predators, controlling poaching, controlling public access, and others.

P-8. Encourage the protection of agricultural areas, recreational resources and sensitive biological habitats, and the reclamation of those areas from the destruction caused by inundation.

Natural Resource Policies

P-5. Preserve and protect the viability of agricultural areas by including an adequate financial mechanism in any planned conversion of agricultural lands to wildlife habitat for conservation purposes. The financial mechanism shall specifically offset the loss of local government and special district revenues necessary to support public services and infrastructure.

P-6. Support the implementation of appropriate buffers, management plans and/or good neighbor policies (e.g. safe harbor agreements) that among other things, limit liability for incidental take associated with adjacent agricultural and recreational activities within lands converted to wildlife habitat to ensure the ongoing agricultural and recreational operations adjacent to the converted lands are not negatively affected.

The proposed Yolo Flyway Farms Restoration Project is generally consistent with all the above policies. The project is not proposing to establish an agricultural conservation easement on the property, but would be under restrictions imposed by the federal and State agencies that would approve the land for conservation purposes. Agricultural lands that are adjacent to the newly created intertidal wetlands are also proposed for similar restoration and would be enhanced, not adversely affected by the project. The project is being required to mitigate for the small amount of agriculturally productive land that is being converted.

Comment 2: The DPC letter comments that "the County may want to consider mitigation measures to address potential noise impacts on nearby residents."

The Supplemental EIR did not analyze impacts related to noise impacts on adjacent residents because the issue was specifically "scoped out" as a potentially significant environmental issue by Notice of Preparation/Initial Study included in the Final EIR for the Lower Yolo Restoration Project. There are few residences in the vicinity of the project and there is no potential for impacts generated by the Flyway Farms project. The SEIR discusses this issue on page 13 and states the following, in referring to the conclusions of the previous Notice of Preparation/Initial Study:

> Construction of the project would temporarily increase noise in the vicinity of the project site. Scrapers typically generate 83 to 91 decibels (dBA) at 50 feet, while haul trucks generate 83-94 dBA and loaders generate about 80 to 85 dBA at this distance (Bolt et al. 1987). Potential sensitive receptors could include a very few individuals who may reside on the ranch compound in the northwest corner of the Lower Yolo project site and at the three or fewer farm residences that are located within one mile west of the Yolo Bypass levee (not on or near the Flyway Farms site). The proposed earthmoving activities would not involve pile driving, blasting, or other vibration generating activities.
>
> The Initial Study and the Final EIR concluded that noise impacts would be "less than significant" or "no impact" and therefore no further analysis was included in the Final EIR for the Lower Yolo Restoration Project. The addition of the 80-acre soil deposit site to the Flyway Farms project would not change this assessment of potential noise impacts, as the 80-acre property shares the same characteristics as the 362-acre main parcel of Flyway Farms and other properties within the larger Lower Yolo Restoration Project, and any existing residences are further away from the Flyway Farms parcels than the Lower Yolo parcels.

No further response is required.

4.0 DRAFT SEIR TEXT CHANGES

This chapter contains revisions to the DSEIR. Additions to the text are indicated by underlining and ~~strikethrough~~.

Page 108

Impacts

The Lower Yolo project would create up to 1,226 acres (including 278 acres at Flyway Farms) of perennial emergent tidal marsh habitats for several species of fish; would immediately expand critical habitats for winter- and spring-run Chinook salmon, steelhead, and delta smelt; provide more EFH for all four runs of Chinook salmon; and would thereby result in a substantial beneficial effect for these aquatic biological resources. This benefit would be the primary objective of the Project in meeting the federal obligations of the Biological Opinions set forth by USFWS and NMFS. The creation of additional acres of habitat is also consistent with the CALFED and Delta Vision planning process (in particular the Delta Stewardship Council's, successor to CALFED, ~~draft~~ 2013 Delta Plan), near term objectives described in the Governor's pending ~~Bay Delta Conservation Plan~~ Governor's EcoRestore program.

Page110

Under the heading "Alterations in Habitat Composition due to Increases in Colonizing Invasive Plant Species," insert the following after the second sentence:

An Invasive Species Plan will be included in the long term management plan for the project that will be prepared at a later date in coordination with the Department of Water Resources. The following steps will be included in the Invasive Species Plan:

Mapping. The site manager will map the presence of non-native invasive terrestrial and aquatic plant species on regular basis to provide a baseline and follow trends in weed growth. Mapping will utilize GIS, aerial photography and biological survey data as necessary.

Survey. A qualified biologist will conduct an annual survey and offer a qualitative assessment of observed noxious weeds or other unwanted terrestrial or aquatic plants and recommend measures to control such plants that may be adversely impacting the achievement of site biological goals. The land manager shall respond to such recommendations in the annual report.

Control. Control techniques available to control terrestrial species include hand or mechanical removal, chemical treatment, and targeted livestock grazing. For aquatic plants, techniques are

limited to hand or mechanical removal and chemical treatment. Only chemicals approved for use for such purposes in California may be employed in any control action. Because funding and time to get to an infestation site may be limiting factors, monitoring may be done simultaneously with treatments to save time.

Follow-up monitoring will occur at the time of year and frequency sufficient to detect change in the populations of invasive plants and the effects of any treatments.

The California Invasive Plant Council provides guidance for weed mapping field protocols and treatment plans. Particular attention should be given to species rated with a high negative ecological impact in California. High-impact invasive plant species known to occur in Delta wetlands and floodplain habitats include, but are not limited to:

Brazilian waterweed, *Egeria densa* (submerged aquatic vegetation)
Water hyacinth, *Eichronia crassipes* (floating aquatic vegetation)
Water primrose, *Ludwigia hexapetela* (submerged aquatic vegetation)
Perennial pepperweed, *Lepidium latifolium* (facultative wetland)

Targeted grazing for control of invasive weeds may be used in the restoration. Targeted grazing defines the application of a specific kind of livestock at a determined season, duration, and intensity to accomplish defined vegetation goals. The major difference between traditional grazing management and targeted grazing is that targeted grazing refocuses outputs of grazing from livestock production to vegetation management and landscape enhancement. Specific targeted grazing regimes will need to be developed on a case by case basis as infestations of invasive weeds are identified. Livestock will be excluded from areas of the restoration site not targeted for grazing with temporary livestock fencing.

Page 152

4.10.1 Cumulative Impacts Analysis on Hydrology

Flood Conveyance Cumulative Impacts

Up to ~~55,000~~ 30,000 acres (ac) of tidal wetland restoration projects identified in the ~~Bay Delta Conservation Plan (BDCP)~~ Governor's EcoRestore program are now under consideration within the project vicinity as well as throughout the Delta (see Table 4.10.2 in the original Final EIR for the Lower Yolo Restoration Project, which is included as Appendix A to this SEIR). The primary hydrologic concern of these actions is their potential cumulative impact on tidal heights in the project vicinity and how this could affect flood conveyance within the Yolo Bypass and ultimately the Delta. The California Department of Water Resources (DWR) conducted preliminary modeling of the effects of restoring approximately 7,500 ac of tidal marsh in the Cache Slough region (Enright, personal communication, 2010). This modeling effort indicated that tidal marsh restoration would reduce the Mean Higher High Water (MHHW) elevation by up to 0.3 feet (ft), thus resulting in a net benefit to flood conveyance within the Delta. Other

actions resulting from studies generated by the CALFED Delta Risk Management Strategy (DRMS) and from funding through the FloodSAFE Strategic Plan would strengthen the levees and channels in Yolo County and elsewhere in the Delta, thereby also providing a beneficial effect to flood protection and flood conveyance in the Yolo Bypass.

~~BDCP~~ ~~m~~Modeling completed by the previous BDCP program of its various isolated facilities alternatives with respect to the Yolo Bypass/Fremont Weir indicated that flow would be equal to or less than what is currently occurring…

Page 155

Dissolved Organic Carbon Levels Cumulative Impacts

Dissolved organic matter (DOC) loads to Delta waters from restored tidal marshes could be a concern to municipal water suppliers, due to the increased potential for disinfection byproduct (DBP) formation. Greatly increased concentrations of DOC could prove to be problematic. The proposed Project lies within the Cache Slough ~~Restoration Opportunity Area (ROA)~~ area, where two other wetland restoration projects are planned and the ~~draft BDCP~~ Governor's EcoRestore program has identified the area for ~~5,000 ac of~~ tidal restoration.

Page 156

Other Water Quality Issues Cumulative Impacts

Sediment, trash, and spills from construction activities at the Project site would have a less-than¬significant impact on water quality in the Delta, due to implementing best management practices (BMP) identified as part of the scope of the Project, along with the preparation and implementation of a storm-water pollution prevention plan (SWPPP) and a spill prevention and control plan (SPCP) (see Chapter 3, Project Description). Potential construction impacts would be isolated to on or near the site, and other related projects (refer to Table 4.10-2) in the immediate area of the Project would be subject to the same stringent requirements to avoid affecting the water quality from sediment, trash, and spills. Therefore, construction impacts of the Project would not be cumulatively considerable to these particular water quality concerns. Tidal restoration to meet the federal biological opinions (BiOps) requirements of 8,000 ac and the ~~BDCP~~ Governor's EcoRestore program targets of ~~55,000~~ 30,000 ac, along with sea level rise projections, have the potential to change the hydrodynamics of the San Francisco Estuary and Delta such that oceanic salinity may extend further inland (see Section 4.1, Hydrology).

Page 158

Delete the two references to the BDCP in the first and fourth paragraphs.

Page 159

Delete the reference to the BDCP in the fourth paragraph.

Page 160

Foraging Habitat for Special-status Raptors Cumulative Impacts

The proposed project would result in a long-term loss of foraging habitat for Swainson's hawk, white-tailed kite, and loggerhead shrike as would several other related projects. In the event that all future restoration efforts and conservation banks listed in Table 4.10-2 are realized and the full ~~BDCP~~ EcoRestore program restoration targets are met, approximately ~~55,000~~ 30,000 ac of agricultural and wetland habitat would be restored to historic conditions in the Delta, Yolo Bypass, and Suisun Marsh…

Page 161

At the western end of Lindsey Slough, the Calhoun Cut tidal wetland enhancement project ~~is currently being planned~~ was completed by the California Department of Fish and Wildlife (CDFW) in 2014. The ~~forthcoming BDCP has identified a 5,000 ac tidal restoration target for the Cache Slough Complex; the project as well as Prospect Island would likely count toward that target. In addition to specific projects, BDCP has identified six ROAs totaling approximately 200,000 ac within which it has identified minimum restoration targets totaling 22,000 ac. Within some or all of these regions, restoration activities would take place to bring the total restoration area up to the currently identified target of 55,000 ac.~~ Governor's EcoRestore program is currently pursuing a target of at least 30,000 acres of habitat projects (including floodplain, tidal marsh, and carbon sequestration/subsidence reversal) in the Delta and Suisun Marsh by 2020.

Page 162

The cumulative impacts analyses of the project on aquatic biological resources were judged not significant for a number of reasons, as detailed in Table 4.10-3 (in the original FEIR). Overall, the reasons leading to this conclusion included the following attributes of the related projects:

- Though the 8,000-ac restoration obligation under the ~~two BiOps~~ 2008 USFWS BiOp for delta smelt is in place and ~~BDCP the~~ Governor's EcoRestore program, with the presumed ~~55,000~~ 30,000-ac restoration obligation, may be agreed upon in the next year or two, most of the actual projects to meet those obligations are currently not identified or not well defined. CEQA does not require speculation or consideration of projects that are not "probable."

Page 163

4.10.5 Cumulative Impacts Analysis on Agricultural Resources

Important Farmland and Productivity Loss Cumulative Impacts

Much of the Delta lands are in agricultural use. Related projects in Table 4.10.2 (Appendix A) have at least one or more of the following attributes: habitat protection and ecosystem restoration, water conveyance and water quality, flood control and levee maintenance, and local and regional land use planning activities. The vast majority of these projects, activities, and programs would have the potential to significantly impact Important Farmland and productivity. Up to ~~55,000~~ 30,000 ac of land in the Delta and Suisun Marsh may be converted to tidal wetlands in order to partially fulfill the ~~two federal~~ USFWS BiOp~~s~~ (requiring 8,000 ac of tidal restoration for the delta smelt) and the ~~BDCP the~~ Governor's EcoRestore program, currently under development (potentially requiring ~~55,000~~ 30,000 ac of wetland restoration, including the 8,000 ac required under the BiOp~~s~~).

Page 164

The proposed Flyway Farms project is one of the first habitat restoration projects designed to meet the two federal BiOps and ~~BDCP~~ Governor's EcoRestore program tidal restoration targets and, as described above, would contribute about 288 acres to the total acreage converted from agricultural to habitat (wetland) uses…

Page 165:

Situated in the Sacramento Valley Air Basin (SVAB), those related projects in Table 4.10-2 (Appendix A) whose construction schedules overlap with the Project's schedule would collectively release air criteria pollutants, mostly notably nitrogen oxides (NOx) and particulate matter (PM). These projects would include, but not be limited to, the Capital Conservation Bank, the CALFED Ecosystem Restoration Program, the Calhoun Cut/Lindsey Slough Tidal Habitat Restoration Project (completed in 2014), the Campbell Ranch Conservation Bank, the Davis-Woodland Water Supply Project, Little Holland Tract Restoration, Putah Creek Wetland Mitigation Bank, Restoring Ecosystem Integrity in the Northwest Delta, SRDWSC Project, and Southport Sacramento River Early Implementation Project.

Page 170

The restoration of ~~55,000~~ 30,000 ac of tidal wetlands in the Delta and Suisun Bay (the preliminarily identified ~~BDCP~~ Governor's EcoRestore program target) could reduce impacts associated with mosquito production in existing ponds and ditches on those sites, but increase mosquito production on new tidal wetland areas…

Page 187

Accordingly, a beneficial effect would result in the economic growth within the County of Yolo. Besides the restoration efforts, the project would partially fulfill the biological opinions (BiOps) requirement ~~of 8,000 ac~~ of habitat restoration for the delta smelt and salmonids in conjunction with the continued, existing operations (OCAP) of the Central Valley Project (CVP) and State Water Project (SWP) facilities, and not their expansion. Hence, no impact (either direct or indirect) would result, because the project would not foster new growth into the region (i.e., new housing or related infrastructure).

Page 194

Delta Stewardship Council ~~2012~~ 2013. ~~*Final Draft*~~ *Delta Plan*. ~~November~~ May. Available online at: http://deltacouncil.ca.gov/delta-plan/ delta-plan-0.

Add Appendix A

Insert Table 4.10-2 (List of Related Projects Utilized in Conducting the Cumulative Impacts Analyses for the Proposed Lower Yolo Restoration Project) from the original 2013 Lower Yolo Restoration Project EIR as Appendix A to the SEIR and add the citation in the Table of Contents. The table is included on the following pages.

Table 4.10-2. List[1] of Related Projects Utilized in Conducting the Cumulative Impacts Analyses for the Proposed Lower Yolo Restoration Project

Names of Related Projects and Lead Agencies (CEQA and/or NEPA)	Location	Brief Descriptions	Status as of April 2013
Anadromous Fish Screen Program (AFSP) (Bureau of Reclamation, U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service [USFWS], and California Department of Fish and Wildlife [CDFW])	Multiple Delta counties, including Yolo County	Protect juvenile Chinook salmon (all runs), steelhead, green and white sturgeon, striped bass and American shad from entrainment at priority diversions throughout the Central Valley, including Sacramento and San Joaquin rivers, their tributaries, the Delta, and the Suisun Marsh. The types of projects eligible for cost-share funds under the AFSP include: construction fish screens on unscreened diversions; rehabilitating existing fish screens; replacing existing non-functioning fish screens; and relocating water diversions to less fishery-sensitive areas. Since 1994, the AFSP has screened 35 high priority diversions ranging from 11 cubic feet per second (cfs) up to 960 cfs. Cumulatively, the AFSP has screened over 5,412 cfs in the Central Valley and the Delta.	Ongoing program. For further information, go to http://www.fws.gov/cno/fisheries/cvpia/AnadromFishScreen.cfm and http://www.usbr.gov/mp/cvpia/docs_reports/meetings/2013/AFSP_Presentation-Public_Meeting1-17-13.pdf?bcsi-ac-a8c0312cffb9ad05=2032707400000002VxA/1szVEffrvD5ei75Ccqw0fDhLBwAAAgAAAPDDGwCEAwAAAwAAAF+wAAA=
Aquatic Weed Control Program (California Department of Boating and Waterways)	Delta and its tributaries (multiple Delta counties, including Yolo County)	To implement both short- and long-term measures to control Brazillian waterweed (*Egeria densa*) and water hyacinth *(Eichhornia crassipes*). Beginning in 2001, this weed control program includes treatment with herbicides, environmental monitoring, regulatory compliance, and surveillance. Permits restrict program treatment in the Delta from April 1 through October 15. Since 1982, the water hyacinth program includes treatment with herbicides, mechanical methods, and biological controls. Permits restrict program treatment of chemicals in the Delta from July 1 through October 15. Every season surveys are done in the Delta region to determine where the hyacinth is located and which areas are in most need of treatment. During the 2012 Legislative session, Assembly Bill 1540 (Buchanan) was approved giving the California Department of Boating and Waterways authority to control a new aquatic weed that has been recently found in the Delta, the South American spongeplant (*Limnobium laevigatum*).	Ongoing program with the agency pursuing new regulatory permits in 2013. Most recent environmental documentation for the waterweed: 2006 Second Addendum to the Certified 2001 Final Environmental Impact Report (EIR) with Five-Year Program Review and Future Operations Plan; 2007 National Marine Fisheries Service Biological Opinion on the program. Go to: http://www.dbw.ca.gov/PDF/Egeria/EIR/eirAdd2.pdf?bcsi-ac-a8c0312cffb9ad05=2032707300000002RzoJ+KZIMVCXPSwBnd/nyDf8LEyFBwAAAgAAANGhHACEAwAAAAAAABW2AAA= A Programmatic EIR for the water hyacinth was certified on December 8, 2009. National Marine Fisheries Service (NMFS) provided its biological opinion on this program on April 4, 2006. Go to: http://www.dbw.ca.gov/BoaterInfo/WaterHyacinth.aspx
Bay Delta Conservation Plan (BDCP) (California Department of Water Resources [DWR]; Bureau of Reclamation [Reclamation])	Multiple Delta counties, including Yolo County	Provide comprehensively for the conservation and management of 54 covered species in the Delta, along with modifying certain existing structures/operations and proposing new water supply diversion facilities in the Delta by state and federal water contractors. If approved, BDCP would restore at least 55,000 acres of tidal wetlands. Specific projects are not defined at this time, but extensive tidal wetland restoration is expected in Cache Slough.	Notice of Preparation was released for review on February 13, 2009. Revised Administrative Draft BDCP released February 2013. Public draft BDCP and EIR/EIS expected summer of 2013. The construction target is 2014. Go to http://baydeltaconservationplan.com/Home.aspx

Table 4.10-2. List[1] of Related Projects Utilized in Conducting the Cumulative Impacts Analyses for the Proposed Lower Yolo Restoration Project

Names of Related Projects and Lead Agencies (CEQA and/or NEPA)	Location	Brief Descriptions	Status as of April 2013
Biological Opinions and Conference Opinions on the Long-term Operations of the Central Valley Project and State Water Project for Delta Smelt and Salmonids (USFWS 2008 and NMFS 2009)	Multiple counties including Yolo County	Issuance of final biological opinions by each regulatory agency with findings that continued operations of the Central Valley Project (CVP) and the State Water Project (SWP) would likely jeopardize several listed species, including the delta smelt and salmonids. These agencies identified reasonable and prudent alternatives that, if implemented, would avoid the likelihood of jeopardizing the continued existence of those listed species. Included in these opinions are actions such as the restoration of 8,000 ac of land to intertidal habitat for the delta smelt and 17,000 to 20,000 ac of seasonal floodplain habitat for the salmonids.	Ongoing. Biological opinions (BiOps) are undergoing revisions due to the outcomes of recent litigation; however, implementation of habitat tidal restoration still remains. The proposed Lower Yolo Restoration Project would partially fulfill that state and federal requirement. Go to the USFWS and NMFS websites: http://www.fws.gov/sfbaydelta/cvp-swp/cvp-swp.cfm and http://swr.nmfs.noaa.gov/ocap.htm
Cache Creek, Bear Creek, Sulfur Creek, Harley Gulch Mercury Total Maximum Daily Load (TMDL) Plan (Central Valley Regional Water Quality Control Board [CVRWQCB])	Cache Creek watershed, including Yolo County	Develop and implement a plan to reduce mercury loads through a combination of actions to clean up mines, sediments, and wetlands; identify engineering options; undertake control erosion reduction actions; and perform studies and related monitoring efforts.	Ongoing program. In 2005, CVRWQCB proposed to amend its Water Quality Plan to control mercury in the Cache Creek watershed. Go to: http://www.waterboards.ca.gov/water_issues/programs/tmdl/#rb5
Cache Creek Resources Management Plan Program (CCRMP), Off-Channel Mining Plan (OCMP), Cache Creek Area Plan (CCAP), and Cache Creek Improvement Program (CCIP) (County of Yolo)	Yolo County	Implement a framework of goals and objectives viewing the creek as a total system (CCRMP). The CCRMP covers agriculture, aggregate resources (OCMP), riparian and wildlife resources, water resources, floodway and channel stability, open space and recreation, and the cultural landscape. The CCAP comprises both the OCMP and the CCRMP. The CCIP implements the goals, objectives, actions, and performance standards of the CCRMP as it relates to the stabilization and maintenance of the Cache Creek channel.	Plan first adopted in 1996 and revised in 2002. Program ongoing. Refer to: http://www.yolocounty.org/Index.aspx?page=1601 and http://www.yolocounty.org/Index.aspx?page=1598
CALFED Ecosystem Restoration Program Conservation Strategy/Delta Regional Ecosystem Restoration Implementation Plan (CDFW)	Delta and Suisun Marsh/Bay	Address the critical environmental conditions in the Delta and Suisun Marsh/Bay during the first phase of CALFED Stage 2 implementation (2009-2020). The strategy includes an ecosystem restoration program (ERP) plan, multi-species conservation strategy, strategic plan for implementation that includes adaptive management, performance measures and monitoring, and proposed performance targets (i.e., Delta outflow and other in-Delta flows, restored tidal marsh and other habitats, stressors, and species abundance).	Ongoing program. For specifics on current CDFW ERP activities and reports, go to: http://www.dfg.ca.gov/erp/reports_docs.asp
Calhoun Cut/Lindsey Slough Tidal Habitat Restoration Project (CDFW and DWR)	Lindsey Slough, Solano County	Enhance about 165 ac of tidal marshes on an approximate 927-ac parcel by removal of features that restrict flow through the slough, excavate starter channels to initiate channel evolution and promote tidal flow, and potentially block Calhoun Cut. This activity is part of the Cache Slough Area Restoration effort and DWR's Interim Delta Actions.	Program in development. Potential implementation date is estimated as 2013 or later. Go to: http://baydeltaconservationplan.com/Libraries/Dynamic_Document_Library/1_7_10_Presentation_Phase_1_Restoration_Projects.sflb.ashx

Table 4.10-2. List[1] of Related Projects Utilized in Conducting the Cumulative Impacts Analyses for the Proposed Lower Yolo Restoration Project

Names of Related Projects and Lead Agencies (CEQA and/or NEPA)	Location	Brief Descriptions	Status as of April 2013
California Aquatic Invasive Species Management Plan (CDFW)	State of California, including the Delta counties (e.g., Yolo County)	Establish a management plan for controlling aquatic invasive species, and provide a framework for developing and implementing a rapid response plan. CDFW has identified at least 312 species of aquatic invaders, which can cause major impacts: disrupting agriculture, shipping, water delivery, recreational and commercial fishing; undermining levees, docks and environmental restoration activities; impeding navigation and enjoyment of the state's waterways; and damaging native habitats and the species that depend on them.	Ongoing program. The Rapid Response Plan for Aquatic Invasive Species in California is an appendix to this adopted 2008 management plan. For general discussion on this program, go to: http://www.dfg.ca.gov/invasives/plan/
CALFED Delta Risk Management Strategy (DRMS) (DWR)	Delta counties, including Yolo County	Assess the sustainability of the Delta and major risks to the Delta resources from floods, seepage, subsidence, and earthquakes. Phase 1 of DRMS was completed in March 2009. This phase evaluated the risk and consequences to the State (e.g., water export disruption and economic impact) and the Delta (e.g., levees, infrastructure, property, and ecosystem) associated with the failure of Delta levees and other assets considering their exposure to all hazards (seismic, flood, subsidence, seepage and sea-level rise, etc.) under present as well as foreseeable future conditions. The evaluation assessed the total risk as well as a disaggregation of the risk for individual islands. DRMS did not include the Project site in its analyses because the site is not located within a subsided Delta island. However, DRMS does consider the risks to nearby islands such as the Hastings Tract and Prospect Island.	Ongoing program. The Phase 2 Report was completed in June 2011 with an errata document released in August 2011. These reports build on the knowledge gained from the DRMS Phase 1 assessment to evaluate scenarios which could reduce the risks to the state economy. The information in the reports provides insight to methods that may be used by DWR and others to manage risk. For more details on DRMS, go to: http://www.water.ca.gov/floodmgmt/dsmo/sab/drmsp/
California Invasive Species Program (CDFW)	Throughout California within the jurisdiction of CDFW	Prevent the introduction of non-native invasive species in California, detect and respond to introduction when they occur, and prevent the spread of non-native invasive species that have become established. Program activities include development of the California Aquatic Invasive Species Management Plan, the Marine Invasive Species Program, and information and education activities for quagga/zebra mussels, New Zealand mudsnails, and dwarf eelgrass.	Ongoing program. Various CDFW websites on this program and related activities. Go to: http://www.dfg.ca.gov/invasives/ http://www.dfg.ca.gov/invasives/quaggamussel/ http://www.dfg.ca.gov/invasives/mudsnail/ http://www.dfg.ca.gov/invasives/dwarfeelgrass
Campbell Ranch Conservation Bank (USFWS)	12 miles south of Dixon in Solano County	Protect about 19 ac of vernal pools and swales, with several sensitive plants and wildlife onsite, within a 160-ac parcel through a conservation easement. Credits available for vernal pool fairy shrimp and vernal pool tadpole shrimp.	Ongoing program. Currently an active conservation bank since 2005. Go to the following websites for further information: http://www.cnlm.org/cms/index.php?Itemid=229&id=100&option=com_content&task=view and http://www.dfg.ca.gov/habcon/conplan/mitbank/catalogue/

Table 4.10-2. List[1] of Related Projects Utilized in Conducting the Cumulative Impacts Analyses for the Proposed Lower Yolo Restoration Project

Names of Related Projects and Lead Agencies (CEQA and/or NEPA)	Location	Brief Descriptions	Status as of April 2013
Capital Conservation Bank	North end of County Road (CR) 107, east of CR 152 in the Southern Yolo Bypass, Yolo County	Establish and manage a giant garter snake conservation bank on 320 ac of land. The project would involve about 480,000 cubic yards (cy) of earthmoving with the excavation and disposal of the soils balanced onsite.	Project currently development (Eric Parfrey, October 14, 2011, pers. comm.).
Central Valley Flood Protection Plan – 2012 (DWR and CVFPB)	Central Valley, multiple Delta counties (including Yolo County)	Guide California's participation (and influence federal and local participation) in managing flood risk along the Sacramento and San Joaquin rivers' systems. The Plan is a system-wide investment approach for sustainable, integrated flood management in areas currently protected by facilities of the State Plan of Flood Control (SPFC). One proposal under consideration is to widen and improve Fremont Weir in Yolo County.	The Final Program EIR was certified and the plan was adopted in June 2012. The environmental documentation and technical studies are at: http://www.water.ca.gov/cvfmp/documents.cfm Orientation briefings are scheduled in the latter part of March 2013 to discuss the Basin-Wide Feasibility Studies and the Conservation Strategy. Go to the following website for updated information: http://www.water.ca.gov/cvfmp/
Conaway Ranch Floodway Corridor and Habitat Enhancement Project	North-central Yolo Bypass, Yolo County	Establish an approximately 17,300-ac seasonal floodplain habitat for both flood protection (i.e., transitory storage of over 66,000 ac-ft of flood water during large storm events) and habitat restoration. Re-create historical floodplain habitat for salmon, splittail, and other native fish spawning and/or juvenile rearing. Construct improvements to New Sacramento River Bypass/Weir to provide for fish passage (e.g., new vertical slot weir and/or fish ladders or improvements). Other opportunities include integrated water management and recreation/open space.	Program under development. Go to the following websites for more information: http://www.conawayranch.com/files/u1/1__Conaway_Flood_Habitat_Proj_Aug_2007.pdf and http://westsideirwm.com/projects/Sort%20by%20Project%20Type.pdf In 2012, the Wildlife Conservation Board issued an exemption to grant to the California Waterfowl Association to acquire a conservation easement on the ranch for protection of agricultural-friendly habitat areas, supporting migratory waterfowl and other bird, amphibian and reptile species. Refer to: http://www.ceqanet.ca.gov/NOEdescription.asp?DocPK=666975

Table 4.10-2. List[1] of Related Projects Utilized in Conducting the Cumulative Impacts Analyses for the Proposed Lower Yolo Restoration Project

Names of Related Projects and Lead Agencies (CEQA and/or NEPA)	Location	Brief Descriptions	Status as of April 2013
Davis-Woodland Water Supply Project (City of Davis, City of Woodland, and University of California at Davis)	East-central portion of Yolo County	Divert up to about 45,000 ac-ft annually of surface water from the Sacramento River and convey it for treatment and subsequent use in the cities of Davis and Woodland and the University of California at Davis campus. Project activities include construction and operation of a water intake/diversion, conveyance, and water treatment facilities. Water rights were granted in March 2011, subject to conditions imposed by the state. Water diversions would be limited during summer and other dry periods. A more senior water right for 10,000 ac-ft was purchased from the Conaway Preservation Group to provide summer water supply. Groundwater would continue to be used by Woodland and Davis during when demand for water cannot be met with surface water supplies alone.	The Final EIR was certified in 2009. The project is scheduled for design in 2013, for construction between 2013 and 2015, and for operation in 2016. Go to http://www.wdcwa.com/the_project
Delta Plan (Delta Stewardship Council)	Sacramento-San Joaquin Delta region	To carry out the intent of water-related measures passed by the State Legislature in 2009, including the Delta Reform Act. The Delta Plan would rely on a mix of policies and recommendations to prioritize actions and strategies for improved water management, ecosystem restoration, and levee maintenance for significant plans, projects, and programs in the Delta.	Environmental analysis is now ongoing with a re-circulated PEIR. It is anticipated that the Final PEIR will be certified in Spring 2013 with implementation to occur in Summer 2013. For further information, go to: http://deltacouncil.ca.gov/ceqa-process
Delta Smelt Permanent Refuge (University of California at Davis, California DWR, CDFG, USFWS, and Bureau of Reclamation)	Possibly in Rio Vista, Solano County	Create a permanent facility, possibly at the proposed USFWS Science Center in Rio Vista.	Program under development. Go to (page 3D-17): http://baydeltaconservationplan.com/Libraries/Dynamic_Document_Library/EIR-EIS_Appendix_3D_-_Defining_Existing_Conditions_No_Action_Alt_No_Project_Alt_and_Cumulative_Impact_Conditions_2-29-12.sflb.ashx
Delta Wetlands Project (US Army Corps of Engineers [USACE])	Contra Costa and San Joaquin counties	This proposal is the same as the project below, Delta Wetlands Project Place of Use, but is being assessed via the National Environmental Policy Act (NEPA) process. The original USACE regulatory permit for the Delta Wetlands Project Place of Use was issued on June 26, 2002. That permit required that construction be completed no later than on December 31, 2007. That permit has since expired; hence, the applicant (Delta Wetland Properties) is applying for a new permit under Section 404 of the federal Clean Water Act and Section 10 of the Rivers and Harbors Act of 1899.	A Federal Register notice was released on February 28, 2013 announcing that USACE intends to prepare a draft environmental impact statement and is conducting a public scoping meeting in March. Refer to: http://www.gpo.gov/fdsys/pkg/FR-2013-02-28/pdf/2013-04722.pdf?bcsi-ac-a8c0312cffb9ad05=2032707200000002lik1rDP6W6ZylY+zMrGIBWAqVVb2BwAAAgAAADlIHgCEAwAAAgAAADrDAAAA=

Table 4.10-2. List[1] of Related Projects Utilized in Conducting the Cumulative Impacts Analyses for the Proposed Lower Yolo Restoration Project

Names of Related Projects and Lead Agencies (CEQA and/or NEPA)	Location	Brief Descriptions	Status as of April 2013
Delta Wetlands Project Place of Use (Semitropic Water Storage District)	Contra Costa and San Joaquin counties	Provide water to various places of use by exporting Delta water through diversion, water storage on Bacon Island and Webb Tract, and supplemental water storage south of the Delta, along with implementing a habitat conservation plan on Bouldin Island and Holland Tract.	A Final EIR and an Addendum were certified in September 2011. Project construction schedule is unknown at this time, go to http://deltawetlandsproject.com
Development Activities Proposed (Sacramento County)	Sacramento County vicinity to the east of the proposed Project	Implement a number of private projects: agricultural rezoning, subdivisions, and lot-line adjustments. One project (C&L Wilson TPM/LRP application) would involve a parcel map division of 50.7 ac into two lots in the AG-40 zone and allow one lot to be about 3.21 ac. Another private project, the Lambert Road Williamson Act application, involves the formation of a Williamson Act preserve on 329 ac in the AG-40 and AG-80 zones. Still another project, the Heringer Ranch BRB, requests extinguishment of development rights of about 155 ac from the Miracle Land Company on 862.51 ac in the AG-80 zone, to allow a Swainson's hawk and agricultural conservation easement of about 765 ac on the same property.	None of these private projects would result in an overlapping contribution with any of the Project's impacts. All three applications are pending at this time. Go to: http://www.planningdocuments.saccounty.net/SACIndividualCommunityMap.aspx?communityid=12
Development Activities Proposed (Solano County)	Vicinity of proposed Project, Solano County	Implement a number of privately, proposed projects: application for a development permit to develop a 198-ft high meteorological tower near the intersection of Etzel and Delhi roads, about a mile west of the proposed Project site; and, an incomplete application for a four-lot minor agricultural subdivision near the intersection of Delhi and Liberty Island roads.	None of these private projects would be of sufficient size and type to result in an overlapping/cumulative contribution with any of the Project's impacts. For general planning information, go to: http://www.co.solano.ca.us/depts/rm/planning/default.asp
Development Activities Proposed (Yolo County)	Vicinity of proposed Project, Yolo County	Implement the Capital Conservation Bank and the Putah Creek Wetland Mitigation Bank (projects referred elsewhere in this table).	For a listing of activities throughout Yolo County, go to: http://www.yolocounty.org/Index.aspx?page=728
Dutch Slough Tidal Marsh Restoration Project (DWR and California State Coastal Conservancy)	Oakley, Contra Costa County	Create and manage about 1,200 ac of tidal marsh and lowland grasslands. The Project has three goals: to provide ecosystem benefits including habitats for sensitive aquatic species, to assess the development of those habitats and measure ecosystem responses so that future Delta restoration projects will be more successful, and to provide opportunities for public access, education, and recreation.	Final EIR was certified in March 2010. Applicants have applied for a USACE regulatory permit and anticipate receiving it in June/July 2013. With all permits obtained, applicants anticipate beginning clearing/grubbing the site in summer 2013. Construction would be anticipated to begin in 2014. For more information go to: http://www.water.ca.gov/deltainit/action.cfm and http://www.water.ca.gov/floodsafe/fessro/environmental/dee/dutch.cfm

Table 4.10-2. List[1] of Related Projects Utilized in Conducting the Cumulative Impacts Analyses for the Proposed Lower Yolo Restoration Project

Names of Related Projects and Lead Agencies (CEQA and/or NEPA)	Location	Brief Descriptions	Status as of April 2013
Fish Screen Project at Sherman and Twitchell Islands (CDFG and DWR)	Sacramento County	Install fish screens on up to 10 currently unscreened DWR-owned agricultural intakes used to irrigate state-owned lands on Sherman and Twitchell islands. Contribute to the protection of the delta smelt and other sensitive aquatic species and the restoration of habitat in the Delta.	Mitigated negative declaration was completed in 2008. Applicants are going through the environmental regulatory processes. For further status, go to: http://www.water.ca.gov/deltainit/action.cfm
FloodSAFE Strategic Plan (DWR and multiple stakeholders)	Multiple Delta counties, including Yolo County	Fund flood system repairs and improvements, repair critical erosion sites, address the backlog of statewide subventions claims, and conduct inspection and maintenance of levees and channels in the Central Valley.	The Draft Strategic Plan was circulated for public review during June and July 2009. DWR is assessing the FloodSAFE Implementation Plan to help organize and manage FloodSAFE work. Upon completion of the draft implementation plan, the strategic plan will be refined and finalized. Go to: http://www.water.ca.gov/floodsafe/plan/
Franks Tract Project (DWR, Reclamation)	Sacramento and Contra Costa counties	Install and operate a flow control gate on up to two Delta waterways (Three-mile Slough and West False River) to protect fish resources and reduce seawater salinity intrusion into the Delta. The project gates would be operated seasonally and during certain hours of the day, depending on fisheries and tidal conditions. Boat passage facilities would allow for passing of watercraft when the gates are in operation.	Notice of Preparation and Notice of Intent were circulated in September/October 2008. The Initial Alternatives Information Report was completed February 2010. The Draft Feasibility Report is due April 2013. Preparation of a joint EIR/EIS has been delayed, go to for additional information: http://www.water.ca.gov/frankstract/ and http://www.usbr.gov/mp/nepa/nepa_projdetails.cfm?Project_ID=3460. No schedule on when project would be constructed.
Fremont Landing Conservation Bank (aka Central Valley Anadromous Salmonid Umbrella Conservation Bank) (CDFW)	Yolo County	Restore, enhance, and preserve of 100 ac of habitat for the federally- and state-listed Chinook salmon and Central Valley steelhead. In particular, to preserve and enhance 40 ac of existing riparian and wetland habitat, and restore/create 60 ac of riparian woodland and wetland sloughs within the floodplain of the Sacramento River. This project involves the excavation of 60,000 cy at Oxbow Slough channels to prevent fish stranding.	Ongoing program. Mitigated Negative Declaration adopted on December 21, 2009. Active habitat bank. Go to: http://www.cvfpb.ca.gov/meetings/2010/072310Item12B_18603_%20FremontLanding_StaffReportAttachmentsandPermit.pdf
Fremont Weir Modifications Project (CDFW)	Northern end of Yolo Bypass, Yolo County	Create and manage approximately 21,500 ac of seasonal floodplain habitat. Increase the duration of Yolo Bypass flooding in winter and spring by modifying the Fremont Weir to allow lower-stage flows of the Sacramento River to pass through the Yolo Bypass. Install an inflatable barrier to induce overbank flooding out of the Tule Canal/Toe Drain or modify the Tule Canal/Toe Drain to create an excavated, shallow flooded region.	This project is an early action measure identified in the CalFed's *Ecosystem Restoration Program Plan: Strategic Plan for Ecosystem Restoration* (see Page D-4 of the 2000 Final Programmatic EIS/EIR Technical Appendix). Potential implementation date is not known at this time. Go to: http://www.dfg.ca.gov/ERP/reports_docs.asp

Table 4.10-2. List[1] of Related Projects Utilized in Conducting the Cumulative Impacts Analyses for the Proposed Lower Yolo Restoration Project

Names of Related Projects and Lead Agencies (CEQA and/or NEPA)	Location	Brief Descriptions	Status as of April 2013
Knaggs Ranch Project **(Formerly known as the Elkhorn Basin Ranch)** (Sacramento Area Flood Control Agency)	Northern Yolo Bypass, Yolo County	Develop and manage approximately 1,750 ac of seasonal floodplain habitat while allowing for continued agricultural production on the remaining portion of the ranch, including grazing or row crop production compatible with Swainson's hawk foraging needs.	Potential implementation date is estimated to be 2015 or later. http://www.water.ca.gov/floodmgmt/fpo/sgb/fpcp/prop84/comp_sol/2008_selections/alist_projects/knaggs/
Knaggs Ranch Project: Experimental Agricultural Floodplain Pilot Study (DWR)	Northern Yolo Bypass, Yolo County	Evaluate growth of juvenile Chinook salmon in flooded agricultural fields as initiated in the winter of 2011-2012 and scheduled to expand over time (i.e., a multi-phased, multi-year research project). This pilot study is investigating the biological and physical parameters of fish habitat, as well as the relationships between habitat, growth, and survival. Such information is essential to the development of Yolo Bypass rearing habitat for salmonids at appropriate temporal and spatial scales.	Ongoing program. For Year One Overview (2011-2012), refer to: http://baydeltaconservationplan.com/Libraries/Dynamic_Document_Library/YBFE_Planning_Team_%E2%80%93_Knaggs_Ranch_Pilot_Project_Year_One_Overview_6-13-12.sflb.ashx
Levee Failure (Natural Event): **Liberty Island**	Solano County	Natural levee failure occurred in 1998 resulting in approximately 4,300 ac of subsided land restored by tidal inundation.	Natural restoration occurring over time
Levee Failures (Natural Events): **Little Holland Tract**	Yolo County	Natural levee failures occurred in 1983 and 1992 breaches resulting in approximately 1,500 ac of subsided land restored by tidal inundation.	Natural restoration occurring over time
Liberty Island Conservation Bank **(Formerly known as the Kerry Parcel Project)** (Reclamation District 2093)	Northern portion of Liberty Island, Yolo County	Preserve, enhance, and restore approximately 186 ac of habitat for native fish species (including Chinook salmon, Central Valley steelhead, and delta smelt) while designated as a wetlands mitigation bank.	Ongoing program. Mitigated Negative Declaration completed in 2009. For further information, go to: http://www.mitigationbanking.org/pdfs/libertyislandcb.pdf Constructed and breached in late 2010. Background information can be found in: http://www.delta.ca.gov/res/docs/meetings/2007/092707_item_15.pdf
Lisbon Weir Fish Passage Enhancement	Yolo County	Improve agriculture and habitat water control structure for fish and wildlife benefits.	Concept only at this time. Go to: http://www.yolobypass.net/docs/BDCPSubcommittee/5-Point%20Plan.pdf
Little Holland Tract Restoration (DWR and USACE)	Yolo County	Continue restoration efforts that would complement what has occurred naturally. This activity is part of the Cache Slough Area Restoration effort and DWR's Interim Delta Actions.	Ongoing program. Go to link for more details: http://www.water.ca.gov/deltainit/docs/6-16-08CacheSlough.pdf

Table 4.10-2. List[1] of Related Projects Utilized in Conducting the Cumulative Impacts Analyses for the Proposed Lower Yolo Restoration Project

Names of Related Projects and Lead Agencies (CEQA and/or NEPA)	Location	Brief Descriptions	Status as of April 2013
Lower Cache Creek, Yolo County Woodland Area Feasibility Study (Cities of Woodland and Davis)	Yolo County	Evaluate modifications to the Cache Creek Settling Basin and other facilities to determine their feasibility and contribution toward achieving urban and rural agricultural flood improvement in the area. Also evaluate the Cache Creek Settling Basin to identify a long-term program for managing sediment and mercury to maintain the flood conveyance capacity of the Yolo Bypass.	Ongoing program. For further information, go to: http://www.cvfpb.ca.gov/meetings/2011/022511item9A_LowerCacheCreekFeasibilityStudy.pdf
Lower Putah Creek Realignment Project (possibly CDFW – not yet established)	Lower Putah Creek from the Toe Drain to Monticello Dam in central Yolo Bypass, Yolo County	Remove fish barriers on 25 miles of Lower Putah Creek, restore and enhance anadromous fish spawning and emigration access, and reroute Lower Putah Creek east of Davis through five miles of new stream channel and seasonal wetland complex. The project would establish between 300 to 700 ac (five miles of stream) of creek and associated floodplain and tidal marsh habitat.	Developing. For more information, go to: http://www.google.com/url?sa=t&rct=j&q=lower%20putah%20creek%20realignment%20project&source=web&cd=1&cad=rja&ved=0CC8QFjAA&url=http%3A%2F%2Fnrm.dfg.ca.gov%2FFileHandler.ashx%3FDocumentID%3D27856&ei=73I_UY3sBYGFyQG4zYH4Dg&usg=AFQjCNGqSQi6Bhya3iB_jiEify2dhBfuPQ&bvm=bv.43287494,d.aWM;bcsi-ac-cbeb2b96b46cba65=204F41B500000002FWTLAvto1TcQEPWrxtPZ9N6HtMBZAgAAAgAAAH0mCQCEAwAAAQAAAFRZAAA= Potential implementation date is unknown at this time.
Mayberry Farms Subsidence Reversal and Carbon Sequestration (Reclamation District No. 341)	Sherman Island, Sacramento County	Create 274 ac of palustrine emergent (permanently flooded) wetlands on a nearly 308-ac parcel owned by the state. About 191,700 cy of peat soil would be excavated to create ponds and channels, and then compacted to make the berms, levees and islands onsite.	Ongoing program. Mitigated negative declaration was adopted on August 20, 2009. Constructed in 2010. Go to http://www.water.ca.gov/floodsafe/fessro/environmental/dee/mayberry.cfm
North Bay Aqueduct Alternative Intake Project (DWR)	Solano and Yolo counties	Construct and operate an alternative intake on the Sacramento River, generally upstream of the Sacramento Regional Wastewater Treatment Plant in Fairfield, and connect it to the existing North Bay Aqueduct (NBA) system by a new segment of pipe. The proposed alternative intake would be operated in conjunction with the existing NBA intake at Barker Slough. The project would be designed to improve water quality and to provide reliable deliveries of SWP supplies to its contractors, the Solano County Water Agency and the Napa County Flood Control and Water Conservation District.	The Notice of Preparation for the EIR was published on November 24, 2009. Release of the Draft EIR is still pending. Start of construction is unknown at this time. Go to the following website for more information: http://www.water.ca.gov/engineering/Projects/Current/NBA/

Table 4.10-2. List[1] of Related Projects Utilized in Conducting the Cumulative Impacts Analyses for the Proposed Lower Yolo Restoration Project

Names of Related Projects and Lead Agencies (CEQA and/or NEPA)	Location	Brief Descriptions	Status as of April 2013
Northern Liberty Island Fish Conservation Bank (aka North Delta Fish Conservation Bank) (Reclamation District 2093)	Northern Liberty Island, Yolo County	Establish an approximate 808-ac of tidal marsh enhancement. Degrade approximately 4,200 linear ft of the east-west private levee along Shag Slough within the Yolo Bypass, excavate minor breaches and small channels, widen and deepen the existing breach on the east-west levee, excavate a bench and plant tule plugs along a portion of the northern project boundary, and seed existing levee upland areas with native and naturalized species.	The Mitigated Negative Declaration was adopted on February 10, 2011. Securing permits and approvals at this time. Go to: http://www.cvfpb.ca.gov/meetings/2012/052512Item7D_18723_ISMND_LTMP_NOD.pdf?bcsi-ac-cbeb2b96b46cba65=204F41B500000002uFWgMVgZTEPNW+Ec92AO8SeH6ExaAgAAAgAAADsqCQCEAwAAAQAAAFRZAAA=
Pope Ranch Conservation Bank Project (Reclamation Board)	Near City of Davis, Yolo County	Replicate natural conditions by creating a mosaic pattern of shallow, permanent ponds interspersed with seasonally inundated swales and uplands to create aquatic (open water), emergent marsh, and grassland habitats throughout the 391 ac, thereby providing suitable habitat for a diversity of wetlands-dependent wildlife species including GGS.	A notice of exemption was issued in April 2001. Currently, this bank is noted in a USFWS list as either inactive or sold out. Go to: http://webcache.googleusercontent.com/search?hl=en&q=cache:evabLLFmNvsJ:http://www.fws.gov/sacramento/ES/Conservation-Banking/Banks/Inactive-Sold-Out/es_conse-bank-inactive-sold-out.htm%2Bpope+ranch+conservation+bank&gbv=2&gs_l=heirloom-hp.1.8.0l3j0i30l7.5397.8865.0.13441.10.10.0.0.0.0.144.951.2j7.9.0...0.0...1c.1.TSOJbkrKf-o&ct=clnk
Prospect Island Restoration Project (DWR and USACE)	East of Sacramento Deep Water Ship Channel (SRDWSC), Solano County	Restore 1,620 ac of tidal marsh and shallow tidal aquatic habitat for fish species, including delta smelt. Project construction would involve the creation of long sinuous interior islands, channels, dead-end sloughs, and interior levee benches. Native wildlife would also benefit.	A Mitigated Negative Declaration and A Finding of No Significant Impact were adopted in September 2001. Plans are still conceptual. Go to: http://deltacouncil.ca.gov/node/8145 Construction date is estimated to be 2016 or later.
Putah Creek Wetland Mitigation Bank (County of Yolo)	North of Yolo Bypass Wildlife Area, Yolo County; at the intersection of County Road (CR) 36 and CR 106, near the city of Davis, Yolo County	Construct seasonal wetlands and playa pools, restore riparian habitat, and preserve upland habitat at the Putah Creek Mitigation Bank. The project site resides within a larger 433.7-ac property at Muzzy Ranch. A majority of the property, excluding the project site, includes upland areas, which was originally purchased by ASB Southport II to preserve Swainson's hawk foraging habitat as mitigation for a development project in West Sacramento. In addition to hawk habitat, the project would restore and construct 72.2 ac of seasonal wetland habitat, and restore 1.97 ac of riparian habitat. Eight constructed wetlands, and six upland mounds, are proposed. The project would involve about 180,000 cy of earth moving in two phases.	A Mitigated Negative Declaration was processed by Yolo County in 2011. Securing regulatory approvals at this time.

Table 4.10-2. List[1] of Related Projects Utilized in Conducting the Cumulative Impacts Analyses for the Proposed Lower Yolo Restoration Project

Names of Related Projects and Lead Agencies (CEQA and/or NEPA)	Location	Brief Descriptions	Status as of April 2013
Remanded Biological Opinions on the Coordinated Long-term Operation of the Central Valley Project and State Water Project (Reclamation)	Counties containing CVP and SWP service areas and facilities	Continue the operations of the CVP, in coordination with the SWP, as described in the 2008 Biological Assessment (as modified) to meet its authorized purposes, in a manner that: is consistent with federal reclamation law, applicable statutes, previous agreements and permits, and contractual obligations; listed species; and does not result in destruction or adverse modification of designated critical habitat. Planning efforts would involve the restoration of up to 8,000 ac. Specific restoration efforts are not yet defined under this program.	Notice of Intent to Prepare an EIS was released on March 28, 2012, with a series of public scoping meetings conducted in April and May 2012. Public comments were extended to June 28, 2012. NEPA alternatives are currently being developed for operation components of the 2008 USFWS and 2009 NMFS Reasonable and Prudent Alternatives for delta smelt and salmonids, respectively. For further information, go to: http://www.usbr.gov/mp/BayDeltaOffice/Documents/remand.html
Restoring Ecosystem Integrity in the Northwest Delta (CDFW)	Yolo and Solano counties	Acquire conservation easements within the Cache Slough complex, along the Barker, Lindsey and Calhoun sloughs, north Delta tidal channels located west of the Yolo Bypass. Acquisition of conservation easements would be on 1,100 ac of existing riparian, wetland and/or agricultural lands. Also, manage and restore up to 1,300 ac of perennial grassland/vernal pool complex in Solano County.	Ongoing program. For background information, go to: http://cdm16658.contentdm.oclc.org/cdm/singleitem/collection/p267501ccp2/id/2008/rec/20
Ridge Cut Giant Garter Snake Conservation Bank (Yolo County)	Yolo County (near Dunnigan)	Restore and preserve about 186 ac of habitat for the GGS by creating 48.4 ac of perennial marsh, 57.4 ac of open water, and 80.1 ac of uplands.	Ongoing program. A Mitigated Negative Declaration was adopted on December 17, 2009. Active habitat conservation bank. Go to: http://www.cvfpb.ca.gov/meetings/2009/Item8C-18406ManagementPlan.pdf
Sacramento River Deep Water Ship Channel (SRDWSC) Project (USACE and Port of West Sacramento)	Within the Sacramento River Deep Water Ship Channel ,Yolo, Solano, Sacramento, Contra Costa counties	Improve the navigation of the 46.5-mile shipping channel via dredging and establishing wetland/riparian habitat on Prospect and lower Sherman islands. Would involve both deepening portions of the SRDWSC to a depth of -35 ft MLLW and selective widening from River Miles (RMs) 0.0 to 35.0, completing the construction that was suspended in 1990, and conducting maintenance dredging from RMs 35.0 to 43.4. This project would involve the excavation and disposal of between 8.1 and 10 mcy of material. The dredging is proposed for six month windows (June 1 – December 31) over four years.	The Draft Supplemental EIS/EIR was released on February 25, 2011 for a public review period that ended on April 18, 2011. A revised Draft EIS/-Subsequent EIR is anticipated to be re-circulated in response to comments in 2013. Construction target is on or before 2015. Go to: http://www.sacramentoshipchannel.org/
Sacramento River Ranch Conservation Bank (CDFW)	Yolo County	Involves the development and minor alteration of 108.5 ac to create wetlands habitat while maintaining agricultural activities on the property outside of the created wetlands. Four types of conservation and mitigation activities on the bank property: species banks for the Valley Elderberry Longhorn Beetle and salmonids, a conservation easement for Swainson's hawk habitat, and a federal wetlands bank at the low-lying, southern end of the property.	Ongoing program; an active mitigation bank. A Notice of Exemption was issued on July 2007. For additional information, go to: http://www.ecoagriculture.org/documents/files/doc_348.pdf

Table 4.10-2. List[1] of Related Projects Utilized in Conducting the Cumulative Impacts Analyses for the Proposed Lower Yolo Restoration Project

Names of Related Projects and Lead Agencies (CEQA and/or NEPA)	Location	Brief Descriptions	Status as of April 2013
Sacramento-San Joaquin Delta Islands and Levee Feasibility Study (USACE)	Delta, Suisun Marsh, and adjacent areas	To evaluate alternatives to meet the study goals of restoring sustainable ecosystem functions and improving flood risk management in the Delta, Suisun Marsh, and adjacent areas. The array of measures and alternatives will depend on the information received during the scoping process.	A Notice of Intent for the preparation of an EIS was published on January 31, 2013. The Draft EIS is expected to be released in early 2014. Go to: http://www.spk.usace.army.mil/Media/NewsReleases/tabid/1034/Article/9959/corps-to-discuss-delta-islands-and-levees-feasibility-study-at-public-meetings.aspx
Southport Sacramento River Early Implementation Project (USACE and West Sacramento Area Flood Control Agency)	Yolo County	Implement flood risk-reduction measures along the Sacramento River South Levee in the city of West Sacramento. The project reach extends along the right (west) bank of the Sacramento River south of the Barge Canal downstream approximately 6.4 miles to the South Cross Levee, protecting the Southport community of West Sacramento. The 3.3-square mile study area encompasses the area of levee improvement along the river corridor and the potential soil borrow sites east and west of southern Jefferson Blvd.	A Notice of Preparation for an EIS/EIR was originally released on August 26, 2011. A revised Notice of Preparation/Notice of Intent due to changes in the preferred alternative was posted on March 8, 2013 and March 15, 2013, respectively, with comments due on April 8, 2013. Certification of the Final EIS/EIR is anticipated for late 2013. Construction is scheduled for sometime between 2014 and 2015. For further information, refer to: http://www.cityofwestsacramento.org/city/flood/southport_eip/milestone_schedule.asp?bcsi-ac-cbeb2b96b46cba65=204F41B400000002YOQ0ZwMumfUE9txLm4N+Vjd1fnRnAgAAAgAAAIdaCQCEAwAAAwAAAFRZAAA=
Tule Canal Fish Passage Enhancement	Yolo County	Identify passage impediments and evaluate the feasibility of improving fish passage or removing fish passage impediments.	Concept only at this time. Go to: http://www.yolobypass.net/docs/BDCPSubcommittee/5-Point%20Plan.pdf
Update to the 2006 Water Quality Control Plan for the Bay-Delta Estuary (Bay-Delta Plan) (State Water Resources Control Board)	Bay-Delta Estuary	Update the existing 2006 Bay-Delta Plan: (1) focus on San Joaquin River flow requirements and southern Delta water quality objectives; (2) examine fish and wildlife beneficial uses; (3) study possible modifications to water rights; and (4) develop and implement flow requirements for priority Delta tributaries.	Update process underway. Go to: http://www.waterboards.ca.gov/waterrights/water_issues/programs/bay_delta/
West Sacramento Levee Improvements Program (West Sacramento Area Flood Control Agency and USACE)	West Sacramento levees, Yolo County	Improve the levee system within the entire West Sacramento Area Flood Control Agency boundaries, including the Sacramento River, the Yolo Bypass, the Sacramento Bypass, and the SRDWSC.	Ongoing program. Final Program EIR/EIS certified in March 2011. For further information, go to: http://www.cityofwestsacramento.org/city/flood/levee_improvements.asp?bcsi-ac-cbeb2b96b46cba65=204F41B400000002GqyiJqepuG3l28WQidwXfIPtuwtoAgAAAgAAAGZeCQCEAwAAAwAAAFRZAAA=

Table 4.10-2. List[1] of Related Projects Utilized in Conducting the Cumulative Impacts Analyses for the Proposed Lower Yolo Restoration Project

Names of Related Projects and Lead Agencies (CEQA and/or NEPA)	Location	Brief Descriptions	Status as of April 2013
Yolo Bypass Salmonid Habitat Restoration and Fish Passage (Reclamation and DWR)	Yolo Bypass, Yolo County (within the Sacramento Valley region)	To create more suitable conditions for fish in the Yolo Bypass and/or lower Sacramento River basin by implementing the Reasonable and Prudent Alternative actions (i.e., I.6.1 and I.7) as described in the 2009 NMFS BiOp and the 2012 Yolo Bypass Salmonid Habitat Restoration and Fish Passage Implementation Plan.	Notice of Intent and Notice of Preparation for the Draft EIS/EIR was released on March 4, 2013. Written comments are due on April 3, 2013; two public scoping meetings were held in mid March. For further information, go to: http://www.usbr.gov/mp/BayDeltaOffice/Documents/yolo.html
Yolo Bypass Wildlife Area Land Management Plan (CDFW)	About 16,770 ac managed in the Yolo Bypass, Yolo County	Guide the management of habitats, species, public use and programs to achieve CDFW's mission; direct an ecosystem approach in coordination with the objectives of the CALFED ERP; promote cooperative relationships with adjoining private property owners; establish a species inventory; create an O&M program with personnel requirements; and meet all applicable environmental regulations and processes.	Ongoing program. Negative Declaration was adopted in 2007. Go to: http://www.dfg.ca.gov/lands/mgmtplans/ybwa/
Yolo County Natural Heritage Program Habitat Conservation Plan/Natural Community Conservation Plan (Yolo County HCP/NCCP Joint Powers Agency and USFWS)	Yolo County	Develop a comprehensive, county-wide plan for 653,820 ac designed to provide long-term conservation and management of natural communities, sensitive species, and the habitats upon which those species depend, while accommodating other important uses of the land. The Plan would set out a conservation strategy that includes measures to ensure that impacts on the 35 covered species and habitats related to covered activities are avoided, minimized, or mitigated, as appropriate. The Plan also proposes to provide conservation for 31 additional species of local concern.	Notice of Intent and Notice of Preparation for the Draft EIS/EIR was released on October 21, 2011. Completion target for plan is 2013. For further information, go to: http://www.yoloconservationplan.org/index.html and http://www.yoloconservationplan.org/enviro-portal.html

[1] Various agencies in the region and documents produced were consulted to establish this table: Yolo County, Solano County, and Sacramento County Planning Departments, USACE, DWR, member agencies of SFCWA, Bay Delta Conservation Plan, Delta Plan, Suisun Marsh Plan, CDFW, and USFWS. This review includes both the public agencies' projects as well as private projects that may require approvals through these public agencies. In particular, several sources were reviewed including the counties' currently proposed projects list, the list of projects being planned as part of the CALFED Ecosystem Restoration Program and its member resource agencies, potential projects identified as part of fulfilling the 8,000-ac restoration requirement contained with the Reasonable and Prudent Alternatives of the USFWS Delta Smelt Biological Opinion of December 2008 and the NMFS Salmonid Biological Opinion of June 2009, potential projects identified as part of fulfilling the 55,000-ac restoration requirement currently being considered for incorporation into the BDCP.

5.0 MITIGATION MONITORING AND REPORTING PLAN

5.1 INTRODUCTION

This Chapter constitutes the Mitigation Monitoring and Reporting Plan (MMRP) for the Yolo Flyway Farms Restoration Project EIR. The California Environmental Quality Act requires public agencies to report on and monitor measures adopted as part of the environmental review process (PRC Section 21081.6 and CEQA Guidelines Sections15091.d and 15097). This MMRP is designed to fulfill that requirement.

The MMRP is designed to ensure that the measures identified in the EIR are fully implemented. The MMRP describes the actions that must take place as a part of each measure, the timing of these actions, the entity responsible for implementation, and the agency responsible for enforcing each action.

The applicant/property owner has the ultimate responsibility to oversee implementation of this MMRP. The Planning, Public Works and Environmental Services Department serves as the Project Monitor responsible for assigning monitoring actions to responsible agencies. The applicant/property owner is responsible for all costs associated with implementation of this MMRP. The commitment for this is further addressed in the Conditions of Approval for the project.

As required by Section 21081.6 of the Public Resources Code, the Planning, Public Works and Environmental Services Department is the "custodian of documents and other material" which constitutes the "record of proceedings" upon which the action on the project was based. Inquiries should be directed to:

Eric Parfrey, AICP, Principal Planner
Planning, Public Works and Environmental Services Department
292 W. Beamer St.
Woodland, CA 95695
(530) 666-8043
eric.parfrey@yolocounty.org

The following shall also apply:

- The adopted MMRP shall run with the real property that is the subject of the project and successive owners, heirs, and assigns of this real property are bound to comply with all of the requirements of the adopted Plan.

- Prior to any lease, sale, transfer, or conveyance of any portion of the real property that is the subject of the project, the applicant /property owner shall provide a copy of the

adopted MMRP to the prospective lessee, buyer, transferee, or one to whom the conveyance is made.

- The responsibilities of the applicant/property owner, and whether any professional expertise is required for completion or evaluation of any part of the MMRP, shall be as specified in the MMRP and as determined by the designated Project Monitor in the course of administering the MMRP.

- Cost estimates for the implementation of this MMRP and satisfaction of each measure are not known or available, but shall be developed by the applicant in the course of implementing each mitigation measure.

- Remedies and penalties for noncompliance with the adopted MMRP are as specified in County code, and state law.

Table MMRP-1

Mitigation Monitoring and Reporting Program for the Flyway Farms Project

Impact Number	Mitigation Measure	Enforcement and Monitoring Responsibility	Timing/ Implementation	Verification (Date and Initials)
TERRESTRIAL BIOLOGICAL RESOURCES				
Impact 4.3-1: Effects to Wetland Communities	**Mitigation Measure 4.3-1:** (Prior to or during ground-disturbing activities in sensitive wetland communities) •Locate construction staging areas outside of sensitive wetland habitats, by having their perimeters be as small as possible, and/or within the excavation/trenching limits. All staging areas shall be clearly flagged to define the limits of the work area. No construction access, parking, or storage of equipment or materials shall be permitted outside of the established limits. This shall be achieved by limiting machinery and vehicle access to temporary tracks or pads, as necessary and direct removal of soils to temporary stockpiles, located away from sensitive areas, for transportation to the selected soils reuse site. These areas shall be identified on work plans, specifications, and other applicable engineering/ contractor documents. •Define clearly on maps the boundaries of sensitive habitats not within the restoration footprint (ground-disturbing areas of the Project site), and demarcated as avoidance areas. •Limit construction and post-construction actions involving ground-disturbing activities to the dry weather season (generally between April and November, but varies each year), thereby reducing the potential for export of contaminants and/or sediments. •Require contractors to sign documentation stating that they have read, agree to, and understand the required avoidance measures. •Require construction crew members to participate in training sessions, which clearly identify and describe sensitive communities and other biological resources. •Utilize the services of a qualified biologist onsite to observe ground-disturbing activities when such activities occur within or adjacent to sensitive habitats, and/or to monitor sensitive special-status species' locations.	*Yolo County Planning, Public Works and Environmental Services Department/State and federal agencies with permit authority over the project.*	*Prior to any ground-disturbing activities in sensitive wetland communities/Measure included as a Condition of Approval.*	

Table MMRP-1

Mitigation Monitoring and Reporting Program for the Flyway Farms Project

Impact Number	Mitigation Measure	Enforcement and Monitoring Responsibility	Timing/ Implementation	Verification (Date and Initials)
Impact 4.3-3: Effects to Special-status Plants	**Mitigation Measure 4.3-2:** Prior to initiation of ground-disturbing activities, a qualified botanist shall conduct appropriately timed, focused botanical surveys of the Project site targeting known and potentially occurring special-status plant species, including Mason's lilaeopsis, Suisun Marsh aster, and Delta tule pea. Dependent on the project's final design and conditions onsite, the following mitigation shall be undertaken to avoid, minimize, or reduce loss or disturbance to identified special-status plants: •Adjust design to avoid or minimize impacts to special-status plants to the extent feasible. •Enumerate, photograph, and flag conspicuously or mark with temporary drift fencing or other physical barriers the areas supporting individual plants or populations of special-status plants that have the potential to be impacted, prior to construction. •Limit work areas including access and staging areas to the minimum area practical. •Notify the California Department of Fish and Wildlife (CDFW) at least ten days in advance of any ground-disturbing activity that could impact special-status plants to allow CDFW the opportunity to salvage affected individual plants for transplanting to a suitable location outside of the disturbed area. •Require construction workers to inspect their clothing, including shoes, all vehicles, and equipment for invasive plant seeds or plant material, prior to entering and leaving the Project area. Appropriate cleaning measures shall be taken to prevent the spread of invasive species into restored areas.	*Yolo County Planning, Public Works and Environmental Services Department/State and federal agencies with permit authority over the project.*	*Prior to initiation of ground-disturbing activities/Measure included as a Condition of Approval.*	
Impact 4.3-5: Impacts to Giant Garter Snake or Giant Garter Snake Habitat	**Mitigation Measure 4.3-4:** •Require construction personnel shall receive U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service (USFWS)-approved worker environmental awareness training to recognize the giant garter snake (GGS) and its habitat. •Confine clearing of vegetation to only those areas necessary to facilitate construction activities and no greater. Areas designated as GGS and/or other	*Yolo County Planning, Public Works and Environmental Services Department/State and federal agencies with permit authority over the project.*	*Prior to initiation of ground-disturbing activities/Measure included as a Condition of Approval.*	

Table MMRP-1

Mitigation Monitoring and Reporting Program for the Flyway Farms Project

Impact Number	Mitigation Measure	Enforcement and Monitoring Responsibility	Timing/ Implementation	Verification (Date and Initials)
	sensitive-species habitat within or adjacent to the Project site shall be flagged as Environmentally Sensitive Areas and shall be avoided by all construction personnel. •Survey the site at least 24 hours prior to the initiation of ground-disturbing activities in suitable GGS habitat. This survey shall be conducted by a USFWS-approved biologist in suitable GGS habitat. Surveys shall be repeated if a lapse in construction activity of two weeks or greater occurs. If a GGS is encountered during ground-disturbing activities, activities at that specific location shall cease until appropriate corrective measures, in concurrence with USFWS coordination, have been completed or it has been determined that the GGS will not be harmed. Sightings shall be reported to USFWS. •Implement construction activity within GGS habitat between May 1 and October 1. This is the active period for GGS and direct mortality is lessened, because GGS are expected to actively move and avoid danger. Consultation with the USFWS is required for construction activities scheduled to occur in potential GGS habitat between October 2 and April 30.			
impact 4.3-6: Impacts on Western Pond Turtle or Western Pond Turtle Habitat	**Mitigation Measure 4.3-5:** •Survey areas prior to implementing restoration activities and/or dewatering scheduled in or adjacent to suitable aquatic habitat for the western pond turtle, by a qualified biologist. •Remove western pond turtles found by a qualified biologist to a safe location outside of the work area in a manner consistent with applicable CDFW regulations. •Conduct periodic monitoring by a qualified biologist of suitable aquatic habitat for the western pond turtle until ground-disturbing/ dewatering activities have ceased in those areas.	*Yolo County Planning, Public Works and Environmental Services Department/State and federal agencies with permit authority over the project.*	*Prior to implementing restoration activities and/or dewatering/ Measure included as a Condition of Approval.*	

Table MMRP-1

Mitigation Monitoring and Reporting Program for the Flyway Farms Project

Impact Number	Mitigation Measure	Enforcement and Monitoring Responsibility	Timing/ Implementation	Verification (Date and Initials)
Impact 4.3-7: Impacts to Nesting Habitat and to Nesting Special-status and Migratory Birds	**Mitigation Measure 4.3-6:** •Remove or trim a minimal number of trees that would satisfy the Project design and allow for minimal access by construction equipment within the construction footprint in advance of nesting season, i.e., August 16 to February 14. Should nesting by sensitive bird species occur prior to February 15, proceed with the remaining steps in this mitigation measure. •Conduct preconstruction nesting bird surveys during the bird breeding season (February 15 to August 15) within the construction footprint including a 300-ft buffer, by a qualified biologist, within two weeks prior to equipment or material staging, pruning/grubbing or surface-disturbing activities, including soils grading or excavation. If no active nests are found, no further mitigation shall be required. •Establish a buffer area if active nests (i.e., nests in the egg laying, incubating, nestling or fledgling stages) are found within 300 ft of the Project footprint for raptors (birds of prey), within a 0.5-mile radius for Swainson's hawk, or 100 feet of the construction footprint for all other bird species. Non-disturbance buffers shall be established at a distance sufficient to minimize disturbance based on the nest location, topography, cover, the nesting pair's tolerance to disturbance and the type/duration of potential disturbance. The size of the buffers may be adjusted provided a qualified biologist, in consultation with CDFW and USFWS, monitors the behavior of the nesting birds and determines that impacts of Project-related activities are not affecting the birds' reproductive or rearing efforts. •Ensure that if rescheduling of work is infeasible and non-disturbance buffers cannot be maintained, a qualified biologist shall be onsite to monitor active nests for signs of disturbance for the duration of the construction activity. If it is determined that Project-related activities are resulting in nest disturbance, then work in those sensitive areas shall cease immediately and CDFW and USFWS shall be contacted for further guidance. • Repeat nest surveys by a qualified biologist, if post-construction activities continue beyond one year.	*Yolo County Planning, Public Works and Environmental Services Department/ State and federal agencies with permit authority over the project.*	*Prior to any grading or removal of trees/ Measure included as a Condition of Approval.*	

Table MMRP-1

Mitigation Monitoring and Reporting Program for the Flyway Farms Project

Impact Number	Mitigation Measure	Enforcement and Monitoring Responsibility	Timing/ Implementation	Verification (Date and Initials)
Impact 4.3-8: Loss of Foraging Habitat for Swainson's Hawk	**Mitigation Measure 4.3-7:** •Ensure that suitable Swainson's hawk foraging habitat is preserved or enhanced at a ratio of 1:1 for approximately 0.4 acres, based on final engineering designs, presence of Swainson's hawk, and consultation with CDFW. Preservation/enhancement may occur through one or more actions: o Preservation and enhancement of habitat onsite with equal or greater quality than existing foraging habitat. o Payment of a mitigation fee to a CDFW-approved mitigation bank for the preservation of Swainson's hawk foraging habitat. o Purchase of conservation easements or fee title to suitable Swainson's hawk foraging habitat to protect the habitat from urban development. o Participation in the Yolo County Natural Community Conservation Plan/Habitat Conservation Plan (NCCP/HCP) should it be adopted prior to the Project's start of construction. o Other measures, as needed, through consultation with CDFW.	*Yolo County Planning, Public Works and Environmental Services Department/ State and federal agencies with permit authority over the project.*	*Prior to any grading or excavation / Measure included as a Condition of Approval.*	
Impact 4.3-10: Effects to Special-Status Species on the Flyway Farms 80-acre Soil Deposit Site	**Mitigation Measure 4.3-8:** The following measures are recommended to avoid and minimize the potential for impacts and ensure that all potential impacts are reduced to a level of less than significant. 1. Conduct Preconstruction Surveys and Avoid Impacts to Special-status Species To ensure that special-status ground-nesting raptors, including burrowing owl, short-eared owl, and northern harrier, or breeding tricolored blackbirds or grasshopper sparrows are not inadvertently affected by project activities, a qualified biologist should conduct a pre-construction survey in areas where soils are expected to be deposited in any given year. If active nests of these species or active	*Yolo County Planning, Public Works and Environmental Services Department/ State and federal agencies with permit authority over the project.*	*Prior to any grading or deposition of dirt / Measure included as a Condition of Approval.*	

Table MMRP-1

Mitigation Monitoring and Reporting Program for the Flyway Farms Project

Impact Number	Mitigation Measure	Enforcement and Monitoring Responsibility	Timing/ Implementation	Verification (Date and Initials)
	burrowing owl winter burrows are found, select an alternative location for soil deposition within the 80-acre field, maintaining a minimum of 200 feet (including truck routes) from all occupied sites; or if necessary, postpone deposition activities until the site is no longer occupied. 2. Avoid Take of Giant Garter Snake If the adjacent water conveyance channels support consistent flowing water prior to project activities, the potential for giant garter snakes to occur in the channels and in adjacent uplands increases. To avoid take of giant garter snakes under these possible future conditions, apply the avoidance measures described for the Yolo Flyway Farms Restoration Project site, which are derived from the Lower Yolo Restoration Project DEIR (SFCWA 2013), to the soil deposition project site. These measures include: • Require construction personnel to receive U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service (USFWS)-approved worker environmental awareness training to recognize the GGS and its habitat. • Confine clearing of vegetation to only those areas necessary to facilitate construction activities and no greater. Areas designated as GGS and/or other sensitive-species habitat within or adjacent to the Project site shall be flagged as Environmentally Sensitive Areas and shall be avoided by all construction personnel. • Survey the site at least 24 hours prior to the initiation of ground-disturbing activities in suitable GGS habitat. This survey shall be conducted by a USFWS-approved biologist in suitable GGS habitat. Surveys shall be repeated if a lapse in construction activity of two weeks or greater occurs. If a GGS is encountered during ground-disturbing activities, activities at that specific location shall cease until appropriate corrective measures, in concurrence with USFWS coordination, have been completed or it has been determined that the GGS will not be harmed. Sightings shall be reported to USFWS. • Implement construction activity within GGS habitat between May 1 and October 1. This is the active period for GGS and direct mortality is lessened, because GGS are expected to actively move and avoid danger. Consultation with the USFWS is required for construction activities scheduled to occur in potential GGS habitat			

Table MMRP-1

Mitigation Monitoring and Reporting Program for the Flyway Farms Project

Impact Number	Mitigation Measure	Enforcement and Monitoring Responsibility	Timing/ Implementation	Verification (Date and Initials)
	between October 2 and April 30. • Ensure that any dewatered GGS habitat shall remain dry for at least 15 consecutive days after April 15, and prior to excavating or filling of the dewatered GGS habitat. • Require when working near flooded canals during the summer months, vehicle speeds shall not exceed 15 miles per hour (MPH) in areas where the line-of-site is obstructed and 25 MPH in other areas to avoid hitting the GGS and other special-status wildlife. • Remove temporary fill and construction debris after construction completion, and, wherever feasible, restore disturbed areas to pre-project conditions.			
Impact 4.4-2: Direct Fish Lethality or Injury	**Mitigation Measure 4.4-1:** •Conduct biological surveys to determine if there are any fishes present. •Recover fishes, if present, using appropriate techniques such as beach seining; retain the captured fishes in cooled, aerated containers; and release fishes the same day as captured into the waters of Stair Step or Toe Drain.	*Yolo County Planning, Public Works and Environmental Services Department/ State and federal agencies with permit authority over the project.*	*Prior to initiation of any grading or excavation/ Measure included as a Condition of Approval.*	
AGRICULTURAL RESOURCES				
Impact 4.5-1: Loss of Important Farmland and Productivity	**Mitigation Measure 4.4-1:** The project shall mitigate for the loss of approximately 0.43 acres of farmed wetlands by complying with the requirements of the Agricultural Conservation and Mitigation Program (Section 8-2.404 of the Yolo County Code).	*Yolo County Planning, Public Works and Environmental Services Department/ Planning Division*	*Prior to issuance of any grading permits / Measure included as a Condition of Approval.*	

Table MMRP-1

Mitigation Monitoring and Reporting Program for the Flyway Farms Project

Impact Number	Mitigation Measure	Enforcement and Monitoring Responsibility	Timing/ Implementation	Verification (Date and Initials)
AIR QUALITY				
Impact 4.6-1: Short-term Construction Emissions of Criteria Pollutants that May Contribute to Existing Air Quality Violations	**Mitigation Measure 4.6-1:** The mitigation measure shall be implemented to minimize emissions of NO_x and PM_{10}: •Limit construction on those days where Yolo County is predicted to exceed the "Spare the Air" Air Quality Index (AQI) for ozone >127 by the Sacramento Metropolitan Air Quality Management District (summer downwind area). Examples of limiting construction could range from stopping work that day to reducing construction to a half day or relying on electrical equipment solely. Once the AQI level of unhealthy is reached, i.e., 151 to 200 or beyond, all construction work shall cease for that day. •Require haul trucks and off-road diesel equipment operators to shut down their engines instead of idling for more than five minutes, unless such idling is necessary for proper operation of the equipment. Provide clear signage that posts this requirement for workers at the entrances to the site. •Require contractors' construction equipment to be maintained and properly tuned in accordance with manufacturer's specifications. All equipment shall be checked and determined to be running in proper condition prior to operations. •Limit vehicle speeds on unpaved roads to 15 MPH. •Cover or maintain at least two feet of freeboard space on haul trucks transporting soil, sand, or loose materials onsite. Any haul trucks that would be traveling along freeways or major roadways shall be covered. •All active construction sites shall be watered at least twice daily. Frequency shall be based on the type of operation, soil, wind exposure, and the ability to eliminate visible fugitive dust. •Between the time of completing construction and prior to the onset of winter rains, encourage the property owner and/or property manager to reinstate typical agricultural irrigation practices as a means to wet soils so they do not generate dust, as feasible. •Cover or water inactive storage piles. •If Soils Reuse Option #1 or #3 is selected, then re-establish vegetation on the toe	*Yolo County Planning, Public Works and Environmental Services Department/*	*During all excavation activities /Measure included as a Condition of Approval.*	

Table MMRP-1

Mitigation Monitoring and Reporting Program for the Flyway Farms Project

Impact Number	Mitigation Measure	Enforcement and Monitoring Responsibility	Timing/ Implementation	Verification (Date and Initials)
	berm and buffer areas, i.e., use native grassland species seed mix on the toe berm and apply native wetland-upland transition mix in the buffer areas. •Develop an emissions reduction plan that demonstrates that off-road equipment of more than 50 horsepower to be used during construction of all project-and program-level elements shall achieve a project-wide fleet-average 20 percent NO_x reduction and 45 percent PM reduction compared to the most recent California Air Resources Board fleet average. Acceptable options for reducing emissions shall include using late model engines, low-emissions diesel products, alternative fuels, engine retrofit technology, after-treatment products, and/or add-on devices such as particulate filters, with specifics dependent on contractor's ability to secure such equipment in a timely fashion.			
CULTURAL RESOURCES				
Impact 4.7-1: Loss of, or Damage to, Unknown Archaeological Resources	**Mitigation Measure 4.7-1:** Where ground-disturbing activities may occur: •Conduct an environmental awareness training concerning cultural resources management utilizing the services of a qualified archaeologist for contractors and their staff prior to the start of construction. •Cease ground-disturbing work in the vicinity of the area should buried archaeological resources be uncovered during construction, operation, and/or routine maintenance, until a qualified archaeologist can visit the site of discovery and assess the significance of the resource. After the assessment is completed, the archaeologist shall submit a report describing the significance of the discovery and its origin with cultural resources management recommendations if the archaeological resources are significant. •Comply with Public Resources Code § 21083.2, as applicable, should buried archaeological resources be found. Avoidance or preservation in an undisturbed state is the preferable course of action. Preservation methods may include: o Planning construction to avoid archaeological sites.	*Yolo County Planning, Public Works and Environmental Services Department/*	*To be included in grading or building plans or specifications/ Measure included as a Condition of Approval.*	

Table MMRP-1

Mitigation Monitoring and Reporting Program for the Flyway Farms Project

Impact Number	Mitigation Measure	Enforcement and Monitoring Responsibility	Timing/ Implementation	Verification (Date and Initials)
	○ Deeding sites into permanent conservation easements. ○ Capping or covering sites with a layer of soil before building on the sites. ○ Planning parks, greenspace, or other open space to incorporate archaeological sites.			
Impact 4.7-3: Impacts to Unknown Human Burial Resources	**Mitigation Measure 4.7-2:** Where ground-disturbing activities may occur: •Notify the Yolo County coroner, Yolo County Department of Public Works, and designated Most Likely Descendant (as identified by the Native American Heritage Commission) in the event of discovering human remains during construction, operation, and/or routine maintenance of the Project. The notification protocol and process shall proceed in accordance with the *State CEQA Guidelines,* California Code of Regulations (CCR) § 15064.5(e); Public Resources Code § 5097.98; and Health and Safety Code § 7050.5, as applicable.	*Yolo County Planning, Public Works and Environmental Services Department/*	*During initial grading or excavation/ Measure included as a Condition of Approval.*	
HAZARDS AND HAZARDOUS MATERIALS				
Impact 4.8-1: Effects of Soils and Materials Contamination	**Mitigation Measure 4.8-1:** Based on final design and environmental/physical conditions onsite, one or more of the following elements of this mitigation measure shall be undertaken if evidence indicates that soil sites and/or materials are contaminated per applicable hazardous waste laws and regulations: •Develop and implement a monitoring and treatment/disposal plan in accordance with all applicable hazardous waste laws and regulations. •Examine soil below any pole-mounted transformers on the portion of the Project site to be graded. If there is evidence (such as discoloration of the soil) that PCBs have leaked from the transformers, then Pacific Gas & Electric (PG&E) shall be contacted. It is the responsibility of PG&E to perform a soils investigation and cleanup if any of the pole-mounted transformers are determined to have leaked PCBs.	*Yolo County Planning, Public Works and Environmental Services Department/*	*Prior to issuance of any grading permits/Measure included as a Condition of Approval.*	

Table MMRP-1

Mitigation Monitoring and Reporting Program for the Flyway Farms Project

Impact Number	Mitigation Measure	Enforcement and Monitoring Responsibility	Timing/ Implementation	Verification (Date and Initials)
	•Test or assume that the wood demolished and removed from the existing irrigation system contains potentially hazardous waste (e.g., lead paint, creosote, arsenic, etc.) and then have it treated, recycled, or disposed of in accordance with applicable regulations concerning hazardous waste.			
Impact 4.8-2: Hazards with Natural Gas Wells and Related Pipelines	**Mitigation Measure 4.8-2:** •Develop and implement actions in coordination and concurrence with the Yolo County Fire and Emergency Services Department and California Division of Oil, Gas, and Geothermal Resources to comply with applicable requirements of the Well Review Program (DOGGR 2007) and other applicable public safety requirements. Such measures include contacting the California Underground Service Alert in a timely manner prior to excavation, inspecting site to look for physical evidence of underground facilities, marking off excavated areas, having an emergency plan in place, etc.	*Yolo County Planning, Public Works and Environmental Services Department*	*Required as part of any approved grading permits/Measure included as a Condition of Approval.*	
CUMULATIVE IMPACTS				
	See Mitigation Measures 4.3-1 thru 4.3-8; 4.6-1; 4.7-1 and 4.7-2; 4.8-1 and 4.8-2, above.			

APPENDIX A

Project Consistency with Delta Plan Program EIR Mitigation Measures

Delta Plan Mitigation Measure #	Delta Plan Mitigation Measure	Flyway Farms Restoration Project Consistency
Water Resources		
3-1	♦ For construction of new facilities, all typical construction mitigation measures shall be required. Typical mitigation measures include the following construction-related Best Management Practices (BMPs): • Gravel bags, silt fences, etc., shall be placed along the edge of all work areas in order to contain particulates prior to contact with receiving waters. • All concrete washing and spoils dumping shall occur in a designated location. • Construction stockpiles shall be covered in order to prevent blowoff or runoff during weather events. • Severe weather event erosion control materials and devices shall be stored onsite for use as needed. • Soil stabilization, sediment control, wind erosion control, tracking control, non-storm water management, and waste management/materials pollution control ♦ Apply other BMPs as determined necessary by the regulating entity (city, county). ♦ Any new facility with introduced impervious surfaces shall include stormwater control measures that are consistent with the Regional Water Quality Control Board (RWQCB) National Pollutant Discharge Elimination System (NPDES) municipal stormwater runoff requirements. The stormwater control measures shall be designed and implemented to reduce the discharge of stormwater pollutants to the maximum extent practical. Stormwater controls such as bioretention facilities, flow-through planters, detention basins, vegetative swales, covering pollutant sources, oil/water separators, and retention ponds shall be designed to control stormwater quality to the maximum extent practical. ♦ Mitigate sediment contaminant bioavailability impacts through (a) the exclusion of bird use or nesting areas from areas that may have excessive selenium or mercury; (b) minimization of methylmercury production; and/or (c) maximization of contaminant degradation before discharge of water, as appropriate. For any construction activities with the potential to cause in-river sediment disturbance associated with construction: ♦ Apply BMPs to avoid or reduce temporary increases in suspended sediment. These BMPs for in-channel construction and levee disturbance may include, but are not limited to, silt curtains, cofferdams, the use of environmental dredges, erosion control on all inward levee slopes, and various levee-stabilization techniques, including revegetation. All construction sites will include preparation of a Storm Water Pollution Prevention Plan and BMPs designed to capture spills and prevent erosion to the waterbody. Turbidity shall be monitored up- and downstream of construction sites as a measure of impact. ♦ Apply bank stabilization BMPs, as needed, for any in-channel disturbance, such as: • A 100-foot vegetative or engineered buffer shall be maintained between the construction zone and surface water body. • Native and annual grasses or other vegetative cover shall be established on construction sites immediately upon completion of work causing disturbance, to reduce the potential for erosion close to a waterway or water body.	Project is consistent with applicable mitigation measures identified in this section. SWPP: see Final SEIR pages 62, 74-75. Mercury: see Final SEIR pages 75-77. BMPs: see Final SEIR pages 62, 74-75.

Delta Plan Mitigation Measure #	Delta Plan Mitigation Measure	Flyway Farms Restoration Project Consistency
3-2	♦ Prior to construction, a survey should be made of all wells located adjacent to the construction site to determine location and depths of the wells and the groundwater surface. During construction of any project that requires dewatering of groundwater, monitoring wells should be installed adjacent to the groundwater dewatering wells or pumps. If the adjacent groundwater declines in a manner that would adversely affect adjacent wells following implementation of dewatering, the dewatering operations should be halted until the following measures are be implemented: • Install sheet piles to reduce the area influenced by shallow groundwater level declines. • In case sheet piles are not an option and domestic well yields are affected, water supplies shall be trucked in to satisfy the well user's water supply needs. • If sheet piles are not effective and the impact on the well yield is important, such that the trucking in of water is not economically feasible, the affected well shall be deepened. Another option for a well that is deep enough would be to lower the pump bowl such that deepened water can be pumped out of the well. If these two options are not feasible, a new, deeper, replacement well shall be installed for groundwater production.	Project is consistent with applicable mitigation measures identified in this section. Wells and Groundwater: See Final SEIR pages 71 and 79.
Biological Resources		
4-1	♦ Avoid, minimize, and compensate for reduction in area and/or habitat quality of sensitive natural communities, including wetlands, by doing the following: • Selecting project site(s) that would avoid sensitive natural communities, including jurisdictional wetlands and other waters, vernal pools, alkali seasonal wetlands, riparian habitats, and inland dune scrub. • Design, to the extent practicable, project elements to avoid effects on sensitive natural communities. • Replacing, restoring, or enhancing on a "no net loss" basis (in accordance with U.S. Army Corps of Engineers (USACE) and State Water Resources Control Board (SWRCB) requirements), wetlands and other waters of the United States and waters of the State that would be removed, lost, and/or degraded. • Where impacts to sensitive natural communities other than waters of the United States or State are unavoidable, compensating for impacts by restoring and/or preserving in-kind sensitive natural communities on-site, or off-site at a nearby site, or by purchasing in-kind restoration or preservation credits from a mitigation bank that services the project site and that is approved by the appropriate agencies , in consultation with applicable regulatory agencies (at ratios that offset temporal loss of habitat value). ♦ Implement advanced mitigation planning for ecosystem restoration prior to construction. ♦ Implement construction best management practices, including: • Developing and implementing a Stormwater Pollution Prevention Plan (SWPPP). • Minimizing soil disturbance, erosion, and sediment runoff from project site. • Avoiding and minimizing contaminant spills. • Minimizing visual and noise disturbance from construction activities. • Conducting biological construction monitoring to ensure that implemented BMPs are effective. ♦ Restore areas temporarily affected by construction activities, including: • Preparing restoration plan for temporary impacts sites for review by resource agencies. • Minimizing soil disturbance and stockpiling topsoil for later use in any areas to be graded.	Project is consistent with applicable mitigation measures identified in this section. Avoid communities: See Final SEIR Mitigation Measures 4.3-1, 4.3-2, 4.3-4, 4.3-5, 4.3-6, 4.3-7, 4.3-8, 4.4-1, and SEIR Chapters 4.3 (Terrestrial Biological Resources) and. Chapters 4.3 (Aquatic Biological Resources). BMPs: see Final SEIR pages62, 74-75 and mitigation measures cited above. Restore areas temporarily affected: this restoration project is designed to restore tidal habitats to the project site. Preservation of oak woodlands: Not applicable. An invasive species management plan will be developed as part of the Long Term Management Plan, which is being coordinated with CDFW staff through the Tidal Marsh Working Group, to ensure consistency with the Interagency Ecological program

Delta Plan Mitigation Measure #	Delta Plan Mitigation Measure	Flyway Farms Restoration Project Consistency
	• Decompacting or amending soil if necessary before planting and use native species for revegetation. • Restoring natural communities with similar or improved function from communities that were affected. ♦ If a project may result in conversion of oak woodlands, as identified in section 21083.4 of the Public Resources Code, one or more of the following mitigation measures shall be implemented: • Conserve oak woodlands, through the use of conservation easements. • Plant an appropriate number of trees, including maintaining plantings and replacing dead or diseased trees. • Contribute funds to the Oak Woodlands Conservation Fund, as established under subdivision (a) of section 1363 of the Fish and Game Code. ♦ An invasive species management plan shall be developed and implemented for any project whose construction or operation could lead to introduction or facilitation of invasive species establishment. The plan shall ensure that invasive plant species and populations are kept below preconstruction abundance and distribution levels. The plan shall be based on the best available science and developed in consultation with Department of Fish and Wildlife (DFW) and local experts, such as the University of California Extension, county agricultural commissioners, representatives of County Weed Management Areas (WMA), California Invasive Plant Council, and California Department of Food and Agriculture. The invasive species management plan will include the following elements: • Nonnative species eradication methods (if eradication is feasible) • Nonnative species management methods • Early detection methods • Notification requirements • Best management practices for preconstruction, construction, and post construction periods • Monitoring, remedial actions and reporting requirements • Provisions for updating the target species list over the lifetime of the project as new invasive species become potential threats to the integrity of the local ecosystems	Tidal Wetlands Monitoring Framework currently in development.

Delta Plan Mitigation Measure #	Delta Plan Mitigation Measure	Flyway Farms Restoration Project Consistency
4-2	♦ Select project site(s) that would avoid habitats of special-status species (which may include foraging, sheltering, migration and rearing habitat in addition to breeding or spawning habitat), and to the maximum extent practicable, (re)design project elements to avoid effects on such species. ♦ Schedule construction to avoid special-status species' breeding, spawning, or migration locations during the seasons or active periods that these activities occur. ♦ Conduct preconstruction surveys (by a qualified biologist) for special-status species in accordance with U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service (USFWS), National Marine Fisheries Service (NMFS) and DFW survey methodologies and appropriate timing to determine presence and locations of any special-status species and their habitat, and avoid, minimize, or compensate for impacts to special-status species in coordination with DFW and USFWS or NMFS. ♦ Establish buffers around special-status species habitats to exclude effects of construction activities. The size of the buffer shall be in accordance with USFWS and DFW protocols for the applicable special-status species. If nest tree removal is necessary, remove the tree only after the nest is no longer active, as determined by a qualified biologist. ♦ Conduct construction monitoring (by qualified biologist) to ensure effectiveness of avoidance and minimization measures and implement remedial measures if necessary. ♦ When appropriate, relocate special-status plant and animal species or their habitats from project sites following USFWS, NMFS, and DFW protocols (e.g., for special-status plant species or elderberry shrubs). ♦ Where impacts to special-status species are unavoidable, compensate for impacts by restoring or preserving in- kind suitable habitat on-site, or off-site, or by purchasing restoration or preservation credits (in compliance with the California Endangered Species Act (CESA) and federal Endangered Species Act (ESA) for affected State- or federally-listed species from a mitigation bank that serves the project site and that is approved by the appropriate agencies, in consultation with the appropriate regulatory agencies (at ratios that offset the temporary loss of habitat value).	Avoid habitats of sensitive species: See Final SEIR Mitigation Measures 4.3-1, 4.3-2, 4.3-4, 4.3-5, 4.3-6, 4.3-7, 4.3-8, 4.4-1, and SEIR Chapters 4.3 (Terrestrial Biological Resources) and. Chapters 4.3 (Aquatic Biological Resources).The project was specifically designed to avoid and improve habitat for Delta smelt, salmonids , and other protected species.
4-3	♦ Select project site(s) that would avoid a substantial reduction in fish and wildlife species habitat. ♦ To the maximum extent practicable, design project elements to avoid effects that would lead to a substantial loss of fish and wildlife habitat. ♦ Replace, restore, or enhance habitats for fish and wildlife species that would be lost. ♦ Where substantial loss of habitat for fish and wildlife species is unavoidable, compensate for impacts by preserving in-kind habitat.	Planned restoration project is consistent with all mitigation measures in this section.
4-4	♦ Protect habitat for migratory waterfowl and shorebirds by expanding existing wildlife refuges and management areas, and establishing new ones in or near wetland areas used by migratory waterfowl and shorebirds. ♦ Protect, restore and enhance connectivity of habitats, including but not limited to wetland and riparian habitats that function as migration corridors for wildlife species. Habitat restoration might be accomplished by establishing suitable hydrology or other physical conditions for desirable vegetation, planting desirable vegetation, fencing and managing grazing, and other means. ♦ Protect migratory pathways for migratory aquatic species such as salmon, steelhead, and sturgeon including those that use Delta tributaries and floodplain habitats by screening new diversions, and screening existing diversions	Connectivity: Restoration project is part of, and adjacent to, the much larger planned Lower Yolo Restoration Project and will create new habitats for native species. Migratory pathways: Project is expected to enhance habitat for Delta smelt and salmonids using the Yolo Bypass and

Delta Plan Mitigation Measure #	Delta Plan Mitigation Measure	Flyway Farms Restoration Project Consistency
	and removing existing migration barriers if the specific proposed project/activity (e.g., increased intake volume through an existing unscreened diversion, new diversion, new barrier, new barrier near an existing unscreened diversion, etc.) exacerbates the negative effect on migratory aquatic species caused by the existing barrier or unscreened diversion. ♦ Avoid or minimize alteration of flow patterns and water quality effects that could disrupt migratory cues for migratory aquatic species by implementing water management measures and establishing programs to reduce water pollution.	north Delta.
4-5	♦ Prior to construction, evaluate impacts to trees or other biological resources protected by local policies and ordinances, and abide by any permit requirements associated with these policies and ordinances.	Local ordinances: See Final SEIR pages123-127.
Delta Flood Risk		
5-1	♦ Prepare a drainage or hydrology and hydraulic study that would assess the need and provide a basis for the design of drainage-related mitigations, such as new onsite drainage systems or new cross drainage facilities. Prepare the study in accordance with applicable standards of Federal Emergency Management Agency (FEMA), USACE, state Department of Water Resources (DWR), Central Valley Flood Protection Board (CVFPB), as well as the local reclamation districts and flood control agencies and the counties and cities. Design subsequent mitigation measures in accordance with the final study and with the applicable standards of FEMA, USACE, DWR, and CVFPB. The study would identify potential increases in flood risks, including those that may result from new facilities. ♦ Provide temporary drainage bypass facilities that would reroute drainage around, along, or over the Proposed Project facilities and construction sites. The temporary bypass facilities would be designed in accordance with the results and recommendations of a drainage or hydrologic and hydraulic study and would be in place and fully functional until long-term replacement facilities are completed. ♦ Provide onsite stormwater detention storage at construction and project facility sites that would reduce project- caused short- or long-term increases in drainage runoff. The storage space placement and capacity would be designed based on the drainage or hydrologic and hydraulic study. ♦ Based on the results of the drainage or hydrologic and hydraulic study, arrange the length of any stockpiles or other construction features in the direction of the floodplain flow to maximize surface flows under flood flow conditions. ♦ At in-stream construction sites that might reduce channel capacity, install setback levees or bypass channels to maintain channel capacity and to mitigate hydraulic impacts. ♦ Where low channel velocities might result from construction, implement a sediment management program in order to maintain channel capacity. ♦ Provide cross drainage, replacement drainage paths and facilities, and enlarged flow paths to reroute drainage around, under, or over the Proposed Project facilities and to restore the function of any affected existing drainage or flow paths and facilities. ♦ Channel modifications for restoration actions would be required to be implemented to maintain or improve flood management functions and would be coordinated with the USACE, DWR, CVFPB, and other flood control agencies to assess the desirability and feasibility for channel modifications. To the extent consistent with floodplain land uses and flood control requirements, if applicable,	Project is consistent with applicable mitigation measures identified in this section. Flood flow conveyance: See Final SEIR Chapter 4.1 (Hydrology), especially pages 69-71.

Delta Plan Mitigation Measure #	Delta Plan Mitigation Measure	Flyway Farms Restoration Project Consistency
	woody riparian vegetation would be allowed to naturally establish. ♦ For areas that would be flooded as a result of the project, or where existing flooding would be increased in magnitude, frequency, or duration, purchase a flowage easement and/or property at the fair-market value. ♦ Provide a long-term sediment removal program at in-river structures. ♦ To mitigate potential impacts of changes in the timing of reservoir releases or the possible combination of river peak flows, use forecasts to implement coordination of operations with existing reservoirs.	
5-2	♦ Prepare a drainage or hydrology and hydraulics study that would assess the need and provide a basis for the design of drainage-related mitigations, such as new onsite drainage systems or new cross drainage facilities. Prepare the study in accordance with applicable standards of FEMA, USACE, DWR, CVFPB, as well as the local reclamation districts and flood control agencies and the counties and cities. Design subsequent mitigation measures in accordance with the final study and with the applicable standards of FEMA, USACE, DWR, and CVFPB. ♦ Provide onsite stormwater detention storage at construction and project facility sites that would reduce project- caused short- and long-term increases in drainage runoff. The storage space would be designed based on the drainage or hydrologic and hydraulic study.	A series of hydrology/drainage studies have been prepared and support the project design and conclusions documented in the Final SEIR (cbec, 2011a and b, 2014).

Delta Plan Mitigation Measure #	Delta Plan Mitigation Measure	Flyway Farms Restoration Project Consistency
5-4	♦ Prepare a drainage or hydrology and hydraulics study that would assess the need and provide a basis for the design of drainage-related mitigations, such as new onsite drainage systems or new cross drainage facilities. Prepare the study in accordance with applicable standards of FEMA, USACE, DWR, CVFPB, as well as the local reclamation districts and flood control agencies and the counties and cities. Design subsequent mitigation measures in accordance with the final study and with the applicable standards of FEMA, USACE, DWR, and CVFPB. ♦ Where high channel velocities might result from construction, provide bank protection, such as rip rap, to protect levees from erosion. ♦ Where construction results in longer channel wind fetch lengths, install vegetative buffer zones or wave erosion protection on the water side slope of levees, such as rock or grouted rip rap, and increase levee freeboard to address higher wind and wave runup. ♦ Based on the drainage or hydrology and hydraulics study, determine any resulting changes to available evacuation plans or emergency response times. ♦ To reduce emergency response times and public safety risks, raise structures and major roads out of the floodplain. ♦ Provide automated flood warning systems. ♦ Develop and implement area-specific evacuation and emergency response plans. ♦ Considering the results of the hydraulics study noted above, perform a seepage and stability analyses that would assess the need and act as a basis for design of other seepage- and stability-related mitigations, such as cutoff walls, adjacent levees, setback levees, berms, and subdrainage features. Perform the analyses in accordance with applicable standards of FEMA, USACE, and DWR. ♦ Perform research and collect subsurface information in accordance with applicable standards of FEMA, USACE, and DWR and perform settlement analyses that would assess the need for monitoring and potential settlement-related mitigations, such as ground improvement or pre-construction surcharging. Perform the analyses in accordance with applicable standards of USACE. ♦ Perform research and collect subsurface information in accordance with applicable standards of FEMA, USACE, and DWR and perform seismic and liquefaction analyses that would assess the need and provide the basis for design of other seismic-related mitigations, such as ground improvement. Perform the analyses in accordance with applicable standards of USACE and American Society of Civil Engineers and Southern California Earthquake Center. ♦ Prepare and implement a plan for periodic maintenance, inspections, repair, and rehabilitation of new water storage and conveyance facilities that could cause flooding upon failure. ♦ Provide redundancy and safety controls and devices on water storage and conveyance facilities (pump stations, canals, and tunnels) to protect against facility failure and subsequent flooding. ♦ To limit flooding from the unlikely event of a conveyance facility failure, limit extensive flow escape with installation of safety devices such as gated checks. ♦ Construct new evacuation roads and access roads, as necessary.*1* ♦ Conduct Golden Guardian emergency drills.	See hydrology studies cited above (cbec, 2011a and b, 2014). Some of these measures are not applicable to the Flyway Farms Project.

Delta Plan Mitigation Measure #	Delta Plan Mitigation Measure	Flyway Farms Restoration Project Consistency
5-5	♦ Prepare a drainage or hydrology and hydraulics study that would assess the need and provide a basis for the design of drainage-related mitigations, such as new onsite drainage systems or new cross drainage facilities. Prepare the study in accordance with applicable standards of FEMA, USACE, DWR, CVFPB, as well as the local reclamation districts and flood control agencies and the counties and cities. Design subsequent mitigation measures in accordance with the final study and with the applicable standards of FEMA, USACE, DWR, and CVFPB. Provide temporary drainage bypass facilities that would reroute drainage around, along, or over the Proposed Project facilities and construction sites. The temporary bypass facilities would be designed in accordance with drainage or hydrology and hydraulic study and would be in place and fully functional until long-term replacement facilities are completed. ♦ Based on the results of the drainage or hydrologic and hydraulic study, arrange the length of any stockpiles or other construction features in the direction of the floodplain flow to maximize surface flows under flood conditions. ♦ At in-stream construction sites that might reduce channel capacity, install setback levees or bypass channels to maintain channel capacity and to mitigate hydraulic impacts. ♦ Provide cross drainage, replacement drainage paths and facilities, and enlarged flow paths to reroute drainage around, under, or over the Proposed Project facilities and to restore the function of any affected existing drainage or flow paths and facilities. ♦ Channel modifications for restoration actions would be required to be implemented to maintain or improve flood management functions and would be coordinated with the USACE, DWR, CVFPB, and other flood control agencies to assess the desirability and feasibility for channel modifications. To the extent consistent with floodplain land uses and flood control requirements, if applicable, woody riparian vegetation would be allowed to naturally establish.	See Final SEIR Chapter 4.1 (Hydrology). The project design and channel modifications have been designed in coordination with the relevant federal and State agencies, to create habitat and retain flood control function and infrastructure in the lower Yolo Bypass.

Land Use and Planning

6-1	♦Minimize physical division of existing established communities or residential areas by designing new facilities and infrastructure to be located underground or with sufficient points of visual and physical access. Examples of methods of minimizing physical division include (but are not limited to): • Burying or visually masking new infrastructure or facilities; • Restoring disturbed landscapes back to preconstruction conditions; • Reestablishing access (e.g., reconnecting roads, rebuilding bridges); • Relocating landmark buildings; or • Implementing other feasible mitigation to reduce the disturbance to a community's physical composition, visual character, or other features integral to the community's identity.	Not applicable
6-2	♦ Compensate for the loss or reduction in environmental values protected by the subject plan or policy. For example, if the project would result in conversion of agricultural land to a non-agricultural use, potential mitigation actions could include: • Recording a deed restriction that ensures permanent conservation and mitigation on other property of equal or greater environmental mitigation value; • Creating a buffer or barrier between uses; • Redesigning the project or selecting an alternate location that avoids or mitigates the impact; and/or • Restoring disturbed land to conditions to provide equal or greater environmental value to the land affected by the covered action.	Regarding agricultural land loss; see Mitigation Measure 4.4.4-1 in the Final SEIR.

Delta Plan Mitigation Measure #	Delta Plan Mitigation Measure	Flyway Farms Restoration Project Consistency

Agriculture and Forestry Resources

7-1	♦ Design proposed projects to minimize, to the greatest extent feasible, the loss of the highest valued agricultural land. ♦ For projects that will result in permanent conversion of Farmland, preserve in perpetuity other Farmland through acquisition of an agricultural conservation easement, or contributing funds to a land trust or other entity qualified to preserve Farmland in perpetuity (at a target ratio of 1:1, depending on the nature of the conversion and the characteristics of the Farmland to be converted, to compensate for permanent loss). ♦ Redesign project features to minimize fragmenting or isolating Farmland. Where a project involves acquiring land or easements, ensure that the remaining nonproject area is of a size sufficient to allow viable farming operations. The project proponents shall be responsible for acquiring easements, making lot line adjustments, and merging affected land parcels into units suitable for continued commercial agricultural management. ♦ Reconnect utilities or infrastructure that serve agricultural uses if these are disturbed by project construction. If a project temporarily or permanently cuts off roadway access or removes utility lines, irrigation features, or other infrastructure, the project proponents shall be responsible for restoring access as necessary to ensure that economically viable farming operations are not interrupted. ♦ Manage project operations to minimize the introduction of invasive species or weeds that may affect agricultural production on adjacent agricultural land. ♦ Establish buffer areas between projects and adjacent agricultural land that are sufficient to protect and maintain land capability and agricultural operation flexibility. Design buffers to protect the feasibility of ongoing agricultural operations and reduce the effects of construction- or operation-related activities (including the potential to introduce special-status species in the agricultural areas) on adjacent or nearby properties. The buffer shall also serve to protect ecological restoration areas from noise, dust, and the application of agricultural chemicals. The width of the buffer shall be determined on a project-by-project basis to account for variations in prevailing winds, crop types, agricultural practices, ecological restoration, or infrastructure. Buffers can function as drainage swales, trails, roads, linear parkways, or other uses compatible with ongoing agricultural operations.	Project is consistent with applicable mitigation measures identified in this section. See Mitigation Measure 4.4.4-1 and pages 68-69 (ag drainage) in the Final SEIR.
7-2	♦ Design proposed projects to minimize, to the greatest extent feasible, conflicts and inconsistencies with land protected by agricultural zoning or a Williamson Act contract and the terms of the applicable zoning/contract.	The County will require the applicant to seek approval of an amended Williamson Act contract to authorize open space uses, see pages 129-130 in the Final SEIR.
7-3	♦ Avoid land protected as forestland and timberland through site selection and/or project design. Where feasible, project proponents should take into account the value of the forest, not only in terms of direct products such as wood but also as part of the watershed ecosystem, when selecting a project site. Wherever possible, nonprotected sites should be preferred and selected instead of protected sites.	Not applicable
7-4	♦ For projects that will result in permanent conversion of Forestland, preserve in perpetuity other forestland through a conservation easement or by acquiring lands or contributing funds to a land trust or other agency (at a target ratio of 1:1, depending on the nature of the conversion and the characteristics of the	Not applicable

Delta Plan Mitigation Measure #	Delta Plan Mitigation Measure	Flyway Farms Restoration Project Consistency
	Forestland to be converted, to compensate for permanent loss). ♦ Avoid land protected as forestland and timberland through site selection and/or project design. Where feasible, project proponents should take into account the value of the forest, not only in terms of direct products such as wood, but also as part of the watershed ecosystem, when selecting a project site. When possible, unprotected sites should be preferred and selected instead of protected sites. ♦ When removal of existing forestland or timberlands is required as part of an action, proponents must acquire the property at fair market value.	

Visual Resources

8-1	♦ Use compatible colors for proposed structural features, such as intakes, pumping plants, and surge towers. Use earth tone paints and stains with low levels of reflectivity. ♦ Minimize the vertical profile of proposed structures as much as possible. Where possible, use subgrades for floors of structures. Use landscaped berms instead of walls to mask views of structures from high-visibility sites. Use green roof design where roof structures would be highly visible. ♦ Use vegetation plantings on proposed facility walls, such as climbing plants, espaliers, and other forms that soften the appearance of structures. ♦ Develop a landscaping plan for all proposed structures. Provide vegetative screening to soften views of structures. Landscaping should complement the surrounding landscape. ♦ Round the tops and bottoms of spoil disposal areas, and contour the faces of slopes to create more natural-looking landforms. Create visual diversity by planting vegetation with diverse growth forms on the spoil disposal areas; plant with more than just grasses. ♦ Landscape parking areas at proposed facilities, and include low-impact design features, such as permeable pavers, tree basins, and bioswales, that reduce stormwater runoff and enhance visual quality. ♦ Conduct only partial vegetative clearing of the limits of construction rather than clear the entire area; partial clearing would leave islands of vegetation and result in a more natural look. Use irregular clearing shapes with feathered edges instead of hard edges to promote a more natural effect. ♦ Develop design form and materials with a goal to achieve aesthetic visual character instead of a strictly utilitarian objective. Use cast natural form elements or natural materials for facing to achieve texture and color compatible with the adjacent landscape; natural materials would be preferable for areas of high visibility and public use. Landscape areas adjacent to facilities. Use natural materials, such as wood and stone, for signage at proposed facilities. ♦ Develop aesthetically pleasing landscaping for relocated roads at the shoulders, intersections, and on- and off- ramps from highways. Design turnouts and scenic vista points where appropriate for relocated roads with high visibility and high public use. ♦ To the extent consistent with the safety and reliability of the electric grid, as well as site-specific considerations, use single-pole electrical transmission towers instead of lattice-form towers for proposed large electrical transmission lines, and put transmission lines underground along areas with high visibility and high public use. ♦ Consider developing aesthetically well-designed visitor centers, vantage areas, or observation decks at appropriate facilities with interpretation features, walking paths, and other features. Although developing visitor centers would not reduce a visual impact, it would have the effect of making the facilities features of interest to the touring public.	These measures are not applicable to the Flyway Farms Project.

Delta Plan Mitigation Measure #	Delta Plan Mitigation Measure	Flyway Farms Restoration Project Consistency
8-2	♦ Implement elements of Mitigation Measure 8-1 for temporary construction activities and new facilities that are visible from scenic vistas and designated roads and highways as appropriate. ♦ Replace all scenic resources (e.g., large trees) that would be removed for the Proposed Project, when feasible. Identify compensatory mitigation for visual or aesthetic resources by providing improvements to areas with existing diminished scenic quality.	Not applicable.
8-3	♦ Use shields for proposed lighting facilities, and direct lighting downward and inward toward the facilities.	Not applicable
Air Quality		
9-1	♦ Use equipment and vehicles that are compliant with Air Resource Board (ARB) requirements and emission standards for on-road and off-road fleets and engines. New engines and retrofit control systems should reduce NO_x and PM from diesel-fueled on-road and off-road vehicles and equipment. ♦ Minimize idling times either by shutting equipment off when not in use or reducing the maximum idling time to 5 minutes (as required by the California airborne toxics control measure Title 13, Section 2485 of CA Code of Regulations [CCR]).Clear signage should be posted for construction workers at all entrances to the site. ♦ Maintain all equipment in proper working condition according to manufacturer's specifications. ♦ Use electric equipment when possible. Use lower-emitting alternative fuels to power vehicles and equipment where feasible. ♦ Use low Volatile Organic Compounds (VOC) coatings and chemicals; minimize chemical use. ♦ Prepare a dust control plan and apply dust control measures at the construction sites. ♦ To minimize track-out of dirt and mud from dirt and gravel roads, all trucks and equipment, including their tires, shall be washed prior to leaving the site. Only exteriors of trucks and equipment are to be washed (no engine degreasing), no detergents or chemicals shall be used in the wash water, and off-site runoff of rinse water shall be prevented. ♦ For projects involving land fallowing, land conversion, or other agricultural operations, implement applicable BMPs from agencies such as the U.S. Department of Agriculture Natural Resources Conservation Service to reduce potential dust emissions. BMPs for fallowed lands could include, but are not limited to, the following: ♦ Implement conservation cropping sequences and wind erosion protection measures, such as: • Plan ahead to start with plenty of vegetation residue, and maintain as much residue on fallowed fields as possible. Residue is more effective for wind erosion protection if left standing. • If residues are not adequate, small grain can be seeded about the first of the year to take advantage of the winter rains and irrigated with a light irrigation if needed to get adequate growth. • Avoid any tillage if possible. • Avoid any traffic or tillage when fields are extremely dry to avoid pulverization. ♦ Apply soil stabilization chemicals to fallowed lands. ♦ Re-apply drain water to allow protective vegetation to be established. ♦ Reuse irrigation return flows to irrigate windbreaks across blocks of land including many fields to reduce wind fetch and reduce emissions from fallowed, farmed, and other lands within the block. Windbreak species,	Project is consistent with applicable mitigation measures identified in this section. See Chapter 4.6 (Air Quality) in the Final SEIR, and mitigation measure 4.6-1.

Delta Plan Mitigation Measure #	Delta Plan Mitigation Measure	Flyway Farms Restoration Project Consistency
	management, and layout would be optimized to achieve the largest feasible dust emissions reduction per unit water available for their irrigation. Windbreak corridors would provide ancillary aesthetic and habitat benefits. Project-specific lists of mitigation measures should also include the recommendations or requirements of the local air district(s). For example, the Bay Area Air Quality Management District (BAAQMD) lists the following basic and additional mitigation measures to reduce emissions from project construction (BAAQMD, 2010. California Environmental Quality Act Air Quality Guidelines. December 2010. San Francisco, California. Site accessed February 8, 2011. http://www.baaqmd.gov/Divisions/Planning-and-Research/CEQA-GUIDELINES.aspx). **Basic Construction Mitigation Measures Recommended for ALL Proposed Projects** 1. All exposed surfaces (e.g., parking areas, staging areas, soil piles, graded areas, and unpaved access roads) shall be watered two times per day. 2. All haul trucks transporting soil, sand, or other loose material off-site shall be covered. 3. All visible mud or dirt track-out onto adjacent public roads shall be removed using wet power vacuum street sweepers at least once per day. The use of dry power sweeping is prohibited. 4. All vehicle speeds on unpaved roads shall be limited to 15 mph. 5. All roadways, driveways, and sidewalks to be paved shall be completed as soon as possible. Building pads shall be laid as soon as possible after grading unless seeding or soil binders are used. 6. Idling times shall be minimized either by shutting equipment off when not in use or reducing the maximum idling time to 5 minutes (as required by the California airborne toxics control measure Title 13, Section 2485 of California Code of Regulations [CCR]). Clear signage shall be provided for construction workers at all access points. 7. All construction equipment shall be maintained and properly tuned in accordance with manufacturer‘s specifications. All equipment shall be checked by a certified visible emissions evaluator. 8. Post a publicly visible sign with the telephone number and person to contact at the lead agency regarding dust complaints. This person shall respond and take corrective action within 48 hours. The Air District’s phone number shall also be visible to ensure compliance with applicable regulations. **Additional Construction Mitigation Measures Recommended for Projects with Construction Emissions Above the Threshold** 1. All exposed surfaces shall be watered at a frequency adequate to maintain minimum soil moisture of 12 percent. Moisture content can be verified by lab samples or moisture probe. 2. All excavation, grading, and/or demolition activities shall be suspended when average wind speeds exceed 20 mph. 3. Wind breaks (e.g., trees, fences) shall be installed on the windward side(s) of actively disturbed areas of construction. Wind breaks should have at maximum 50 percent air porosity. 4. Vegetative ground cover (e.g., fast-germinating native grass seed) shall be planted in disturbed areas as soon as possible and watered appropriately until vegetation is established. 5. The simultaneous occurrence of excavation, grading, and ground-disturbing	

Delta Plan Mitigation Measure #	Delta Plan Mitigation Measure	Flyway Farms Restoration Project Consistency
	construction activities on the same area at any one time shall be limited. Activities shall be phased to reduce the amount of disturbed surfaces at any one time. 6. All trucks and equipment, including their tires, shall be washed off prior to leaving the site. 7. Site accesses to a distance of 100 feet from the paved road shall be treated with a 6- to 12-inch compacted layer of wood chips, mulch, or gravel. 8. Sandbags or other erosion control measures shall be installed to prevent silt runoff to public roadways from sites with a slope greater than one percent. 9. Minimizing the idling time of diesel powered construction equipment to two minutes. 10. The project shall develop a plan demonstrating that the off-road equipment (more than 50 horsepower) to be used in the construction project (i.e., owned, leased, and subcontractor vehicles) would achieve a project wide fleet- average 20 percent NO_x reduction and 45 percent PM reduction compared to the most recent ARB fleet average. Acceptable options for reducing emissions include the use of late model engines, low-emission diesel products, alternative fuels, engine retrofit technology, after-treatment products, add-on devices such as particulate filters, and/or other options as such become available. 11. Use low VOC (i.e., reactive organic gases or ROG) coatings beyond the local requirements (i.e., Regulation 8, Rule 3: Architectural Coatings). 12. Requiring that all construction equipment, diesel trucks, and generators be equipped with Best Available Control Technology for emission reductions of NO_x and PM. 13. Require all contractors to use equipment that meets ARB's most recent certification standard for off-road heavy duty diesel engines.	
9-2	♦ Applicants should develop and implement a project-specific Odor Management Plan. Odor control measures that can be incorporated into this plan include, but are not limited to, the following: • A list of potential odor sources • Identification and description of the most likely sources of odor • Identification of potential, intensity, and frequency of odor from likely sources • A list of odor control technologies and management practices that could be implemented to minimize odor releases • A protocol for monitoring, recording, reporting and responding to odor events, including notification of the local and downwind jurisdictions of projects that may result in odor complaints, including contact numbers for responsible individuals during construction. If odor an event occurs, construction activity should be suspended until conditions change, removing the cause and resultant odors, or until alternate management practices are implemented that significantly reduce the odors.	Not applicable
9-3	The Air Quality Technical Report prepared for the Proposed Project should evaluate human health risks from potential exposures of sensitive receptors to substantial pollutant concentrations on a project-specific basis. The need for a human health risk analysis should be evaluated using approved screening tools, and discussed with the local Air Quality Management District (AQMD) or Air Pollution Control District (APCD) at the time of preparation of the Air Quality Technical Report. If the health risk is determined to be significant on a project-specific basis, control measures should be implemented to reduce health risks to levels below the applicable air district threshold. Implementation of one or more of the following requirements, where feasible and	Not applicable

Delta Plan Mitigation Measure #	Delta Plan Mitigation Measure	Flyway Farms Restoration Project Consistency
	appropriate would reduce the effects of Impact 9-3a, Construction or Operation of Projects Would Expose Sensitive Receptors to Substantial Pollutant Concentrations: ♦ Implement Mitigation Measure 9-1 to reduce air emissions and air quality impacts from construction and operations of the Proposed Project. ♦ Use equipment with diesel engines designed or retrofitted to minimize DPM emissions, usually through the use of catalytic particulate filters in the exhaust. ♦ Use electric equipment to eliminate local combustion emissions. ♦ Use alternative fuels, such as compressed natural gas or liquefied natural gas. If the project would result in significant emissions of airborne, naturally occurring asbestos or metals from excavation, hauling, blasting, tunneling, placement, or other handling of rocks or soil, a dust mitigation and air monitoring plan would be required to specify site-specific measures to minimize emissions and that airborne concentrations of the toxic air contaminants (TACs) of concern do not exceed regulatory or risk-based trigger levels.	

Cultural Resources

10-1	♦ Before any ground-disturbing activities begin, conduct intensive archaeological surveys, including subsurface investigations to identify the locations, extent, and integrity of presently undocumented archaeological resources that may be located in areas of potential disturbance. In addition, if ground-disturbing activities are planned for an area where a previously documented prehistoric archaeological site has been recorded but no longer may be visible on the ground surface, conduct test excavations to determine whether intact archaeological subsurface deposits are present. Also conduct surveys at the project site for the possible presence of cultural landscapes and traditional cultural properties. ♦ If potentially CRHR-eligible prehistoric or historic-era archeological resources are discovered during the survey phase, additional investigations may be necessary. These investigations could include, but not necessarily be limited to, measures providing resource avoidance, archival research, archaeological testing and California Register of Historical Resources (CRHR) eligibility evaluations, and contiguous excavation unit data recovery. In addition, upon discovery of potentially CRHR-eligible prehistoric resources, coordinate with the NAHC and the Native American community to provide for an opportunity for suitable individuals and tribal organizations, including federally recognized tribes, to comment on the proposed research. ♦ If CRHR-eligible archaeological resources or cultural landscapes/properties are present and would be physically impacted, specific strategies to avoid or protect these resources should be implemented if feasible. These measures may include: • *Planning construction to avoid the sensitive sites* • *Deeding the sensitive sites into permanent conservation easements* • *Capping or covering archaeological sites* • *Planning parks, green space, or other open space to incorporate the sensitive sites* • Granting of cultural easements to Native American tribes for the purpose of protecting cultural resource properties ♦ If federal agencies are participants in the activity and Section 106 of the National Historic Preservation Act applies, conduct formal consultation with the State Historic Preservation Officer, Tribal Historic Preservation Officer (THPO) or Tribal Administrator for tribes that do not have a THPO, and the Native American community. Potential adverse effects on cultural resources recommended as eligible for listing in the National Register of Historic Places (NRHP) will be resolved through the development of a memorandum of agreement and/or a program-level agreement.	Project is consistent with applicable mitigation measures identified in this section. See Chapter 4.7 (Cultural Resources) and mitigation measure 4.7-1 and 4.7-2 in the Final SEIR.

Delta Plan Mitigation Measure #	Delta Plan Mitigation Measure	Flyway Farms Restoration Project Consistency
	♦ As part of efforts to identify, evaluate, and consider cultural resources, including prehistoric sites, Native American human remains, and traditional cultural properties, Native Americans would be consulted. The California Native American Heritage Commission (NAHC) would be asked to provide a list of Native Americans who should be contacted concerning an identified future project. The NAHC would also be asked to search its Sacred Lands Files. Native Americans identified by the NAHC would be contacted by letter to request information on cultural resources of importance. They also would be asked to identify concerns they have about the project. THPOs and Tribal Administrators of federally recognized tribes would be contacted and asked to search their files and provide information necessary for the identification and consideration of cultural resources. ♦ Before any project-specific ground-disturbing activities begin, conduct investigations to identify submerged cultural resources. These investigations would include review of State Lands Commission (SLC) Shipwrecks Database and other SLC files, and remote sensing surveys conducted under the direction of a qualified maritime archaeologist. If avoidance of significant submerged cultural resources is not feasible, a permit from SLC may be necessary to conduct resource documentation and possible salvage of artifacts, ship components, and other data and objects. ♦ If CRHR-eligible archaeological resources, including submerged or buried shipwrecks or other maritime-related cultural resources, are discovered during construction activities, work would halt within 100 feet of the discovery until the find can be evaluated by a qualified archaeologist or maritime archaeologist as appropriate. In addition, SLC would be consulted.	
10-2	The identification, evaluation, and determination of disposition of Native American human remains shall be conducted in accordance with Native American consultation procedures described below and in Mitigation Measure 10-1. The location, content, and character of Native American human remains are confidential and shall not be released to the public. Native American human remains and associated funerary objects shall be treated with the utmost respect and in accordance with the direction of the identified Most Likely Descendant (MLD). ♦ If human remains are encountered during ground-disturbing construction activities, stop work that would potentially affect the find and contact the county coroner. • In accordance with the California Health and Safety Code and the California Native American Grave Protection and Repatriation Act (CNAGPRA), if human remains are uncovered during ground-disturbing activities, the contractor shall immediately halt potentially damaging excavation in the area of the burial and notify the county coroner, a professional archaeologist to determine the nature of the remains, and a representative of California Indian tribes. The coroner is required to examine all discoveries of human remains within 48 hours of receiving notice of a discovery on private or State lands (Health and Safety Code section 7050.5[b]). If the coroner determines that the remains are those of a Native American, he or she must contact the NAHC by telephone within 24 hours of making that determination (Health and Safety Code section 7050[c]). • Following the coroner's findings, the property owner, contractor or project proponent, an archaeologist, and the NAHC-designated Most Likely Descendent (MLD) shall determine the ultimate treatment and disposition of the remains and take appropriate steps to ensure that additional human interments are not disturbed. The responsibilities for acting upon notification of a discovery of Native American human remains are identified in California Public Resources Code section 5097.9. • Upon the discovery of Native American remains, the landowner shall ensure that the immediate vicinity (according to generally accepted cultural or archaeological standards and	Project is consistent with applicable mitigation measures identified in this section. See Chapter 4.7 (Cultural Resources) and mitigation measures 4.7-1 and 4.7-2 in the Final SEIR.

Delta Plan Mitigation Measure #	Delta Plan Mitigation Measure	Flyway Farms Restoration Project Consistency
	practices) is not damaged or disturbed by further activity until consultation with the MLD has taken place. The MLD shall have 48 hours to complete a site inspection and make recommendations after being granted access to the site. • A range of possible treatments for the remains, including nondestructive removal and analysis, preservation in place, relinquishment of the remains and associated items to the descendents, or other culturally appropriate treatment may be discussed. California Public Resources Code section 5097.9 suggests that the concerned parties may extend discussions beyond the initial 48 hours to allow for the discovery of additional remains. The following is a list of site protection measures that the landowner shall employ: *(1) Record the site with the NAHC or the appropriate information center. (2) Use an open space or conservation zoning designation or easement. (3) Record a document with the county in which the property is located.* • The landowner or his or her authorized representative shall rebury the Native American human remains and associated grave goods with appropriate dignity on the property in a location not subject to further subsurface disturbance if the NAHC is unable to identify a MLD or if the MLD fails to make a recommendation within 48 hours after being granted access to the site. The landowner or his or her authorized representative may also reinter the remains in a location not subject to further disturbance if he or she rejects the recommendation of the MLD and mediation by the NAHC fails to provide measures acceptable to the landowner. ♦ If the discovery of human remains occurs on lands owned and administered by a federal agency, the provisions of the Native American Graves Protection and Repatriation Act (NAGPRA) will apply. NAGPRA requires federal agencies and certain recipients of federal funds to document Native American human remains and cultural items in their collections, notify native groups of their holdings, and provide an opportunity for repatriation of these materials. The act also requires planning for dealing with potential future collections of Native American human remains and associated funerary objects, sacred objects, and objects of cultural patrimony.	

Delta Plan Mitigation Measure #	Delta Plan Mitigation Measure	Flyway Farms Restoration Project Consistency
10-3	♦ Inventory and evaluate historic-era buildings, structures, and linear features. Conduct cultural resources studies to determine whether historic-era buildings, structures, and linear features in the project area are eligible for listing in the CRHR. ♦ Before construction activities begin, an inventory and evaluation of historic-era resources in the project area should be conducted under the direct supervision of an architectural historian meeting the Secretary of the Interior's Professional Qualification Standards for history or architectural history. The documentation should include conducting an intensive field survey, background research on the history of the project area, and property-specific research. Based on this research, the eligibility of historic-era resources located in the project area should be evaluated by the architectural historian using criteria for listing in the CRHR. The resources would be recorded on DPR 523 forms and the findings documented in a technical report. If federal funding or approval is required, then the project implementation agencies would comply with Section 106 of the National Historic Preservation Act. ♦ Identify measures to avoid significant historic resources. Avoidance through project redesign is the preferred mitigation measure for mitigating potential effects on historic-era buildings, structures, linear features, and archaeological sites that appear to be eligible for listing in the NRHP or CRHR. ♦ Record photographic and written documentation to Historic American Building Survey (HABS)/Historic American Engineering Record (HAER) standards. If avoidance of a significant historic resource is not feasible, the lead agency should ensure that HABS/HAER documentation is completed. Through HABS/HAER documentation, a qualified architectural historian and qualified photographer should formally document the historic resource through large-format photography, measured drawings, written architectural descriptions, and historical narratives. The completed documentation should be submitted to the Library of Congress. ♦ Conform to the Secretary of the Interior's Standards for Rehabilitation and Guidelines for Rehabilitating Historic Buildings in the event of relocation. If any historic buildings, structures, or levees are relocated or altered, the lead agency should ensure that any changes to significant buildings or structures conform to the Secretary of the Interior's Standards for Rehabilitation and Guidelines for Rehabilitating Historic Buildings. Implementation of this measure can mitigate potential changes to significant architectural resources. ♦ Conform to the Secretary of the Interior's Guidance for the Treatment of Cultural Landscapes to preserve landscapes' historic form, features, and details that have evolved over time.	Project is consistent with applicable mitigation measures identified in this section. See Chapter 4.7 (Cultural Resources) and mitigation measures 4.7-1 and 4.7-2 in the Final SEIR.
10-4	♦ Mitigation Measures 10-1 and 10-3 will also mitigate Impact 10-4, Disturbance or Destruction of Cultural Landscapes and Traditional Cultural Properties. However, to mitigate Impact 10-4, Mitigation Measure 10-1 surveys and Mitigation Measure 10-3 inventories would focus on cultural landscapes and traditional cultural properties.	Project is consistent with applicable mitigation measures identified in this section. See Chapter 4.7 (Cultural Resources) and mitigation measures 4.7-1 and 4.7-2 in the Final SEIR.

Delta Plan Mitigation Measure #	Delta Plan Mitigation Measure	Flyway Farms Restoration Project Consistency
Geology and Soils		
11-1	♦ For construction that occurs in an Alquist-Priolo Special Studies Zone, a determination must be made by a licensed practitioner (California Certified Engineering Geologist) that no fault traces are present within the building footprint of any structure intended for human occupancy. The standard of care for such determinations includes direct examination of potentially affected subsurface materials (soil and/or bedrock) by logging of subsurface trenches. Uncertainties regarding the exact locations of future ground ruptures associated with such determinations generally are resolved by providing a minimum setback of 50 feet from any known surface trace of an active fault. For critical structures, such as hospitals, dams, and emergency facilities, more stringent mitigation measures are required, including but not limited to greater structural setbacks and heavier reinforcement against strong ground motion, in compliance not only with California regulations but in many cases in compliance with additional Federal regulations. ♦ Lead agencies shall ensure that geotechnical design recommendations are included in the design of facilities and construction specifications to minimize the potential impacts from seismic events and the presence of adverse soil conditions. Recommended measures to address adverse conditions shall conform to applicable design codes, guidelines, and standards.	Not applicable, the project is not within a Special Studies Zone. Standard conditions and requirements attached to the grading permits issued by the County will address soil conditions.
11-2	♦ Require adherence, at minimum, to the precepts of the current approved version of the International Building Code (IBC). Included in the IBC are measures for mitigation of the impacts of strong ground motion on constructed works. In addition to the California –required conformance with the IBC, for critical structures, such as dams (including levees), hospitals, and emergency facilities, additional construction requirements are codified in federal statutes and the regulations of various federal agencies. Lead agencies will, by force of law, require conformance with these codified mitigation measures.	See above.
11-3	♦ For projects that would result in significant or potentially significant grading operations, a geotechnical investigation shall be performed and a geotechnical report prepared. The geotechnical report shall include a quantitative analysis to determine whether excavation or fill placement would result in a potential for damage due to soil subsidence during and/or after construction. Project designs shall incorporate measures to reduce the potential damage to an insignificant level, including but not limited to removal and recompaction of existing soils susceptible to subsidence, ground improvement (such as densification by compaction or grouting, soil cementation), and reinforcement of structural components to resist deformation due to subsidence. The site-specific potential for and severity of cyclic seismic loading shall be analyzed in the assessment of subsidence for specific projects. ♦A geotechnical investigation shall be performed by an appropriately licensed professional engineer and/or geologist to determine the presence and thickness of potentially liquefiable sands that could result in loss of bearing value during seismic shaking events. Project designs shall incorporate measures to mitigate the potential damage to an insignificant level, including but not limited to ground improvement (such as grouting or soil cementation), surcharge loading by placement of fill, excavation, soil mixing with non-liquefiable finer-grained materials and replacement of liquefiable materials at shallow depths, and reinforcement of structural components to resist deformation due to liquefaction. An analysis of site-specific probable and credible seismic acceleration values, in accordance with current applicable standards of care, shall be performed to provide for suitable project design. ♦ For projects that would result in construction of wells intended for groundwater extraction, a hydrogeological/geotechnical investigation shall be performed in accordance with the current standards of care for such work by an appropriate	A geotechnical investigation will be required for the submittal and approval of the grading plans by Yolo County.

Delta Plan Mitigation Measure #	Delta Plan Mitigation Measure	Flyway Farms Restoration Project Consistency
	licensed professional engineer or geologist to identify and quantify the potential for groundwater extraction-induced subsidence. The study shall include an analysis of existing conditions and modeling of future conditions to assess the potential for aquifer compaction/consolidation. ♦ For projects that would result in construction of surface reservoirs and canals a hydrogeological/geotechnical investigation shall be performed by a licensed professional engineer or geologist to identify and quantify the potential for seeps and springs to develop in areas adjacent to the proposed improvements and to propose mitigation measures. Mitigation of such seepage could include, without limitation, additives to concrete that reduce its permeability, construction of impervious liner systems, and design and construction of subdrainage (passive control) or dewatering systems (active control). Geotechnical investigations and preparation of geotechnical reports shall be performed in the responsible care of California licensed geotechnical professionals including professional civil engineers, certified geotechnical engineers, professional geologists, certified engineering geologists, and certified hydrogeologists, all of whom should be practicing within the current standards of care for such work.	
11-4	♦ Any covered action that would have significant soil erosion and topsoil loss impacts (Impact 11-4) shall incorporate specific measures for future projects that would expand the use of BMPs or optional erosion control measures listed in the SWPPPs. The SWPPP shall identify an effective combination of BMPs to reduce erosion during construction and to prevent erosion during operation. Examples of typical BMPs include: • Erosion control measures such as silt fencing, sand bags, straw bales and mats, and rice straw wattles shall be placed to reduce erosion and capture sediment. Straw used for erosion control shall be new cereal grain straw derived from rice, wheat, or barley; free of mold and noxious weed seed; and neither derived from dry-farmed crops nor previously used for stable bedding. Clearance shall be obtained from the County Agricultural Commissioner before straw obtained from outside the county is delivered to the work site. Monitoring requirements of the newly revised General Construction Permit shall be implemented, and more effective BMPs shall be identified and installed if runoff samples indicate excessive turbidity. • During construction activities, topsoil shall be removed, stockpiled, and saved for reapplication following completion of construction. The top 6 inches shall be salvaged and reapplied to a comparable thickness. Soil material shall be placed in a manner that minimizes compaction and promotes plant reestablishment. • If catch basins are used for sediment capture, the site shall be graded to ensure stormwater runoff flows into the basins, and basins shall be designed for the appropriate storm interval as provided in the General Construction Permit. • Temporary work areas shall be surfaced with a compacted layer of well-graded gravel. They may be covered with a thin asphalt binder. Where expansive or compressible soils are present in temporary work areas, construction trailers shall be supported with concrete pads or footings. • Dust control shall conform to all federal, State, and local requirements and may include use of water trucks, street sweepers, or other methods described in the SWPPP. • Spoils shall be placed in 12-inch-thick loose lifts and compacted to reduce erosion and minimize future subsidence. Placement of peat spoils shall be on agricultural land where possible. Following construction, spoils sites shall be restored to avoid erosion.	Project is consistent with applicable mitigation measures identified in this section. SWPP: see Final SEIR pages 62, 74-75.

Delta Plan Mitigation Measure #	Delta Plan Mitigation Measure	Flyway Farms Restoration Project Consistency
11-5	♦ In areas where expansive clays exist, a hydrogeological/geotechnical investigation shall be performed by a licensed professional engineer or geologist to identify and quantify the potential for expansion, particularly differential expansion of clayey soils due to leakage and saturation beneath new improvements. Measures could include, but are not limited to removal and recompaction of problematic expansive soils, soil stabilization, and/or reinforcement of constructed improvements to resist deformation due to expansion of subsurface soils.	A geotechnical investigation will be required for the submittal and approval of the grading plans by Yolo County.
11-6	♦ For projects that would result in construction of canals, storage reservoirs and other surface impoundments, project design shall provide for protection from leakage to the subsurface. Measures could include, but are not limited to rendering concrete less permeable by specifying concrete additives such as bentonite, design of impermeable liner systems, design of leakage collection and recovery systems, and construction of impermeable subsurface cutoff walls. ♦ For ecosystem restoration projects that might cause subsurface seepage of nuisance water onto adjacent lands: • Perform seepage monitoring studies by measuring the level of shallow groundwater in the adjacent soils, to evaluate the baseline conditions. Continue monitoring for seepage during and after the project implementation. • Develop a seepage monitoring plan if subsurface seepage constitutes nuisance water to the adjacent land. • Implement seepage control measures if adjacent land is not useable, such as installing subsurface agricultural drainage systems to avoid raising water levels into crop root zones. Cutoff walls and pumping wells can also be used to mitigate for the occurrence of subsurface nuisance water.	Not applicable. There are no impoundments constructed as part of the project.
11-7	♦ For projects that would result in construction of levees, surface impoundments and other fill embankments project design shall incorporate fill placement in accordance with local and State regulations and in accordance with the prevailing standards of care for such work. Measures could include, but are not limited to blending of soils most susceptible to landsliding with soils having higher cohesion characteristics, installation of slope stabilization measures, designing top-of-slope berms or v-ditches, terrace drains and other surface runoff control measures, and designing slopes at lower inclinations.	A geotechnical investigation will be required for the submittal and approval of the grading plans by Yolo County.
11-8	♦ A geotechnical investigation shall be performed and a geotechnical report prepared. The geotechnical report shall include a quantitative analysis to determine whether on-site soils would be suitable for an on-site wastewater treatment system. If it is determined that the soil could not support a conventional on-site treatment system, non- conventional systems shall be analyzed. Potential alternative systems include (SWRCB, 2011, Onsite Wastewater Treatment System Scoping Document. http://www.swrcb.ca.gov/water_issues/programs/owts/index.shtml): • Containment systems that do not generate waste • Anoxic and anaerobic systems • Attached and suspended growth aerobic treatment systems • Natural treatment systems • Disinfection systems • Engineered-fill leach fields • Monitoring control systems	Not applicable
11-9	♦ For projects that would result in significant or potentially significant risk to structures due to the presence of highly organic soils, lead agencies shall require geotechnical evaluation prior to construction to identify measures to mitigate organic soils. The following measures may be considered: • Over-excavation and import of suitable fill material • Structural reinforcement of constructed works to resist deformation • Construction of structural supports below the depth of highly organic soils into materials with suitable bearing strength	Not applicable

Delta Plan Mitigation Measure #	Delta Plan Mitigation Measure	Flyway Farms Restoration Project Consistency
Paleontological Resources		
12-1	♦ During the project-level analysis, a Paleontological Resources Monitoring and Recovery Plan (PRMRP) shall be developed and implemented for all actions. The PRMRP shall include protocols for paleontological resources monitoring in those areas where sediment with moderate to high paleontological sensitivity would be affected by construction-related excavations. The PRMRP also shall set forth the following procedures: • Confirming the paleontological sensitivity (high, moderate, or low) of the areas to be impacted through review of project-level geological and geotechnical data • Determining the qualifications of the paleontologist as established by the Society of Vertebrate Paleontology (SVP) (SVP, 1991. Standard Measures for assessment and mitigation of adverse impacts to nonrenewable paleontological resources. Society of Vertebrate Paleontology News Bulletin 152:2 – 5; SVP, 1995. Assessment and mitigation of adverse impacts to nonrenewable paleontological resources: Standard guidelines. Society of Vertebrate Paleontology News Bulletin 163: 22 – 27; SVP, 1996. Conditions of Receivership for Paleontologic Salvage Collections. Society of Vertebrate Paleontology News Bulletin. Vol. 166, pp. 31 - 32 • The assessment and recovery of discovered fossil resources • The preparation and curation of fossil finds The PRMRP would provide guidelines for the establishment of a yearly or biannual monitoring program led by a qualified paleontologist to determine the extent of fossiliferous sediment being exposed and affected by erosion, and determine whether paleontological resources are being lost. If loss of scientifically significant paleontological resources can be documented, then a recovery program should be implemented.	Not applicable
Mineral Resources		
13-1	♦ Ensure land use compatibility between existing mineral resource extraction activities and projects, activities or actions that may be implemented as the result of the Proposed Project. ♦ Maintain adequate buffer between future projects and designated MRZ-2 sectors. ♦ Explore opportunities to classify and designate new MRZ-2 sectors (e.g., in existing MRZ-3 sectors) to ensure that important mineral resources are conserved and continue to be available for future construction needs. ♦ Ensure future land use changes within designated mineral resource extraction areas recognize mineral resource extraction as a compatible use. ♦ Limit use of construction aggregate to local sources with sufficient capacity to meet both project and future local development needs, to the extent possible. ♦ Use recycled aggregate where possible, to decrease the demand for new aggregate.	There are active gas wells on the Burroughs parcel, which will be protected. Several inactive wells on Burroughs and Gilbert parcel have been filled and abandoned by Venoco. Gas lease for Gilbert parcel requires a well pad to be preserved and its location has been agreed to by DWR and Venoco; restoration will not impact the pad.

Delta Plan Mitigation Measure #	Delta Plan Mitigation Measure	Flyway Farms Restoration Project Consistency
13-2	♦ Ensure access is maintained to existing, active mineral resource extraction sites both during and after project construction. ♦ Implement recommendations identified in Division of Oil, Gas, and Geothermal Resources of the U.S. Geological Survey (DOGGR) construction site well review program (DOC 2007, California Department of Conservation, Division of Oil, Gas and Geothermal Resources, Well Review Program: Introduction and Application.), such as: • For all future projects, identify all existing natural gas well sites and oil production facilities within or in close proximity to the project area. • Identify any oil and natural gas well within 100 feet of any navigable body of water or watercourse perennially covered by water or any officially recognized wildlife preserve as a "critical well" (California Code of Regulations, Title 14, Chapter 4, Article 2, Section 1720(a)(2)(B) and (C)). The DOC requires that a "critical well" include more stringent blowout prevention equipment than non-critical wells based on pressure testing and rating. • Identify safety measures to prevent unauthorized access to equipment. • Include safety shut-down devices on oil and natural gas wells and other equipment, as appropriate. • Notify DOC of new oil and natural gas wells or changes in oil and natural gas well operations or physical conditions, receive written approval from DOC of the changes, and receive written notification of DOC's inspection of new or changed equipment. The approvals will be primarily related to the ability to: (1) protect all subsurface hydrocarbons and fresh water, (2) protect the environment, (3) use adequate blowout prevention equipment, and (4) use approved drilling and cementing techniques. • If any plugged/abandoned or unrecorded oil and natural gas wells are uncovered during construction, the DOC should be notified, the wells should undergo remedial well plugging actions, and no structures should be constructed over the abandoned oil and natural gas wells. • If oil and natural gas wells are under the jurisdiction or a lease from the California State Lands Commission, project proponents should provide additional plans and environmental documentation as required prior to modification of the oil or natural gas wells.	Project is consistent with applicable mitigation measures identified in this section. Location of gas wells: See Draft EIR Figure 2-6 on page 2-9.

Delta Plan Mitigation Measure #	Delta Plan Mitigation Measure	Flyway Farms Restoration Project Consistency
Hazards and Hazardous Materials		
14-1	♦ Refueling and maintenance of vehicles and equipment to occur only in designated areas that are either bermed or covered with concrete, asphalt, or other impervious surfaces to control potential spills. ♦ Refueling of vehicles and equipment to occur only when employees are present. ♦ Vehicle and equipment service and maintenance conducted only by authorized personnel. ♦ Refueling conducted only with approved pumps, hoses, and nozzles. ♦ Catch-pans placed under equipment to catch potential spills during servicing. ♦ All disconnected hoses placed in containers to collect residual fuel from the hoses. ♦ Vehicle engines shut down during refueling. ♦ No smoking, open flames, or welding allowed in refueling or service areas. ♦ Refueling performed away from bodies of water to prevent contamination of water in the event of a leak or spill. ♦ When refueling is completed, the service truck to leave the project site. ♦ Service trucks provided with fire extinguishers and spill containment equipment, such as absorbents. ♦ Should a spill contaminate soil, the soil shall be placed in containers and disposed of as appropriate. All containers used to store hazardous materials to be inspected at least once per week for signs of leaking or failure. All maintenance and refueling areas to be inspected monthly. Results of inspections to be recorded in a logbook maintained onsite. ♦ Provision of an automatic sprinkler system for indoor hazardous material storage areas. ♦ Provision of an exhaust system for indoor hazardous material storage areas. ♦ Separation of incompatible materials by isolating them from each other with a noncombustible partition. ♦ Spill control in all storage, handling, and dispensing areas. ♦ Separate secondary containment for each chemical storage system. The secondary containment is required to hold the entire contents of the tank plus the volume of water for the fire suppression system that could be used for fire protection for a period of 20 minutes in the event of a catastrophic spill. In addition to the above, federal, state and local requirements for hazardous materials must be followed. In the unlikely event of a spill, the spill shall be reported to the appropriate regulatory agencies and contaminated soil shall be cleaned, treated, and/or removed in accordance with regulatory requirements. Small spills shall be contained and cleaned up immediately by trained, onsite personnel. Larger spills shall be reported via emergency phone numbers to obtain help from offsite containment and cleanup crews. All personnel working on the project during the construction phase shall be trained in handling hazardous materials and the dangers associated with hazardous materials. An onsite health and safety person shall be designated to implement health and safety guidelines and to contact emergency response personnel and the local hospital, if necessary. If there is a large spill from a service or refueling truck, contaminated soil shall be placed into barrels or trucks by service personnel for offsite disposal at an appropriate facility in accordance with law. If a spill involves hazardous materials quantities equal to or greater than the specific Reportable Quantities as required by	Project is consistent with applicable mitigation measures identified in this section. See Chapters 4.2 (Water Quality) and 4.8 (Hazards and Hazardous Materials) in the Final SEIR. The project incorporates measures that require preparation of a SWPP and a sil prevention and control plan (SPCP). See Final SEIR pages 62, 74-75.

Delta Plan Mitigation Measure #	Delta Plan Mitigation Measure	Flyway Farms Restoration Project Consistency
	regulatory agencies (42 gallons for petroleum products), all federal, State, and local reporting requirements shall be followed. In the event of a fire or injury, the local fire department shall be called.	
14-2	♦ To reduce the risk due to increased exposure to materials that could be released during soil disturbance, worker training programs and breathing apparatus shall be provided. Monitoring programs shall be implemented as areas are excavated to determine the potential for exposure to soil organisms or other constituents. ♦ To reduce risk to the community due to increased exposure to materials that could be released during soil disturbance, public outreach programs shall be conducted to educate the public of the types of construction activities and risks that could occur. In areas near extreme hazards, such as construction in areas with identified petroleum-product pipelines or soils with high concentrations of petroleum products, warning sirens shall be used at construction sites to immediately notify workers and residents. Emergency procedures shall be included in the education and outreach programs for the workers and the community.	Project is consistent with applicable mitigation measures identified in this section. See Chapter 4.8 (Hazards and Hazardous Materials) and Mitigation Measure 4.8-1 in the Final SEIR.
14-3	♦ Freshwater habitat management to include water-control-structure management, vegetation management, mosquito predator management, drainage improvements, and other best management practices, and coordination with the DFG and local mosquito and vector control agencies regarding these strategies and specific techniques to help minimize mosquito production. ♦ Maintenance of permanent ponds that increase the diversity of waterfowl yet decrease the introduction of vectors through constant circulation of water, vegetation control, and periodic draining of ponds. ♦ Tidal management focused on mosquito problems arising from the residual tidal and floodwaters remaining in depressions and cracked ground (SCMAD 2011. San Joaquin County Mosquito and Vector Control District. http://www.sjmosquito.org/.). ♦ Avoidance of ponding in tidal marsh habitat or in areas within the waterside of setback levees. Design of ecosystem restoration areas, waterfowl hunting areas, setback levees, parks, canals, and surface water storage facilities to minimize standing water, or use of other methods such as mosquito fish to reduce mosquito breeding.	The Flyway Farms Project would reduce levels of mosquito production below those of existing conditions, by reducing areas of seasonal and perennial wetlands. Restored tidal marsh would not be sources of floodwater mosquitos due to increased tidal flushing. See pages 4.8-3 thru 4.8-14 of the Lower Yolo Restoration Project Final EIR, which is incorporated by reference in the Final SEIR.
14-4	♦ Avoid creating hazardous wildlife attractants within a distance of 10,000 feet of an Airport Operations Area. ♦ Maintain a distance of 5 statute miles between the farthest edge of the Airport Operations Area and hazardous wildlife attractants.	Not applicable
14-5	♦ Prepare and implement a fire management plan to minimize potential for wildland fires.	Not applicable

Delta Plan Mitigation Measure #	Delta Plan Mitigation Measure	Flyway Farms Restoration Project Consistency
Noise		
15-1	♦ Limit the hours of operation at noise-generation sources located near or adjacent to noise-sensitive areas, wherever practicable, to reduce the level of exposure to meet applicable local standards. ♦ Locate construction equipment away from sensitive receptors, to the extent feasible, to reduce noise levels below applicable local standards. ♦ Maintain construction equipment to manufacturers' recommended specifications, and equip all construction vehicles and equipment with appropriate mufflers and other approved noise-control devices. ♦ Limit idling of construction equipment to the extent feasible to reduce the time that noise is emitted. ♦ Conduct individual traffic noise analysis of identified haul routes and provide mitigation, such as reduced speed limits, at locations where noise standards cannot be maintained for sensitive receptors. ♦ Incorporate use of temporary noise barriers, such as acoustical panel systems, between construction activities and sensitive receptors if it is concluded that they would be effective in reducing noise exposure to sensitive receptors. ♦ Near sensitive receptors, avoid or minimize use of construction equipment known to generate high levels of ground borne vibration (for example, pile drivers).	Not applicable. There are no sensitive receptors on or near the Flyway Farm site.
15-2	♦ Conduct a preliminary ground borne vibration analysis report to determine future construction-related ground borne vibration levels based on, but not limited to, a detailed equipment list, hours of operation and distances to sensitive receptors located within 500 feet of project sites. ♦ Provided that future ground borne vibration results in significant impacts at sensitive receptors, the following measures shall be implemented: • Designate a complaint coordinator and post this person's contact information in a location near construction areas where it is clearly visible to the nearby receptors most likely to be affected. The coordinator will manage complaints and concerns resulting from activities that cause vibrations. The severity of the vibration concern should be assessed by the coordinator and, if necessary, evaluated by a qualified noise and vibration control expert. • Vibration monitoring will be conducted before and during vibration generating operations occurring within 100 feet of historic structures. Every attempt will be made to limit construction-generated vibration levels during pile driving and other ground borne noise and vibration-generating activities in the vicinity of the historic structures in accordance with recommendations of the appropriate agency with authority. • Adjacent historic features will be covered or temporarily shored, as necessary, for protection from vibrations, in consultation with the appropriate cultural resources authority. • Pile driving required within a 50-foot radius of residences will use alternative installation methods where possible (e.g., pile cushioning, jetting, predrilling, cast-in-place systems, resonance-free vibratory pile drivers). This would reduce the number and amplitude of blows required to seat the pile. • Pile-driving activities conducted within 285 feet of sensitive receptors will occur during daytime hours to avoid sleep disturbance during evening and nighttime hours.	Not applicable

Delta Plan Mitigation Measure #	Delta Plan Mitigation Measure	Flyway Farms Restoration Project Consistency
15-3	♦ Identify noise-sensitive receptors in the vicinity of project activities and design projects to minimize exposure of sensitive receptors to long-term, operational noise sources (for example, water pumps) to reduce noise levels below applicable local standards. ♦ Conduct a preliminary noise analysis report to determine future operation-related noise and distances to sensitive receptors. Provided that future operation-related noise results in significant at sensitive receptors, incorporate into construction design measures such as a structure encasing the new noise generating infrastructure. Materials (masonry brick, metal shed, wood) used to house the infrastructure will be of solid construction and void of gaps at the ground, roof line, and joints. All vents will include acoustically rated louvers. ♦ Locate dog parks no closer than 200 feet from the nearest residential property line and at least 75 feet from habitat for noise-sensitive wildlife species. ♦ Locate parking lots no closer than 65 feet from the nearest residential property line and at least 25 feet from habitat for noise-sensitive wildlife species unless a detailed noise study is conducted that determines that placement of parking lots closer than the distances specified above will not result in noise levels that exceed 67 dBA at the nearest residential property line or 60 dBA from noise-sensitive habitat, or appropriate mitigation measures, including permanent noise barriers, can be incorporated to reduce noise levels to equal the ambient noise level or referenced thresholds for residential property and noise sensitive habitat. ♦ Locate playing fields no closer than located at least 125 feet from the nearest residential property line and at least 50 feet from habitat for noise-sensitive wildlife species unless a detailed noise study is conducted that determines that placement of playing fields closer than the distances specified above will not result in noise levels that exceed 67 dBA at the nearest residential property line or 60 dBA from noise-sensitive habitat, or appropriate mitigation measures, including permanent noise barriers, can be incorporated to reduce noise levels to equal the ambient noise level or referenced thresholds for residential property and noise sensitive habitat.	Not applicable
Population and Housing		
16-1	♦ Require compliance with applicable local policies and regulations regarding the provision of affordable housing. ♦ Construct replacement housing if existing housing will be displaced.	Not applicable
Public Services		
17-1	♦ Establish construction fee schedules by local agencies for the new or modified facilities to fund additional emergency services potentially required during construction. If emergency services are not needed, a portion of the fees could be refunded. ♦ Develop worker training programs to reduce construction and operations risks. ♦ Develop appropriate emergency access routes and equipment for both land and water access, if applicable (such as in the Delta), that provides for adequate response time. If use of an existing emergency access route becomes limited due to new or modified facilities, additional routes or placement of duplicate equipment on each side of the route limitation could be considered. ♦ Develop traffic plans and emergency response plans for construction and operations phases of new facilities. ♦ Develop all facilities, including parks and ecosystem restoration areas, in accordance with applicable fire codes and regulations, and with adequate fire equipment access routes, occupancy limitations, and fire-protection equipment.	Project is consistent with applicable mitigation measures identified in this section. There are no construction fee schedules adopted by Yolo County.

Delta Plan Mitigation Measure #	Delta Plan Mitigation Measure	Flyway Farms Restoration Project Consistency
Recreation		
18-1	♦ If the substantial impairment, degradation, or elimination of recreational facilities occurs, replacement facilities of equal capacity and quality with ongoing funding provided for maintenance of these facilities. ♦ If degradation or impairment of recreational facilities, settings, and activities occur from implementation of water use efficient practices and water conservation measures at recreational areas, the park and recreation areas shall be redeveloped with drought-tolerant plant materials, water efficient irrigation systems, and synthetic turf substitutes where appropriate, in such a way as to retain recreational facilities and use areas. ♦ If the volume of water exported from the Delta declines over multiple years, the lead agencies that implement local water supplies may be unable to develop a long-term replacement water supply for the south-of-Delta surface water reservoirs with recreation uses. At these sites, facilities must be modified (including access facilities, as necessary) to accommodate lower water elevations or more frequent fluctuations in water elevations that could occur more frequently in the Proposed Project than under existing conditions.	Not applicable
18-2	♦ If substantial temporary or permanent impairment, degradation, or elimination of recreational facilities causes users to be directed towards other existing facilities, lead agencies shall coordinate with impacted public and private recreation providers to direct displaced users to under-utilized recreational facilities. ♦ Lead agencies shall provide additional operations and maintenance of existing facilities in order to prevent deterioration of these facilities. ♦ If possible, lead agencies shall provide temporary replacement facilities. ♦ If the increase in use is temporary, once use is decreased back to existing conditions, degraded facilities shall be rehabilitated or restored. ♦ Where impacts to existing facilities are unavoidable, compensate for impacts through mitigation, restoration, or preservation off-site or creation of additional permanent new replacement facilities.	Not applicable
18-3	♦ Projects shall be sited in areas that would have minimal adverse physical effect on the environment. ♦ Where impacts to the environment are unavoidable, compensate for impacts through mitigation, restoration, or preservation off-site or creation of additional permanent new replacement facilities.	Not applicable
Traffic and Transportation		
19-1	♦ Avoid modifications to federal, State, and county highways, local roadways, and bridges that may reduce vehicle capacity, to the extent feasible. ♦ Develop and implement a traffic control plan to reduce effects of roadway construction activities, including full and partial lane closures, bike and pedestrian facility closures, and reduced access to adjacent properties. Minimize lane closures during morning and evening peak hours. Limit lane closures near the affected segment. Reroute bicycle and pedestrian access around the project area. Prevent bicyclists and pedestrians from entering the work area. ♦ As part of the traffic control plan, identify specific project-vehicle access routes that would avoid additional traffic in residential areas or would adversely affect other sensitive land uses, where feasible. ♦ Install roadway status signs at strategic locations in the Delta to inform the public of roadway closures and limits to ingress to/egress from Delta Islands. The signs shall include maps showing the relative locations of road closures and access restrictions to other Delta features. ♦ For project operations that increase traffic, prepare a traffic study. Determine haul routes that would be used. Evaluate the levels of service at affected	Not applicable. The project is located in a very remote area of Yolo County which is not served by public roadways.

Delta Plan Mitigation Measure #	Delta Plan Mitigation Measure	Flyway Farms Restoration Project Consistency
	intersections and road segments during the peak a.m. and peak p.m. periods. Model changes in traffic with project traffic. If the level of service is maintained at levels acceptable to the appropriate agency, then no additional mitigation is required. If project traffic causes an intersection or road segment to perform below the minimum level of service standard, then select an alternate route for project traffic or schedule project trips for non-peak-hour periods. If alternate routes are not feasible, then design and construct facility improvements to intersections or road segments to maintain the acceptable level of service. ♦ During the planning and analysis of site-specific actions, coordinate with Caltrans and/or other local agencies with jurisdiction over transportation system features for the purpose of minimizing impacts on bridges, roadways, culverts, or other features that may be affected. Agencies responsible for constructing and maintaining levees on which a public roadway may be located shall also be consulted to ensure consistency with levee design criteria. ♦ For roads that will be flooded during floodplain operation, prepare and implement vehicular traffic detour planning as necessary. Provide convenient and parallel vehicular traffic detours for routes closed because of inundation. A detour plan shall be prepared and implemented in accordance with current Caltrans Standard Plans and Specifications. (A temporary crossing structure, for example a Bailey Bridge, may be used to maintain circulation and avoid a detour plan.) The detour plan shall be implemented before roadway inundation. The detour plan will include an assessment of existing roadway conditions, whether paved or unpaved, and provisions for repair and maintenance if the roadway conditions are substantially degraded from increased use. After the detour route is identified and before flood flows are released that would overtop roads, the condition of the detour road surface will be assessed and documented. The documentation will be submitted to the local agency responsible for maintenance of the road. After the detour is no longer needed, the condition of the road surface will be assessed and documented. The documentation will identify substantial changes in the condition of the road surface, such as potholing or rutting. Repair and maintenance actions needed to restore the road surface to predetour conditions will be identified. In coordination with the local maintenance agency, the repair and maintenance actions may be conducted by the agency conducting the floodplain operation or by the local maintenance agency to be proportionately reimbursed by the flood management authority. The detour plan will prioritize paved roads for use as detour routes. If use of paved roadway detours is not feasible during flood flow road inundation periods, the detour plan will require that visible dust emissions from unpaved detour routes will be limited to the percent opacity indicated by the appropriate air pollution control district. The following dust control measures may be used to stabilize unpaved roadways: • Watering • Uniform layer of washed gravel • Roadmix • Paving Any other method that can be demonstrated to the satisfaction of the appropriate air pollution control district that effectively limits visible dust emission to the local percent opacity standard and meets the conditions of a stabilized unpaved road.	

Delta Plan Mitigation Measure #	Delta Plan Mitigation Measure	Flyway Farms Restoration Project Consistency
19-1, con't	♦ Traffic impact reports shall be prepared that meet the applicable agencies' standards to assess potential impacts on appropriate street segments and intersections. The traffic impact reports shall identify impacts that exceed the agencies' guidelines for significance and identify appropriate mitigation. Acceptable mitigation measures may include: • Turn restrictions • Roadway widening to add lanes or shoulders • Redesign of freeway on- and off-ramps • Median construction/modification to restrict access • Flaring of intersections to add turn lanes • Provision of passing lanes or turnouts • Acceleration and deceleration lanes • Removal of obstructions • Roundabouts • Restriping to add lanes with or without parking removal and restrictions • Protected left-turn pockets or free right-turn lanes • Parking restrictions, daily or during peak hours • Fair share contributions to approved projects identified in the agency's Capital Improvement Plan • Fair share contributions to traffic signals identified in the agency's traffic signal plan. Prepare and implement a waterway traffic control plan to ensure safe and efficient vessel navigation during construction in waterways. The plan shall identify vessel traffic control measures to minimize congestion and navigation hazards to the extent feasible. Construction areas in the waterway will be barricaded or guarded by readily visible barriers or other effective means to warn boaters of their presence and restrict access. Warning devices and signage will be consistent with the California Uniform State Waterway Marking System and effective during nondaylight hours and periods of dense fog. ♦ Where temporary partial channel closure is necessary, a temporary channel closure plan shall be developed. The waterway closure plan will identify and implement alternate detour routing and procedures for notifying boaters of construction activities and partial closures, including coordination with the U.S. Coast Guard, local boating organizations and marinas. ♦ To the extent feasible, ensure that safe boat access to public launch and docking facilities, businesses, and residences is maintained. ♦ Coordinate with transit system operators to establish appropriate alternate transit system routes to be rerouted during construction activities, as appropriate. ♦ Boat passage facilities shall be provided as an integral component of operable gate facilities, when feasible. Boat passage facilities shall be designed to provide uninterrupted boat passage when gate are in the "up" position. Floating docks with mooring bits shall be provided along the shoreline on both sides of the boat passage facility for boaters to use while they await passage. Floating barriers will guide boats into the passage facility chambers. ♦ Implement a program to provide boater education on procedures for waiting at and using the boat passage facility. ♦Minimize impacts on bicycle and pedestrian circulation where feasible by avoiding impacts, minimizing closure ofpaths, and providing for temporary or permanent relocation of the facility to the extent feasible. Consult with the appropriate public works department to determine the most feasible alignment for facility relocation.	Not applicable. The project is located in a very remote area of Yolo County which is not served by public roadways.

Delta Plan Mitigation Measure #	Delta Plan Mitigation Measure	Flyway Farms Restoration Project Consistency
19-2	♦ Develop and implement a program that will include procedures for routine inspections and emergency facility operation to allow safe navigation should the facility become damaged or malfunction. The program will include the following specific components: • Routine inspections and correction procedures to ensure that facility safety features are in good working order. • Routine inspections and correction procedures for navigational hazards around facilities, including floating or submerged debris and the formation of shoals. • Contingency and emergency operating procedures to address the possibility that a boat colliding with the flow control facilities will damage the facilities or otherwise render them unable to operate as engineered, and provisions to allow safe navigation.	Not applicable
19-3	♦ Coordinate with responsible local agencies to establish appropriate emergency routes during construction activities and before existing emergency routes are reclassified to a nonemergency route use. ♦ Phase construction activities, and use multiple routes to and from offsite locations to minimize the daily amount of traffic on individual roadways. ♦ Post warnings about the potential presence of slow-moving vehicles. ♦ Use traffic-control personnel when appropriate. ♦ Place and maintain barriers, and install traffic-control devices necessary for safety, as specified in Caltrans' Manual of Traffic Controls for Construction and Maintenance Work Zones and in accordance with city and county requirements. ♦ Notify appropriate emergency service providers of project construction throughout the construction period to ensure that emergency access through construction areas is maintained.	Not applicable. The project is located in a very remote area of Yolo County which is not served by public roadways.
19-4	♦ Projects where construction- and operations conflict with adopted policies, plans, or programs regarding bicycle or pedestrian facilities should implement Mitigation Measure 19-1, above. The portion of the measure that addresses minimizing impacts on bicycle and pedestrian circulation also would be applicable to this measure.	Not applicable
Utilities and Service Systems		
20-1	♦ Establish construction debris disposal fee schedules to promote recycling and minimize solid waste. ♦ Limit disposal of construction debris and other solid waste at local landfills if the landfills have limited capacity. ♦ Dispose of all construction debris at landfills and disposal facilities that are licensed for the type of wastes to be disposed. If the landfills and disposal facilities are not located near future construction sites, include analysis of transportation of solid waste in future environmental documentation for specific projects. ♦ Require construction contractors to prepare construction debris management plans and require reuse or recycling of construction debris. ♦ Develop project-specific solid waste plans to maximize practices that reduce and recycle solid waste and sludge generated by water, wastewater, and stormwater treatment facilities; and collect, recycle, or compost litter and solid waste generated at new facilities designed for visitor use (such as parks and visitor centers).	Project is consistent with applicable mitigation measures identified in this section.
20-2	♦ Relocate or modify existing water, wastewater, and stormwater facilities or electricity transmission systems in a manner that does not affect current operational reliability to existing and projected users. ♦ Coordinate utility relocation and modification with utility providers and local agencies to integrate potential other construction projects and minimize disturbance to the communities. ♦ Verify utility locations through field surveys and services such as Underground Service Alert.	Not applicable. The project is located in a very remote area of Yolo County which is not served by utilities.

Delta Plan Mitigation Measure #	Delta Plan Mitigation Measure	Flyway Farms Restoration Project Consistency

Climate Change and Greenhouse Gas Emissions

21-1	Implement GHG mitigation measures listed in the most recent California Air Pollution Control Officers Association (CAPCOA), BAAQMD, and other air district guidance documents (e.g., CAPCOA, 2010. Quantifying Greenhouse Gas Mitigation Measures. A Resource for Local Government to Assess Emission Reductions from Greenhouse Gas Mitigation Measures. Sacramento, California. August, p. 210-232; BAAQMD, 2011. California Environmental Quality Act Air Quality Guidelines. San Francisco, California. Updated May 2011, p. 8-6). Current versions of such guidance documents list the following for construction: 1. Use alternative fuels for construction equipment. 2. Use electric and hybrid construction equipment. 3. Limit construction equipment idling beyond regulatory requirements. 4. Institute a heavy-duty off-road vehicle plan. 5. Implement a construction vehicle inventory tracking system. 6. Use local building materials for at least ten percent of total materials. 7. Recycling or reusing at least 50 percent of construction waste or demolition materials. In addition, the California Attorney General's Office has developed a list of various measures that may reduce GHG emissions at the individual project level. A selected list of those proposed measures that could be applied to DWR projects was appended to the DWR guidance document, titled Guidance for Quantifying Greenhouse Gas Emissions and Determining the Significance of their Contribution to Global Climate Change for CEQA Purposes (DWR, 2010c. Guidance for Quantifying Greenhouse Gas Emissions and Determining the Significance of their Contribution to Global Climate Change for CEQA Purposes. California Department of Water Resources Internal Guidance Document. CEQA Climate Change Committee. Sacramento, CA. January, Appendix B). As appropriate, the measures can be included as design features of a project, required as changes to the project, or imposed as mitigation (whether undertaken directly by the project proponent or funded by mitigation fees). The measures are examples; the list is not intended to be exhaustive. The following may serve as BMPs to be considered and implemented (as applicable) during design, construction, operation, and maintenance of project facilities. **Efficiency** 14. Design buildings to be energy efficient. Site buildings to take advantage of shade, prevailing winds, landscaping and sun screens to reduce energy use. 15. Install efficient lighting and lighting control systems. Use daylight as an integral part of lighting systems in buildings. 16. Install light colored "cool" roofs, cool pavements, and strategically placed shade trees. 17. Install energy efficient heating and cooling systems, appliances and equipment, and control systems. 18. Install light-emitting diodes for street and other outdoor lighting. 19. Limit the hours of operation of outdoor lighting. 20. Provide education on energy efficiency. **Renewable Energy**	Project is consistent with applicable mitigation measures identified in this section. See Final SEIR pages 135 to 137.

Delta Plan Mitigation Measure #	Delta Plan Mitigation Measure	Flyway Farms Restoration Project Consistency
	21. Install solar and wind power systems and energy-efficient heating ventilation and air conditioning. 22. Install solar panels over parking areas. 23. Use combined heat and power in appropriate applications. **Water Conservation and Efficiency** 24. Create water-efficient landscapes. 25. Install water-efficient irrigation systems and devices, such as soil moisture-based irrigation controls. 26. Use reclaimed water for landscape irrigation. Install the infrastructure to deliver and use reclaimed water. 27. Design buildings to be water-efficient. Install water-efficient fixtures and appliances. 28. Restrict watering methods (e.g., prohibit systems that apply water to non-vegetated surfaces) and control runoff. 29. Restrict the use of water for cleaning outdoor surfaces and vehicles. 30. Implement low-impact development practices that maintain the existing hydrologic character of the site to manage stormwater and protect the environment. (Retaining stormwater runoff on-site can drastically reduce the need for energy-intensive imported water at the site.) 31. Devise a comprehensive water conservation strategy appropriate for the project and location. The strategy may include many of the specific items listed above, plus other innovative measures that are appropriate to the specific project. 32. Provide education about water conservation. **Solid Waste Measures** 33. Reuse and recycle construction and demolition waste (including, but not limited to, soil, vegetation, concrete, lumber, metal, and cardboard). 34. Provide interior and exterior storage areas for recyclables and green waste and adequate recycling containers located in public areas. 35. Recover by-product methane to generate electricity. **Transportation and Motor Vehicles** 36. Limit idling time for commercial vehicles, including delivery and construction vehicles. 37. Use low or zero-emission vehicles, including construction vehicles. 38. Institute a heavy-duty off-road vehicle plan and a construction vehicle inventory tracking system for construction projects. 39. Promote ride sharing. 40. Provide the necessary facilities and infrastructure to encourage the use of low or zero-emission vehicles (e.g., electric vehicle charging facilities and conveniently located alternative fueling stations). 41. Increase the cost of driving and parking private vehicles by, e.g., imposing tolls and parking fees. 42. Provide shuttle service to public transit/[work sites]. 43. Provide information on all options for individuals and businesses to reduce transportation-related emissions. **Carbon Offsets** 44. If, after analyzing and requiring all reasonable and feasible on-site mitigation measures for avoiding or reducing greenhouse gas-related impacts, the lead agency determines that additional mitigation is required, the agency may consider additional off-site mitigation. The project proponent could, for example, fund off-site mitigation projects (e.g., alternative energy projects, or energy or water audits for existing projects) that will reduce carbon emissions, conduct an audit of its other existing operations and agree to retrofit, or purchase carbon “credits” from another entity that will undertake mitigation. 45. The topic of offsets can be complicated, and a full discussion is outside the scope of this summary document. Issues that the lead agency should consider include:	

Delta Plan Mitigation Measure #	Delta Plan Mitigation Measure	Flyway Farms Restoration Project Consistency
	a. The location of the off-site mitigation. (If the off-site mitigation is far from the project, any additional, non-climate related benefits of the mitigation will be lost to the local community.) b. Whether the emissions reductions from off-site mitigation can be quantified and verified. c. Whether the mitigation ratio should be greater than 1:1 to reflect any uncertainty about the effectiveness of the offset. **SmartWay Truck Efficiency** The strategy involves requiring existing trucks/trailers to be retrofitted with the best available "SmartWay Transport" and/or ARB approved technology. Technologies that reduce GHG emissions from trucks may include devices that reduce aerodynamic drag and rolling resistance. Aerodynamic drag may be reduced using devices such as cab roof fairings, cab side gap fairings, cab side skirts, and on the trailer side, trailer side skirts, gap fairings, and trailer tail. Rolling resistance may be reduced using single wide tires or low-rolling resistance tires and automatic tire inflation systems on both the tractor and the trailer. **Tire Inflation Program** The strategy involves actions to ensure that vehicle tire pressure is maintained to manufacturer specifications. **Blended Cements** The strategy to reduce CO2 emissions involves the addition of blending materials such as limestone, fly ash, natural pozzolan and/or slag to replace some of the clinker in the production of Portland cement. **Anti-idling Enforcement** The strategy guarantees emission reductions as claimed by increasing compliance with anti-idling rules, thereby reducing the amount of fuel burned through unnecessary idling. Measures may include enhanced field enforcement of anti-idling regulations, increased penalties for violations of anti-idling regulations, and restriction on registrations of heavy-duty diesel vehicles with uncorrected idling violations.	
21-2	• Prepare a drainage or hydrology and hydraulics study that would assess the need and provide a basis for the design for flood protection of the facilities constructed along waterways. Prepare the study in accordance with applicable standards of Federal Emergency Management Agency (FEMA), USACE, DWR, Central Valley Flood Protection Board, San Francisco Bay Conservation and Development Commission (BCDC), as well as the local reclamation districts and flood control agencies and the counties and cities. Design subsequent mitigation measures in accordance with the final study and with the applicable standards of FEMA, USACE, DWR, Central Valley Flood Protection Board, and BCDC. • Design intakes/diversions and outfalls to be operated at multiple surface water elevations between existing conditions and maximum projected surface water elevations during a high flow event with sea level rise for the life of the facility. ♦ Prepare a hydrogeologic study that would assess long-term groundwater recharge and safe yield of wells and wellfields under a sustainable groundwater management plan. If the wells can be used to a greater degree in some years in a manner that would support the sustainable groundwater management plan to avoid long-term groundwater overdraft, wells could be drilled to deeper depths than would be required under existing conditions.	Not applicable.

Delta Plan Mitigation Measure #	Delta Plan Mitigation Measure	Flyway Farms Restoration Project Consistency
21-3	♦ Prepare a drainage or hydrology and hydraulics study that would assess the need and provide a basis for the design for ecosystem habitat restoration, including adjacent areas that would allow for migration of the habitat to higher elevations as the surface water elevations increase. Prepare the study in accordance with applicable standards of FEMA, USACE, DWR, and BCDC. Design subsequent mitigation measures in accordance with the final study and with the applicable standards of FEMA, USACE, DWR, Central Valley Flood Protection Board, and BCDC.	
21-4	♦ Prepare a drainage or hydrology and hydraulics study that would assess the need and provide a basis for the design for projects that reduce risks of floods in the Delta. Prepare the study in accordance with applicable standards of FEMA, USACE, DWR, and BCDC. Design subsequent mitigation measures in accordance with the final study and with the applicable standards of FEMA, USACE, DWR, Central Valley Flood Protection Board, and BCDC. ♦ Based on the results of the drainage or hydrologic and hydraulic study, arrange the length of flood management facilities in the direction of the floodplain flow to maximize surface flows under flood conditions. ♦ Install setback levees or bypass channels to maintain channel capacity and to mitigate hydraulic impacts of high flow events and higher surface water elevations due to climate change and sea level rise. ♦ Channel modifications for restoration actions would be required to be implemented to maintain or improve flood management functions and would be coordinated with the USACE, DWR, Central Valley Flood Protection Board, BCDC, and other flood control agencies to assess the desirability and feasibility for channel modifications. To the extent consistent with floodplain land uses and flood control requirements, if applicable, woody riparian vegetation would be allowed to naturally establish.	Not applicable