2.0 SUMMARY

2.1 PROJECT UNDER REVIEW

This Draft EIR evaluates the environmental impacts related to implementation of the proposed update to the Cache Creek Area Plan (CCAP Update or proposed Project). The CCAP is a rivershed management plan adopted by Yolo County in 1996 for 14.5 miles of Lower Cache Creek, located generally between an area just west of the Capay Dam and the town of Yolo. The CCAP was adopted as a "specific plan" pursuant to Section 65450 et seq of the California Government Code, and as a part of the County's General Plan. As a result, changes to the CCAP are regulated as amendments to the 2030 Countywide General Plan. The CCAP consists of two distinct, complementary plans governing different areas of the overall plan area, namely the Cache Creek Resources Management Plan (CCRMP) and the Off-Channel Mining Plan (OCMP). The CCRMP is a creek restoration plan that eliminated in-channel commercial mining and includes the Cache Creek Improvement Program (CCIP) for implementing on-going projects to improve, stabilize, and maintain the creek. The OCMP is an aggregate resources management plan that established a policy and regulatory framework that allows for controlled off-channel gravel mining. The CCAP Update also includes revisions to a number of implementing ordinances that were prepared to regulate activities to be undertaken under the CCAP. The CCAP Update includes an extension of the CCAP horizon date from 2026 to 2068, and revisions to the CCRMP, OCMP and implementing ordinances. The revisions to the CCRMP, OCMP and ordinances directly revise or establish new requirements, guidelines or other general criteria governing implementation of the CCAP. This Draft EIR evaluates the potential impacts associated with implementation of the CCAP Update, examines alternatives to the proposed Project, and recommends mitigation measures to reduce or avoid potentially significant physical impacts. A complete description of the Project is contained in Chapter 3.0, Project Description.

2.2 AREAS OF CONTROVERSY

Section 15123 of the CEQA Guidelines requires the summary section of an EIR to include "areas of controversy known to the lead agency, including issues raised by agencies and the public..." The County published a Notice of Preparation (NOP) of the Draft EIR and an Initial Study (IS) in May 2017 to help identify the types of impacts that could result from implementation of the CCAP Update, as well as potential areas of controversy. The NOP/IS was mailed to public agencies, organizations, and individuals likely to be interested in the Project and its potential impacts. Additionally, a public meeting to introduce the CCAP Update and conduct a scoping session for the Draft EIR was held on June 8, 2017, during a Planning Commission meeting. Six comment letters on the NOP and Initial Study were received by the County and the topics identified in the letters were considered during preparation of the EIR. None of the letters identified an "area of controversy" associated with implementation of the CCAP Update. Copies of the NOP and the comment letters are included in Appendix A. The Initial Study is included in Appendix B.

2.3 ISSUES TO BE RESOLVED

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

- Whether to adopt all changes and modifications included as art of the proposed CCAP Update.

- Whether to increase the in-channel material removal limit from 210,000 tons to 690,800 tons annually.

- Whether to rezone 1,188 acres to add the Sand and Gravel Reserve Overlay (SGRO) which would allow possible future mining.

- Whether to include all additional changes and modifications proposed in this EIR as mitigation measures.

2.4 SUMMARY OF IMPACTS AND MITIGATION MEASURES

This summary provides an overview of the analysis contained in Chapter 4.0 Setting, Impacts and Mitigation Measures and in the Initial Study contained in Appendix B. This summary also includes discussions of: 1) effects found not to be significant; 2) significant impacts and recommended mitigation measures; and 3) unavoidable significant impacts.

1. Summary of Effects Found Not To Be Significant

Section 15128 of the CEQA Guidelines requires an EIR to contain a statement briefly indicating the reasons that various possible significant effects of a project were determined not to be significant and were therefore not discussed in detail. The summary below identifies topics and impact areas eliminated from further analysis ("scoped out") in the Initial Study (see Appendix B). Also, a number of topics evaluated in individual sections of the Draft EIR identify impacts that are less than significant. These impacts are discussed in the individual Draft EIR sections and summarized on Table 2-1.

Land Use

The CCAP Update area includes the unincorporated communities of Capay, a portion of Madison, and Wild Wings, among others. Most of the CCAP area is comprised of scattered rural residences, agricultural land and established mining sites. The City of Woodland, the county seat, is located to the southeast of the CCAP Update area. None of the CCRMP activities, which would largely be confined to the Cache Creek channel and the adjacent channel banks, would have the potential to physically divide a community because there are no communities within the creek channel. The proposed Project does not include the construction of new roads that could physically divide an established community. New areas were identified as part of the CCAP Update where off-channel mining could occur in the future as part of the rezoning to expand the areas of SGRO. Based on the review of the proposed locations of these possible new mining sites, none would occur within or adjacent to established communities (e.g., Capay or Madison). Therefore, updates to the CCAP would not have the potential to physically divide a community.

The CCAP is a specific plan that has already been determined by the County to be consistent with the Countywide 2030 General Plan and Zoning Code. No conflicts have been identified related to other land use plans or regulations that were adopted for the purpose of avoiding or mitigating an environmental effect.

Population and Housing

The proposed CCAP Update would not induce substantial unplanned population growth in the CCAP Update area and environs because no housing construction or extension of roadways, services and utilities to support housing is proposed a part of the Project.

The CCAP Update would not result in the substantial displacement of people or existing housing units. It is possible that potential new off-channel mining areas could include one or more rural residences that would need to be removed in order to conduct mining and reclamation operations at a particular site. However, the removal and reconstruction of small numbers of individual rural residences would not be considered a substantial displacement of housing stock. This potential impact was found to be less than significant.

Public Services

The CCAP Update, which includes an expanded area where off-channel mining projects could occur, could incrementally increase fire hazards related to the operation of heavy equipment (i.e., sparks from internal combustion engines). In addition, CCRMP activities could increase fire hazards by increasing riparian habitat (which may represent an increase fire fuel load) within and along the Cache Creek channel. However, the CCRMP also includes the removal of invasive plant species which would reduce the fuel load and decrease fire hazard risks. Overall, with some incremental increases and decreases, it is anticipated that the net change in the fuel load associated with restoration activities would be negligible or beneicial, and therefore, impacts related to the need for additional fire protection services were found to be less than significant.

Police protection within the CCAP Update area is provided by the Yolo County Sheriff's Department. It is possible that trespass, vandalism, or theft of equipment could occur within the expanded OCMP area and/or as a result of implementation of individual projects that might lead to increased future public access to the corridor. However, active mining sites are generally well controlled and monitored by the operator, and there is an existing program for patrolling the Cache Creek corridor. Overall, it is anticipated that there would be no significant net change in the need for police protection, and potential impacts related to an increase in the need for additional services were determined to be less than significant.

As there is no housing associated with the CCAP Update, there would be no impact on existing schools or other public services generally driven by residential land uses.

Similarly, the CCAP Update program would not result in substantial adverse physical impacts associated with the provision of new or physically altered governmental facilities, or need for new or physically altered governmental facilities, the construction of which could cause significant environmental impacts. The Project would have a less-than-significant effect on the provision of public services.

Recreation

There are few public recreational facilities located within the CCAP Update area along Cache Creek, primarily because the land uses along the Creek are predominantly agricultural and mining related. Due to the high proportion of land in private ownership, access to the creek is limited. The CCRMP does include the creation of a "parkway" of reclaimed properties along lower Cache Creek over time. The CCAP Update would not change this component of the CCRMP program. The CCAP Update does not include the construction or expansion of additional public recreational facilities beyond those already negotiated as a part of development agreements executed with existing mining operators. New employees associated with in-channel projects and the expansion of the off-channel mining area would not increase

the use of existing parks such that substantial physical deterioration would occur. Therefore, implementation of the CCAP Update would have a less-than-significant adverse effect on recreational facilities.

The CCAP Update may have a beneficial effect on recreational facilities as it includes a proposed clarification regarding the practice of accepting property dedications and easements for/on reclaimed mining sites, restored habitat, trail connections, and related community enhancements as community benefits (“net gains”) required under the program per OCMP revised Action 2.4-7 (CCAP Update proposed new text underlined).

Action 2.4-7 Require that all surface mining applications within the OCMP plan area include a proposal for providing a "net gain" to the County, as determined by the following criteria:

a. Reclamation to multiple or conjunctive uses;

b. Enhancement and enrichment of existing resources;

c. Restoration of past sites where the requirements of reclamation at the time no longer meet community expectations in terms of good stewardship of the land; and/or

d. Provision of new dedications and easements to supplement/benefit the Cache Creek Parkway including reclaimed mining sites, restored habitat, trail connections, and related enhancements.

Utilities and Service Systems

The proposed Project does not require or result in the construction of new water or wastewater facilities and does not propose new discharges to a wastewater treatment facility. In general, during operation new mining projects will either use portable toilet facilities or install on-site septic systems. No impact related to new water or wastewater facilities would occur as a result of the proposed Project.

With the exception of temporary irrigation of new plantings and revegetation projects, the in-channel restoration projects generally do not require substantial water supply. Water supply for temporary irrigation would be provided by local sources, including local wells. Off-channel mining sites and processing plants use water for dust control and aggregate processing. The existing mining operators use water from wells and/or wet pits. It is expected that any future mining operations would similarly use local water from wells and/or wet pits. In addition, water use for off-channel operations would be evaluated for potential environmental impacts during project-level CEQA review per Mining Ordinance Section 10-4.505. Applications: Review.

Regarding effects on stormwater drainage facilities, in general, stormwater within the CCAP area either infiltrates into the ground or flows overland toward creek channels. New off-channel mining areas that could be developed under the CCAP Update may include on-site drainage facilities (e.g., culverts). However, construction, inspection and maintenance of drainage facilities is regulated by the existing and updated Mining Ordinance such that any environmental effects related to the construction of new drainage facilities would be less-than-significant (CCAP Update proposed new text underlined and deletions are shown with strikeout):

Section 10-4.413. Drainage.

> Surface water may be allowed to ~~shall be prevented from~~ enter~~ing~~ mined areas, through either perimeter berms or ditches and grading when designed and engineered pursuant to an approved reclamation plan and where effective best management practices (BMPs) to trap sediment and prohibit contamination are included. Appropriate erosion control measures shall be incorporated into all surface water drainage systems. ~~Natural and~~ Stormwater drainage systems shall be designed to connect with natural drainages so as to prevent flooding on surrounding properties and County rights-of-way. Storm water runoff from mining areas shall be conveyed to lowered areas (detention basins) to provide detention of runoff generated during a 20-year, one-hour storm event. All drainage conveyance channels or pipes (including spillways for detention areas) shall be designed to ensure positive drainage and minimize erosion. The drainage conveyance system and storm water detention areas shall be designed and maintained in accordance with Best Management Practices for the reduction of pollutants associated with runoff from mined areas. The design and maintenance procedures shall be documented in the Storm Water Pollution Prevention Plan required for mining operations. The drainage system shall be inspected annually by a Registered Civil Engineer, Registered Geologist, or Certified Erosion and Sediment Control Specialist to ensure that the drainage system is functioning effectively and that adverse erosion and sedimentation are not occurring. The annual inspection shall be documented in the Annual Mining and Reclamation Report. If the system is found to be functioning ineffectively, the operator shall promptly implement the recommendations of the engineer.

The in-channel CCAP Update activities would generate a negligible amount of solid waste, and most of the aggregate material removed due to restoration-related projects would be processed and used for beneficial purposes. Most of the solid waste generated by off-channel mining operations is composed of fines from aggregate washing and processing. It is expected that for new operations the usual process would be followed which is to use these fines in the mining areas during the reclamation process. However, new off-channel mining projects would generate some solid waste that would need disposal outside of the area. One public disposal facility in Yolo County, the 722-acre Yolo County Central Landfill, accepts solid waste from businesses. The landfill is projected to be operational through December 31, 2080,[1] well beyond the horizon date of the CCAP Update. Disposal of solid wastes generated during aggregate mining, reclamation, and processing activities would be subject to federal, State, and local waste management laws and regulations. Therefore, implementation of the CCAP Update would have a less-than-significant impact related to the disposal of solid wastes.

2. Summary of Effects Found to Be Significant and Avoidable with Mitigation Measures

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

[1] Yolo County, 2009, County of Yolo 2030 Countywide General Plan

environmental impacts in several areas, as described in the topical sections contained in Chapter 4.0 and summarized in Table 2-1.

This EIR discusses mitigation measures that should be implemented to address the identified significant project-related impacts. Generally, program-level mitigation for the CCAP Update includes modifications to the plans, or the addition or modification of implementing ordinances. A summary of identified impacts and appropriate mitigation is provided in Table 2-1.

3. Summary of Effects Found to Be Significant and Unavoidable

Under CEQA, a significant and unavoidable effect of the project is one that would cause a substantial adverse effect on the environment and for which no mitigation is available or identified to reduce the impact to a less-than-significant level if the project is approved. All impacts are discussed in Chapter 4.0 of this EIR and summarized in Table 2-1.The following significant and unavoidable (SU) impacts related to implementation of the CCAP Update were identified in this Draft EIR:

- Impact CUMULATIVE AES-1: Implementation of the OCMP in conjunction with other planned development in the region would contribute cumulatively to aesthetic impacts. (SU)

- Impact AG-1: The CCAP Update would have the potential to convert Prime Farmland, Unique Farmland, or Farmland of Statewide Importance (Farmland), to non-agricultural use. (SU)

- Impact CUMULATIVE AG-1: Implementation of the OCMP in conjunction with other planned development in the region would contribute cumulatively to loss of farmland impacts. (SU)

- Impact AIR-1: The CCAP Update would conflict with or obstruct implementation of the applicable air quality plan. (SU)

- Impact AIR-2: Under the CCAP Update, the CCAP Program would continue to result in violation of air quality standards and contribute to a cumulatively considerable net increase in an existing or projected air quality violation. (SU)

- Impact CUMULATIVE AIR-1: Implementation of the Plan in conjunction with other planned development in the region would contribute cumulatively to air quality impacts. (SU)

- Impact GHG-1: The CCAP Update would generate GHG emissions that may have a significant impact on the environment. (SU)

- Impact CUMULATIVE GHG-1: Implementation of the OCMP in conjunction with other planned development in the region would contribute cumulatively to GHG emissions impacts.

- Impact CUMULATIVE NOI-1: Implementation of the OCMP and associated increase in truck trips in conjunction with increased traffic under General Plan build-out would contribute cumulatively to roadway noise impacts. (SU)

- Impact CUMULATIVE TR-1: Implementation of the OCMP and associated increase in truck trips in conjunction with increased traffic under General Plan build-out would contribute cumulatively to transportation impacts. (SU)

2.5 SUMMARY OF ALTERNATIVES ANALYSIS

Chapter 5.0 of this Draft EIR includes the analysis of alternatives to the proposed Project to meet the requirements of CEQA to analyze a range of reasonable alternatives to a project that would feasibly attain most of the project's basic objectives and avoid or substantially lessen any of the significant effects of the project. The CEQA alternatives analyzed in Chapter 5.0 include:

- Alternative 1, **No Project Alternative.** This alternative assumes the County would not make or adopt any of the changes to the CCRMP, CCIP, OCMP and implementing ordinances identified per the CCAP Update. All existing plans, policies, and regulations would remain in place with no revisions.

- Alternative 2, **Constrained Implementation Alternative.** This alternative assumes 50 percent less material would be removed from the Cache Creek channel under the CCRMP/CCIP relative to the proposed CCAP Update and that the amount of potential new off-channel mining under the OCMP would be 50 percent of the acreage identified under the proposed CCAP Update.

These alternatives represent a reasonable range of potential alternatives to the proposed CCAP Update in light of the objective of reducing or avoiding environmental impacts identified in this EIR. Alternative 1 (No Project) was found to be the environmentally superior alternative. Alternative 2 (Constrained Implementation) was found to be the best most environmentally superior alternative.

2.6 SUMMARY OF IMPACTS AND MITIGATION MEASURES TABLE

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

- Identified environmental impacts;

- Projected level of significance without mitigation;

- Recommended mitigation measures; and

- Projected level of significance after implementation of mitigation measures.

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

Table 2-1: Summary of Impacts and Mitigation Measures

	Level of Signficance Before Mitigation			Level of Signficance After Mitigation	
Environmental Impact	**LTS**	**S**	**Mitigation Measures**	**LTS**	**SU**
Aesthetics					
AES-1: The CCAP Update would not have a substantial adverse effect on a scenic vista.	X		None required.	X	
AES-2: The CCAP Update would not substantially damage scenic resources, including, but not limited to, trees, rock outcroppings, and historic buildings within a state scenic highway.	X		None required.	X	
AES-3: Sediment removal and/or mining operations under the CCAP Update could degrade the existing visual character or quality of public views of the site and its surroundings.	X		None required.	X	
AES-4: Activities under the CCAP Update would not create a new source of substantial light or glare which could adversely affect day or nighttime views in the area.	X		None required.	X	
Agriculture and Forestry Resources					
AG-1: The CCAP Update could have the potential to convert Prime Farmland, Unique Farmland, or Farmland of Statewide Importance (Farmland), to non-agricultural use.		X	None available.		X
AG-2: The CCAP Update would not conflict with existing zoning for agricultural use or with a Williamson Act contract	X		None required.	X	
AG-3: The CCAP Update could not conflict with existing zoning for, or cause rezoning of, forest land (as defined in Public Resources Code section 12220(g)), timberland (as defined by Public Resources Code section 4526), or timberland zoned Timberland Production (as defined by Government Code section 51104(g)).	X		None required.	X	
AG-4: The CCAP Update would not have the potential to result in the loss of forest land or conversion of forest land to non-forest use	X		None required.	X	
AG-5: The CCAP Update would not involve other changes in the existing environment which, due to their location or nature, could result in conversion of Farmland, to non-agricultural use or conversion of forest land to non-forest use	X		None required.	X	
Air Quality					
AIR-1: The CCAP Update could conflict with or obstruct implementation of the applicable air quality plan.		X	None available.		X

	Level of Signficance Before Mitigation			Level of Signficance After Mitigation	
Environmental Impact	**LTS**	**S**	**Mitigation Measures**	**LTS**	**SU**
AIR-2: Under the CCAP Update, the CCAP Program could continue to result in violation of air quality standards and contribute to a cumulatively considerable net increase in an existing or projected air quality violation.		X	AIR-2: The following regulation shall be added as Sect. 10-4.414.1 to the Mining Ordinance: Wherever practical and feasible, aggregate facilities shall use clean electric energy from the grid or install alternative on-site electricity generation systems to replace diesel equipment and reduce criteria pollutant emissions.		X
AIR-3: The CCAP Update would not expose sensitive receptors to substantial pollutant concentrations.	X		None required.	X	
AIR-4: The CCAP Update would not result in substantial emissions (such as odors and dust) adversely affecting a substantial number of people.	X		None required.	X	
Biological Resources					
BIO-1: The CCAP Update could have a substantial adverse effect, either directly or through habitat modifications, on special-status species in local or regional plans, policies, regulations or by the California Department of Fish and Wildlife or US Fish and Wildlife Service.		X	BIO-1a. The following revisions (shown in underline) shall be made to the CCAP Update Section 10-3.501(d) to better integrate the Yolo HCP/NCCP and ensure adequate mitigation for non-listed special-status species through compliance with the State Fish and Game Code, Migratory Bird Treaty Act and other applicable regulations, plans and programs, as appropriate. Proposed changes to Action 4.4-14 in the CCRMP and Section 10-3.501(d) of the In-Channel Ordinance shall be further modified as follows: A biological database search (e.g., California Natural Diversity Data Base) shall be completed prior to implementation of priority projects. The database search shall compile existing information on occurrences of special-status species and areas supporting sensitive natural communities that should be considered for preservation. In addition, the database search shall be supplemented by reconnaissance-level field surveys to confirm the presence or absence of populations of special-status species, location of elderberry shrubs, active bird nests and colonies, and extent of sensitive natural communities along the creek segment. Essential habitat for special-status species and sensitive natural communities shall be protected and enhanced as part of restoration efforts or replaced as part of mitigation plans prepared by a qualified biologist and reviewed by the TAC. Compliance with the Yolo HCP/NCCP will ensure mitigation for covered activities and covered species. Action 4.4-16 in the CCRMP and Section 10-3.505(c) and (d) of the In-Channel Ordinance shall be modified to include the following text: Modifications to the plan area shall be reviewed and approved by the TAC to ensure that sensitive biological resources are protected and enhanced, that restoration plans are consistent with the policies of the CCRMP, and that	X	

	Level of Signficance Before Mitigation			Level of Signficance After Mitigation	
Environmental Impact	**LTS**	**S**	**Mitigation Measures**	**LTS**	**SU**
			various habitat restoration projects are compatible. Actions shall include compliance with the Yolo HCP/NCCP, State Fish and Game Code and the Migratory Bird Treaty Act, and other applicable regulations, plans and programs, as appropriate. (This was incorporated into the CCIP and In-Channel Ordinance.) The In-Channel Ordinance shall be revised to include a new section as follows: Section 10-3.406.1. Habitat conservation plan compliance. All in-channel activities performed under the CCRMP and CCIP shall be consistent with applicable components of the Yolo County Habitat Conservation Plan/Natural Community Conservation Plan (HCP/NCCP).		
			BIO-1b. The following revisions shall be made to provisions in the CCAP Update to better integrate the Yolo HCP/NCCP, and ensure adequate mitigation for non-listed special-status species through compliance with the State Fish and Game Code, Migratory Bird Treaty Act and other applicable regulations, plans and programs, as appropriate. (LTS) Action 6.4-3 in the OCMP shall be revised as follows: Mitigate for short-term and long-term loss of agricultural land and habitat pursuant to applicable County requirements and CEQA.in effect at the time Comply with the Yolo HCP/NCCP for covered species. For non-covered species for which impacts may occur, ensure compliance with appropriate measures in site-specific biological assessments required under the OCMP and CCRMP, in compliance with the State Fish and Game Code, Migratory Bird Treaty Act, and other applicable regulations, plans and programs, as appropriate. The title of Section 10-5.514 of the Reclamation Ordinance shall be changed as follows: Section 10-5.514. Habitat management conservation plan compliance. …. Section 10-4.440 in the Mining Ordinance shall be revised as follows: Avoid disturbance to important wildlife habitat features such as bird nesting trees, colonial breeding locations, elderberry host plants for Valley Elderberry Longhorn Beetle, and mature riparian forest and oak woodland habitat. This shall include sensitive siting of haul roads, trails, and recreational facilities away from these features. Suitable habitat for special-status species shall be protected and enhanced, or replaced as a part of mitigation plans prepared by a qualified biologist, where necessary, and through compliance with the Yolo HCP/NCCP for covered special-status species. Mining and reclamation activities shall be performed in accordance with the State Fish and Game Code, Migratory Bird Treaty Act, and other applicable regulations to protect bird nests when in active use. …	X	

	Level of Signficance Before Mitigation			Level of Signficance After Mitigation	
Environmental Impact	**LTS**	**S**	**Mitigation Measures**	**LTS**	**SU**
			Section 10-4.502(b)(1) in the Mining Ordinance shall be revised as follows: A biological inventory and analysis to evaluate the on-site habitat value of the proposed mined area, as well as the potential impacts to special-status species and sensitive natural communities, both on-site and within the immediate area. The analysis shall propose appropriate measures to reduce any potential adverse impacts to special-status species or associated significant suitable habitat, and shall ensure compliance with the Yolo HCP/NCCP, California Fish and Game Code, Migratory Bird Treaty Act, and other applicable regulations, plans and programs. The analysis shall also include a wetland delineation study for any potential on-site wetlands, and shall provide adequate mitigation and appropriate authorizations from regulatory agencies, where required. If landscaping is proposed to screen the surface mining operations from adjoining public rights-of-way or public and private lands, the biological analysis shall include an evaluation of the feasibility of the species, weed control, and irrigation methods to be used;		
BIO-2: The CCAP Update could have a substantial adverse effect on riparian habitat and other sensitive natural community types identified in local or regional plans, policies, regulations or by the California Department of Fish and Wildlife or US Fish and Wildlife Service.		X	BIO-2. The following revisions shall be made to provisions in the In-Channel Ordinance to ensure flexibility in native planting guidelines and the source of material used in revegetation efforts within the CCRMP area, where appropriate. These revisions would improve the success of native habitat restoration efforts, including establishment of sensitive natural community types, by providing flexibility in the source of plant material used in relatively small restoration efforts where the expense of native seed collection and propagation of locally collected plant material may make it otherwise infeasible. Revegetation guidelines in Section 10-3.415(A) of the In-Channel Ordinance shall be revised as follows: 12) The following guidelines shall be followed when developing wetland habitat areas, with refinements and adjustments made based on current professional practice where recommended by a qualified biologist, subject to review by the TAC: 13) The following guidelines shall be followed when developing riparian woodland habitat areas, with refinements and adjustments made based on current professional practice where recommended by a qualified biologist, subject to review by the TAC: 14) The following guidelines shall be followed when developing oak woodland habitat areas, with refinements and adjustments made based on current professional practice where recommended by a qualified biologist, subject to review by the TAC:	X	

	Level of Signficance Before Mitigation			Level of Signficance After Mitigation	
Environmental Impact	**LTS**	**S**	**Mitigation Measures**	**LTS**	**SU**
			15) The following guidelines shall be followed when creating habitat areas within previously mined areas outside of the active channel, with refinements and adjustments made based on current professional practice where recommended by a qualified biologist, subject to review by the TAC: Revegetation provisions in Section 10-3.415(A)7 of the In-Channel Ordinance shall be revised as follows: 7) Plant materials shall preferably be collected in the vicinity of the project site in order to control the origin of the genetic stock and provide the most site-adapted ecotypes. If seeding of native herbaceous species is proposed, seeds shall be collected, cleaned, tested for viability, and stored appropriately by a qualified native seed supplier. Cottonwood cuttings shall be collected and contract-grown at a nursery with staff experienced in the propagation of native plants. Alternatively, cottonwood cuttings can be collected from vegetation in the project vicinity and stockpiled for planting within twenty-four (24) hours of collection. Willow cuttings can be collected from vegetation in the project vicinity and stockpiled for planting within 24 hours of collection. Other woody riparian species shall be collected and contract-grown from local seed by a qualified native plant nursery. Where revegetation involves such a relatively small area that the requirements for locally-collected and grown material would be infeasible, the seed and plant material to be used in revegetation efforts may be obtained commercially as long as it is of local origin from within Yolo County.		
BIO-3: The CCAP Update could have a substantial adverse effect on State or federally protected wetlands (including but not limited to marsh, vernal pool, coastal, etc.) through direct removal, filling, hydrological interruption, or other means.		X	BIO-3. Implement Mitigation Measure BIO-1b.	X	
BIO-4: The CCAP Update would not interfere substantially with the movement of any native resident or migratory fish or wildlife species or with established native resident or migratory wildlife corridors, or impede the use of native wildlife nursery sites.	X		None required.	X	
BIO-5: The CCAP Update could conflict with local policies or ordinances protecting biological resources, such as tree preservation policies or ordinances.		X	BIO-5a: Implement Mitigation Measures BIO-1a, Bio-1b, and BIO-2.	X	
		X	BIO-5b. Implement Mitigation Measure BIO-1a and BIO-1b.	X	
BIO-6: The CCAP Update would not conflict with the provisions of the adopted Yolo County HCP/NCCP or other approved local, regional, or state habitat conservation plan.	X		None required.	X	

	Level of Signficance Before Mitigation			Level of Signficance After Mitigation	
Environmental Impact	**LTS**	**S**	**Mitigation Measures**	**LTS**	**SU**
BIO-7: The CCAP Update has the potential to: substantially reduce the habitat of a fish or wildlife species; cause a fish or wildlife population to drop below self-sustaining levels; threaten to eliminate a plant or animal community; or substantially reduce the number or restrict the range of an endangered, rare or threatened species.	X		None required.	X	
Cultural and Tribal Cultural Resources					
CUL-1: The CCAP Update could cause a substantial adverse change in the significance of an archaeological resource pursuant to CEQA Guidelines Section 15064.5		X	CUL-1: The following revision shall be made to the CCAP Update In-Channel Ordinance Section 10-3.501. to ensure that an analysis of the potential for cultural resources is undertaken as part of the application process. In-Channel Ordinance Section 10-3.501. Applications: Contents. Except as provided for in Section 10-3.502 of this article, all project application documentation shall be submitted to the Director at one time. Three (3) complete copies of the application shall be provided to the County. Applications for proposed in-channel activities shall include, but shall not be limited to, the following: (e) A cultural resources survey of the proposed mining area, in order to evaluate the potential for historic and/or prehistoric artifacts. A survey may not be required if a preliminary investigation from the Northwest Information Center indicates that the likelihood of archaeological resources is low for the proposed site.	X	
CUL-2: The CCAP Update could cause a substantial adverse change in the significance of a tribal cultural resource (defined in Public Resources Code section 21074 as either a site, feature, place, cultural landscape that is geographically defined in terms of the size and scope of the landscape, sacred place, or object with cultural value to a California Native American tribe).	X		None required.	X	
Geology, Soils, Mineral, and Paleontological Resources					
GEO-1: The CCAP Update would not directly or indirectly cause potential substantial adverse effects, including the risk of loss, injury, or death involving landslides	X		None required.	X	
GEO-2: Off-channel mining and channel maintenance activities that include excavation would not result in substantial soil erosion or the loss of topsoil	X		None required.	X	
GEO-3: Off-channel mining and channel maintenance activities that include excavation could directly or indirectly destroy a unique paleontological resource site, and could destroy a unique geologic feature		X	GEO-3: Implementation of mitigation measures GEO-3a and GEO-3b would ensure that this impact is mitigated to a less-than-significant level.	X	

	Level of Signficance Before Mitigation			Level of Signficance After Mitigation	
Environmental Impact	**LTS**	**S**	**Mitigation Measures**	**LTS**	**SU**
			Section10-3.404. Cultural Resources. (a) All resource records shall be checked for the presence of and the potential for prehistoric and historic sites, paleontological resources, and unique geologic features. Damaging effects to cultural resources shall be avoided whenever possible. If avoidance is not feasible, the importance of the site shall be evaluated by a qualified professional (e.g. archeologist, paleontologist, or geologist, depending on the resource type) prior to the commencement of operations. If a cultural or unique geological resource is determined not to be important, both the resource and the effect on it shall be reported to the County, and the resource need not be considered further. If avoidance of an important cultural resource is not feasible, a mitigation plan shall be prepared and implemented. The mitigation plan shall explain the importance of the resource, describe the proposed approach to mitigate destruction or damage to the site, and demonstrate how the proposed mitigation would serve the public interest. (b) If human skeletal remains are encountered during material removal, all work within seventy-five (75) feet shall immediately stop, and the County Coroner shall be notified within twenty-four (24) hours. If the remains are of Native American origin, the appropriate Native American community identified by the Native American Heritage Commission shall be contacted, and an agreement for treating or disposing, with appropriate dignity, of the remains and associated grave goods shall be developed. If any cultural resources, such as chipped or ground stone, historic debris, building foundations, or paleontological materials are encountered during material removal, then all work within seventy-five feet shall immediately stop and the Director shall be notified at once. Any cultural or paleontological resources found on the site shall be recorded by a~~A~~ qualified archaeologist or paleontologist using relevant professional protocols ~~shall then examine any cultural resources found on the site and the information~~ and a report fully recording the find shall be submitted to the County. This report shall include recommendations for appropriate treatment of the resource/artifact. The County encourages the donation of resources, other than tribal cultural resources, to the County for public display at the Cache Creek Nature Preserve or other appropriate venue. ~~Damaging effects to cultural resources shall be avoided whenever possible. If avoidance is not feasible, the importance of the site shall be evaluated by a qualified archeologist prior to the commencement of operations. If a cultural resource is determined not to be important, both the resource and the effect on it shall be reported to the County, and the resource~~	X	

	Level of Signficance Before Mitigation			Level of Signficance After Mitigation	
Environmental Impact	**LTS**	**S**	**Mitigation Measures**	**LTS**	**SU**
			~~need not be considered further. If avoidance of an important cultural resource is not feasible, a mitigation plan shall be prepared and implemented. The mitigation plan shall explain the importance of the resource, describe the proposed approach to mitigate destruction or damage to the site, and demonstrate how the proposed mitigation would serve the public interest.~~		
			Mitigation Measure GEO-3b: The text of Off-Channel Ordinance Section 10-4.410 shall be modified as follows: Section 10-4.410. Cultural resources. (a) All resource records shall be checked for the presence of and the potential for prehistoric and historic sites, paleontological resources, and unique geologic features. Damaging effects on cultural, paleontological, and unique geologic resources shall be avoided whenever possible. If avoidance is not feasible, the importance of the site shall be evaluated by a qualified professional (either an archaeologist of geologist, depending on the resource type) prior to the commencement of mining operations. If a cultural resource or unique geologic resource is determined not to be important, both the resource and the effect on it shall be reported to the County~~Agency~~, and the resource need not be considered further. If avoidance of an important cultural, paleontological, or unique geologic resource is not feasible, a mitigation plan shall be prepared and implemented. The mitigation plan shall explain the importance of the resource, describe the proposed approach to mitigate destruction or damage to the site, and demonstrate how the proposed mitigation would serve the public interest. (b) If human skeletal remains are encountered during excavation, all work within seventy-five (75) feet shall immediately stop, and the County Coroner shall be notified within twenty-four (24) hours. If the remains are of Native American origin, the appropriate Native American community identified by the Native American Heritage Commission shall be contacted, and an agreement for treating or disposing of, with appropriate dignity, the remains and associated grave goods shall be developed. If any cultural resources, such as chipped or ground stone, historic debris, building foundations, or paleontological materials are encountered during excavation, then all work within seventy-five (75) feet shall immediately stop and the Director shall be notified at once. ~~Any cultural resources found on the site shall be recorded by a qualified archaeologist and the information shall be submitted to the Agency.~~ The find must be recorded by a qualified archaeologist or paleontologist using relevant professional protocols and a report fully recording the find submitted to the County. This report shall	X	

	Level of Signficance Before Mitigation			Level of Signficance After Mitigation	
Environmental Impact	**LTS**	**S**	**Mitigation Measures**	**LTS**	**SU**
			include recommendations for appropriate removal and preservation of the artifact. The County encourages the donation of the find to the County for public display at the Cache Creek Nature Preserve or other appropriate venue.		
Greenhouse Gas Emissions and Energy					
GHG-1: The CCAP Update would generate GHG emissions that may have a significant impact on the environment.		X	None available.		X
GHG-2: The CCAP Update would not conflict with an applicable plan, policy or regulation adopted for the purpose of reducing the emissions of greenhouse gases.	X		None required.	X	
EN-1: The CCAP Update would not result in a potentially significant environmental impact due to wasteful, inefficient, or unnecessary consumption of energy, or wasteful use of energy resources, during project construction or operation.	X		None required.	X	
EN-2: The CCAP Update would not conflict with or obstruct a state or local plan for renewable energy or energy efficiency.	X		None required.	X	
Hazards and Hazardous Materials					
HAZ-1: Implementation of the CCAP Update could result in locating a new mining facility within an airport land use plan area and could result in a safety hazard.	X		None required.	X	
Hydrology and Water Quality					
HYD-1: The CCAP Update would not result in increased erosion and sedimentation or violation of any water quality standards or waste discharge requirements, but could otherwise substantially degrade surface or ground water quality by creating conditions that allow for methylmercury to form in wet pit lakes.		X	**HYD-1:** The text of Sections 10.5.517 and 10-5.532 of the Reclamation Ordinance shall be replaced in their entirety by the following: Section 10-5.517. Mercury bioaccumulation in fish. As part of each approved long-term mining plan involving wet pit mining to be reclaimed to a permanent pond, lake, or water feature, the operator shall maintain, monitor, and report to the Director according to the standards given in this section. Requirements and restrictions are distinguished by phase of operation as described below. (a) Mercury Protocols. The Director shall issue and update as needed "Lower Cache Creek Off-Channel Pits Mercury Monitoring Protocols" (Protocols), which shall provide detailed requirements for mercury monitoring activities. The Protocols shall include procedures for monitoring conditions in each pit lake, and for monitoring ambient mercury level in the lower Cache Creek channel within the CCAP planning area, as described below. The Protocols	X	

	Level of Signficance Before Mitigation			Level of Signficance After Mitigation	
Environmental Impact	**LTS**	**S**	**Mitigation Measures**	**LTS**	**SU**
			shall be developed and implemented by a qualified aquatic scientist or equivalent professional acceptable to the Director. The Protocols shall identify minimum laboratory analytical reporting limits, which may not exceed the applicable response threshold identified in subsection (e) below. Data produced from implementing the Protocols shall meet or exceed applicable standards in the industry. (b) Ambient Mercury Level. The determination of the ambient or "baseline" fish mercury level shall be undertaken by the County every ten years in years ending in 0. This analysis shall be undertaken by the County for use as a baseline of comparison for fish mercury testing conducted in individual wet mining pits. The work to establish this baseline every ten years shall be conducted by a qualified aquatic systems scientist acceptable to the Director and provided in the form of a report to the Director. It shall be paid for by the mining permit operators on a fair-share basis. The results of monitoring and evaluation of available data shall be provided in the report to substantiate the conclusions regarding ambient concentrations of mercury in fish within the lower Cache Creek channel within the CCAP planning area. (c) Pit Monitoring. (1) Mining Phase (including during idle periods as defined in SMARA). The operator shall monitor fish and water column profiles in each pit lake once every year during the period generally between September and November for the first five years after a pit lake is created. Fish monitoring should include sport fish where possible, together with other representative species that have comparison samples from the creek and/or other monitored ponds. Sport fish are defined as predatory, trophic level four fish such as bass, which are likely to be primary angling targets and have the highest relative mercury levels. The requirements of this subsection apply to any pit lake that is permanently wet and navigable by a monitoring vessel. If, in the initial five years after the pit lake is created, the applicable response threshold identified in subsection (e) is exceeded in any three of five monitoring years, the operator shall, solely at their own expense, undertake expanded analysis pursuant to subsection (f) and preparation of a lake management plan pursuant to subsection (g). (2) Reclamation Phase. No monitoring is required after mining has concluded, during the period that an approved reclamation plan is being implemented, provided reclamation is completed within the time specified by SMARA or the project approval, whichever is sooner. (3) Post-Reclamation Phase. After reclamation is completed, the operator shall monitor fish and water column profiles in each pit lake at least once		

	Level of Signficance Before Mitigation			Level of Signficance After Mitigation	
Environmental Impact	**LTS**	**S**	**Mitigation Measures**	**LTS**	**SU**
			every two years during the period of September-November for ten years following reclamation. Monitoring shall commence in the first calendar year following completion of reclamation activities. If fish monitoring results from the post-reclamation period exceed the applicable response threshold described in subsection (e) or, for ponds that have implemented mitigation management, results do not exhibit a general decline in mercury levels, the operator shall, solely at their own expense, undertake expanded analysis pursuant to subsection (f) and preparation of a lake management plan pursuant to subsection (g). (4) Other Monitoring Obligation. If monitoring conducted during both the mining and post-reclamation phase did not identify any exceedances of the ambient mercury level for a particular pit lake, and at the sole discretion of the Director no other relevant factors substantially support that continued monitoring is merited, the operator shall have no further obligations. (d) Reporting. (1) Pit Monitoring Results. Reporting and evaluating of subsection (c) pit monitoring results shall be conducted by a qualified aquatic scientist or equivalent professional acceptable to the Director. Monitoring activities and results shall be summarized in a single report(addressing all wet pit lakes) and submitted to the Director within six months following each annual monitoring event. The report shall include, at a minimum: (1) results from subsection (b) (pit monitoring), in relation to subsection (a) (ambient mercury levels). (2) Expanded Analysis Results. Reporting and evaluation of subsection (f) expanded analysis shall be conducted by a qualified aquatic scientist or equivalent professional acceptable to the Director. Results shall be summarized in a single report (addressing all affected wet pit lakes) and submitted to the Director within six months following each annual monitoring event. The report shall include, at a minimum, the results of the expanded analysis undertaken pursuant subsection (f). (2) Data Sharing. For pit lakes open to the public, the Director may submit the data on mercury concentrations in pit lake fish to the state Office of Environmental Health Hazard Assessment (or its successor) for developing site-specific fish consumption advisories. (e) Response Thresholds. (1) Fish Consumption Advisory. If at any time during any phase of monitoring the pit lake's average sport fish tissue mercury concentration exceeds the Sport Fish Water Quality Objective, as it may be modified by the state over time (as of 2019, the level was 0.2 mg/kg), the operator shall post fish		

	Level of Signficance Before Mitigation			Level of Signficance After Mitigation	
Environmental Impact	**LTS**	**S**	**Mitigation Measures**	**LTS**	**SU**
			consumption advisory signs at access points around the lake and around the lake perimeter. Catch-and-release fishing may still be allowed. Unless site-specific guidance has been developed by the state's Office of Health Hazard Assessment or the County, statewide fish consumption guidance shall be provided. (2) Mining Phase Results. If, during the mining phase of monitoring, the pit lake's average fish tissue mercury concentration exceeds the ambient mercury level for any three of five monitoring years, annual monitoring shall continue for an additional five years, and the operator shall undertake expanded analysis pursuant to subsection (f) and preparation of a lake management plan pursuant to subsection (g). (3) Post-Reclamation Phase Results. If during the first ten years of the post-reclamation phase of monitoring, the pit lake's average fish tissue mercury concentration exceeds the ambient mercury level for any three of five monitoring years, biennial monitoring shall continue for an additional ten years, and the operator shall undertake expanded analysis pursuant to subsection (f) and preparation of a lake management plan pursuant to subsection (g). (f) Expanded Analysis. (1) General. If during the mining or post-reclamation phase, any pit lake's average fish tissue mercury concentration exceeds the ambient mercury level for any three years, the operator shall undertake expanded analyses. The analysis shall include expanded lake water column profiling (a minimum of five profiles per affected wet pit lake plus one or more non-affected lakes for control purposes) conducted during the warm season (generally May through October) in an appropriate deep profiling location for each pit lake. The following water quality parameters shall be collected at regular depth intervals, from surface to bottom of each lake, following protocols identified in subsection (a): temperature, dissolved oxygen, conductivity, pH and oxidation-reduction potential (ORP), turbidity or total suspended solids, dissolved organic matter, and algal density by Chlorophyll or Phycocyanin. The initial analysis shall also include one-time collections of fine grained (clay/silt) bottom sediments from a minimum of six well distributed locations for each affected lake, and from one or more non-affected lakes for control purposes, to be analyzed for mercury and organic content. (2) Scope of Analysis. The purpose of the expanded analyses is to identify and assess potential factors linked to elevated methylmercury production and/or bioaccumulation in each pit lake. The scope of the expanded analyses shall include monitoring and analysis appropriate to fulfill this purpose, invoking best practices in the industry. In addition to the analyses described		

	Level of Signficance Before Mitigation			Level of Signficance After Mitigation	
Environmental Impact	**LTS**	**S**	**Mitigation Measures**	**LTS**	**SU**
			in subsection (f)(1) above, the analysis should also consider such factors as: electrical conductivity, bathymetry (maximum and average depths, depth-to-surface area ratios, etc.), and trophic status indicators (concentrations, Secchi depth, chlorophyll a, fish assemblages, etc.). Additional types of testing may be indicated and appropriate if initial results are inconclusive. (3) Use of Results. The results of the expanded analyses undertaken pursuant to this subsection shall be used to inform the preparation of a lake management plan described below under subsection (g). (g) Lake Management Activities (1) General. If monitoring conducted during the mining or post-reclamation phases triggers the requirement to undertake expanded analysis and prepare and implement a lake management plan, the operator shall implement lake management activities designed by a qualified aquatic scientist or equivalent professional acceptable to the Director, informed by the results of subsection (f). Options for addressing elevated mercury levels may include (A) and/or (B) below at the Director's sole discretion and at the operator's sole expense. (A) Lake Management Plan. Prepare a lake management plan that provides a feasible, adaptive management approach to reducing fish tissue mercury concentrations to at or below the ambient mercury level. Potential mercury control methods could include, for example: addition of oxygen to or physical mixing of anoxic bottom waters; alteration of water chemistry (modify pH or organic carbon concentration); and/or removal or replacement of affected fish populations. The lake management plan may be subject to external peer review at the discretion of the Director. Lake management activities shall be appropriate to the phase of the operation (eg. during mining or post-reclamation). The Lake Management Plan shall include a recommendation for continued monitoring and reporting. All costs associated with preparation and implementation of the lake management plan shall be solely those of the operator. Upon acceptance by the Director, the operator shall immediately implement the plan. The lake management plan shall generally be implemented within three years of reported results from the expanded analyses resulting from subsection (f). If lake management does not achieve acceptable results and/or demonstrate declining mercury levels after a maximum of three years of implementation, at the sole discretion of the Director, the operator may prepare an alternate management plan with reasonable likelihood of mitigating the conditions. (B) Revised Reclamation Plan. As an alternative to (A), or if (A)		

	Level of Signficance Before Mitigation			Level of Signficance After Mitigation	
Environmental Impact	**LTS**	**S**	**Mitigation Measures**	**LTS**	**SU**
			does not achieve acceptable results and/or demonstrate declining mercury levels after a maximum of three years of implementation, at the sole discretion of the Director, the operator shall prepare and submit revisions to the reclamation plan (including appropriate applications and information for permit amendment) to fill the pit lake with suitable fill material to a level no less than five (5) feet above the average seasonal high groundwater level, and modify the end use to agriculture, habitat, or open space at the discretion of the Director, subject to Article 6 of the Mining Ordinance and/or Article 8 of the Reclamation Ordinance as may be applicable. (2) Implementation Obligations. (A) If a lake management plan is triggered during the mining or post-reclamation phase and the subsequent lake management activities do not achieve acceptable results and/or demonstrate declining mercury levels, the operator may propose different or additional measures for consideration by the Director and implementation by the operator, or the Director may direct the operator to proceed to modify the reclamation plan as described in subsection (g)(1)(B). (B) Notwithstanding the results of monitoring and/or lake management activities during the mining phase, the operator shall, during the post-reclamation phase, conduct the required ten years of biennial monitoring. (C) If monitoring conducted during the post-reclamation phase identifies three monitoring years of mercury concentrations exceeding the ambient mercury level, the operator shall implement expanded analyses as in subsection (f), to help prepare and implement a lake management plan and associated monitoring. (D) If subsequent monitoring after implementation of lake management activities, during the post-reclamation phase, demonstrates levels of fish tissue mercury at or below the ambient mercury level for any three monitoring years (i.e., the management plan is effective), the operator shall be obligated to continue implementation of the plan and continue monitoring, or provide adequate funding for the County to do both, in perpetuity. Section 10-5.532. Use of overburden and fine sediments in reclamation. Sediment fines associated with processed in-channel aggregate deposits (excavated as a result of maintenance activities performed in compliance with the CCIP) may be used for other purposes such as in the backfill or reclamation of off-channel pit lakes, for in-channel reshaping or habitat		

	Level of Signficance Before Mitigation			Level of Signficance After Mitigation	
Environmental Impact	**LTS**	**S**	**Mitigation Measures**	**LTS**	**SU**
			restoration, and/or as a soil amendment in agricultural fields provided the operator can demonstrate that no detrimental sediment toxicity exists (consistent with the state's Stream Pollution Trends Monitoring Program protocols) and fine-grained soil (<63 micron) do not exceed 0.4 mg/kg total mercury. The operator shall use overburden and processing fines whenever possible to support reclamation activities for pit lakes. If topsoil (A-horizon soil), formerly in agricultural production, is proposed for use within a pit lake or its drainage area, the operator must sample the soils prior to placement and analyze them for pesticides and herbicides (EPA Methods 8141B and 8151A, or equivalent) as well as for total mercury (EPA Method 7471B, or equivalent). The operator shall collect and analyze samples in accordance with EPA Test Methods for Evaluating Solid Waste Physical/Chemical Methods, SW-846 (as updated). Topsoil that contains pesticides or herbicides above the Maximum Contaminant Levels for primary drinking water (California Code of Regulations), or that contains fine-grained soils exceeding on average 0.4 mg/kg total mercury shall not be placed in areas that drain to the pit lakes. Land reclaimed to a subsequent use that includes planting of vegetation (e.g., agriculture, habitat) shall be provided an adequate soil profile (i.e., depth and texture of soil) to ensure successful reclamation. At the discretion of the Director and at the operator's sole expense, the proposed reclamation plan for the project may be peer reviewed by an appropriate expert/professional, and recommendations, if any, shall be incorporated into the project as conditions of approval.		
HYD-2: The CCAP Update would not substantially decrease groundwater supplies or interfere substantially with groundwater recharge such that the Project may impede sustainable groundwater management of the basin	X		None required.	X	
HYD-3: Substantially alter the existing drainage pattern of the site or area, including through the alteration of the course of a stream or river, or substantially increase the rate or amount of surface runoff in a manner which could result in flooding on- or off-site or impede or redirect flood flows	X		None required.	X	
HYD-4: The CCAP Update could conflict with or obstruct implementation of a water quality control plan or sustainable groundwater management plan.	X		None required.	X	
Noise					
NOI-1: The CCAP Update would not result in a substantial temporary or	X		None required.	X	

	Level of Signficance Before Mitigation			Level of Signficance After Mitigation	
Environmental Impact	**LTS**	**S**	**Mitigation Measures**	**LTS**	**SU**
periodic increase in ambient noise levels in the vicinity of the Project area above levels existing without the Project.					
NOI-2: The CCAP Update would not result in exposure of persons to or generation of excessive groundborne vibration or groundborne noise levels	X		None required.	X	
Transportation					
TR-1: The CCAP Update could conflict with a program plan, ordinance or policy addressing the circulation system, including transit, roadways, bicycle lanes and pedestrian paths	X		None required.	X	
TR-2: The Project would not conflict or be inconsistent with CEQA Guidelines Section 15064.3, subdivision (b)		X	TR-2: Modify Section 10-4.502(b)(4) of the Mining Ordinance as follows: (4) A transportation impact ~~traffic~~ analysis to evaluate the impacts of the proposed operation on haul routes and other impacted county roads (if any) pursuant to Secs. 10-4.408 and 10-4.409 of the Mining Ordinance, and the County General Plan. ~~on the Levels of Service for County roads and State highways.~~ The analysis shall evaluate operations, safety, and truck and vehicle VMT (as required to ensure compliance with the CCAP and County General Plan). ~~specific designated truck routes and~~ The analysis shall satisfy the requirements of the County's Transportation Impact Study Guidelines and shall include an evaluation of existing road conditions for those routes to be used, as well as any other information necessary to demonstrate compliance with applicable county and State standards. The analysis shall also specify the projected number of average truck trips per year, average truck trips per day, estimated maximum truck trips on peak days, estimated number of peak days per year, and estimated months in which peak days will occur. The analysis shall identify mitigation measures such as capital improvements and maintenance to be undertaken by the applicant ~~include appropriate measures~~ to reduce direct and indirect ~~any~~ significant adverse impacts to traffic flow and/or safety to acceptable levels consistent with applicable LOS, VMT, pavement condition, and other thresholds in the Yolo County General Plan and County Transportation Impact Study Guidelines;	X	

	Level of Signficance Before Mitigation			Level of Signficance After Mitigation	
Environmental Impact	**LTS**	**S**	**Mitigation Measures**	**LTS**	**SU**
TR-3: The CCAP Update could substantially increase hazards due to a design feature (e.g., sharp curves or dangerous intersections) or incompatible uses (e.g., farm equipment)		X	Mitigation Measure TR-3a: The text of Section 10.3.409 of the In-Channel Ordinance shall be amended to include the following: (f) Unless a subsequent environmental impact assessment is completed or a determination is made that a subsequent environmental impact assessment is not necessary, the combined volume of aggregate material removed from in-channel and off-channel sources that is transported on the County roadway network in any given year shall not exceed the annual allocation assigned to the applicable off-channel operator (as specified in their approved mining permit).	X	
			Mitigation Measure TR-3b: Make the following modifications to identified sections of the County Mining and Reclamation Ordinances: Section 10-4.212/10-5.212. Haul road. "Haul road" or "route" shall mean: 1) a road along which material is transported from the area of excavation to the processing plant or stock pile area of the surface mining operation; and/or 2) the designated route aggregate trucks are authorized to take pursuant to Section 10-4.419. Section 10-4.419. Haul route roads. ~~An operator may only haul on~~Trucks accessing a mining site to pick up a load, or leaving a mining site to deliver a load, are restricted to the approved/designated haul routes identified in the operator's permit which applies to the route taken from the mining site access/driveway to a state /federal highway. If a truck subsequently exists the state/federal highway while within Yolo County, this too may only occur on an approved/designate haul route. This applies to all truck trips serving the mining site, unless making a local delivery. Those portions of designated truck haul routes that include County-maintained roads shall be posted as such, in accordance with the Public Works Department, to facilitate law enforcement and public safety. Private truck haul routes or conveyors shall be used to transport material within the mining site, in order to reduce impacts to public roads.	X	
Cumulative					
CUMULATIVE AES-1: Implementation of the OCMP in conjunction with other planned development in the region would contribute cumulatively to aesthetic impacts.		X			X
CUMULATIVE AG-1: Implementation of the OCMP in conjunction with other planned development in the region would contribute cumulatively to loss of farmland impacts.		X	None available		X
CUMULATIVE AIR-1: Implementation of the CCAP Update in		X	None available.		X

	Level of Signficance Before Mitigation			Level of Signficance After Mitigation	
Environmental Impact	**LTS**	**S**	**Mitigation Measures**	**LTS**	**SU**
conjunction with other planned development in the unincorporated county would contribute cumulatively to air quality impacts.					
CUMULATIVE GHG-1: Implementation of the OCMP in conjunction with other planned development in the region would contribute cumulatively to GHG emissions impacts.		X	None available.		X
CUMULATIVE NOI-1: Implementation of the OCMP and associated increase in truck trips in conjunction with increased traffic under General Plan build-out would contribute cumulatively to roadway noise impacts		X	None available.		X
CUMULATIVE TR-1: Implementation of the OCMP and associated increase in truck trips in conjunction with increased traffic under General Plan build-out would contribute cumulatively to transportation impacts.		X	None available.		X