1. INTRODUCTION

1.1 INTRODUCTION

Teichert Materials (Teichert) has submitted an application to the County of Yolo (Yolo County or County) to conduct mining and reclamation activities on the Shifler property south of Cache Creek and west of the City of Woodland. This project is known as the Teichert Shifler Mining and Reclamation project (proposed project). The requested approval would be a discretionary action by Yolo County, which will serve as the lead agency under CEQA, responsible for the preparation of this Draft EIR. The proposed project is located within the boundaries of the Cache Creek Area Plan (CCAP) adopted by the Board of Supervisors in 1996, and most recently updated in 2019. The project must comply with the requirements of this program, including all relevant components of adopted plans and regulations. The key proposed elements of this project are as follows: 1) relocation of a segment of Moore Canal to the northerly portion of the site and modification of Magnolia Canal to align with the relocated Moore Canal; 2) transfer of tonnage from the Teichert Esparto and Teichert Schwarzgruber operation to the Teichert Shifler operation; 3) continued operation and expansion of the Teichert Woodland Plant facilities (including new equipment and increased processing capacity); 4) excavation at the Shifler site; 5) reclamation of the Shifler site; 6) delayed reclamation at Woodland Plant site; 7) dedication of various reclaimed properties to the County; and 8) completion of an in-channel gravel bar removal project.

The Teichert Shifler Mining and Reclamation Project Draft Environmental Impact Report (EIR) has been prepared in accordance with the California Environmental Quality Act of 1970, Pub. Res. Code § 21000 et seq., as amended (CEQA) and the Guidelines for Implementation of the California Environmental Quality Act, Cal. Code Regs. Title 14, § 15000 et seq. (CEQA Guidelines). As required by Section 15121 of the CEQA Guidelines, the purpose of an EIR is to: (a) inform public agency decision-makers, and the public generally, of the significant environmental effects of the project; (b) identify possible ways to minimize the significant adverse environmental effects; and (c) describe reasonable project alternatives. It is not the purpose of an EIR to provide a recommendation of approval or denial of a project; rather the purpose is to disclose information related to environmental impacts. The County is required to consider the information in the EIR in deliberating the merits of the project.

1.2 PROJECT SUMMARY

This section provides an overview of the project location and components. For additional project description details, please refer to Chapter 3, Project Description, of this EIR.

Project Location

The project site consists of approximately 319.3 acres located on the 442.2-acre Shifler property, three miles west of the City of Woodland in Yolo County, California. The project site is bounded by Cache Creek to the north, County Road 94B to the west, County Road 22 to the south, and unpaved dirt access roads to the east.

Currently, the central and southern portions of the project site consist primarily of actively managed agricultural land. The northern portion of the site consists of scattered oak trees and

ruderal grassland vegetation, as well as an electric conveyor and associated gravel road formerly used to transport mined aggregate from Teichert's Storz mining site to the Woodland Plant located north of the project site. Moore Canal, a concrete-lined water conveyance structure owned and operated by the Yolo County Flood Control and Water Conservation District (YCFCWCD), bisects the central portion of the site from west to east. The Yolo County General Plan designates the site Agriculture, and about half of the site (about 107 acres) is also designated with the Mineral Resource Overlay (MRO). The site is zoned Agricultural Intensive (A-N).

Project Components

The proposed project requests approval for mining and reclamation of the project site. Overall, the project would allow for mining of approximately 277 acres of the 319.3-acre project site. The four Shifler property parcels in their entirety total approximately 442.4 acres. The portions of the Shifler property within the Cache Creek channel and on Monument Hill have been excluded from the project site for the purpose of this analysis because no disturbance is proposed on those portions of the Shifler property. Thus, the 319.3-acre project site is limited to the proposed 277-acre mining area and surrounding areas needed for the proposed relocation/realignment of Moore Canal, setbacks, visual screening, noise and safety berms, aggregate conveyors, access roads, and other project-related uses described further below.

Excavated material from the proposed mining activities would be processed at the existing Teichert Woodland Plant facility to the northeast of the site. Activities would consist of mining aggregate for use throughout the region. Aggregate mined above the groundwater level would be harvested by scrapers and dozers. Aggregate mined below the water table would be extracted by a combination of equipment such as excavators, draglines, and potentially a floating dredge. In order to conduct the proposed mining activities, the project would require relocation of Moore Canal, construction of a conveyor over-crossing connecting to the Woodland Plant site, provision of new screening features along the southern site boundary, and various other grading and drainage improvements.

The relocated alignment of Moore Canal would be set back 200 feet from the existing channel bank of Cache Creek. The proposed mining activities would be set back 300 feet from top of bank, 50 feet from the County Road 94B right-of-way on the west side of the project site, and 50 feet from the Woodland Plant site to the northeast east. Berms and stockpiles may be located within mining setbacks; however, berms or stockpiles are not proposed within 100 feet of the top of bank of Cache Creek. In addition, the project would include a Reclamation Plan to be implemented after the proposed mining activities are concluded. Approximately 117 acres of the mining area would be reclaimed to agricultural use, while the remainder of the mining area would be reclaimed to a lake (113 acres) with riparian woodland along the fringes/shoreline (47.5 acres).

In order to allow mining equipment to move between the Woodland Plant and the Shifler mining site, an over-crossing of the relocated Moore Canal would be constructed as part of the proposed project. Aggregate trucks would continue to access the Woodland Plant site by way of the existing entrance on County Road 20, using the existing haul route discussed previously. This over-crossing would remain in place following reclamation.

The project site would be graded to allow stormwater runoff to collect in the proposed mining pit, where the runoff would gradually percolate or evaporate. At the conclusion of mining, the site would remain contoured such that stormwater runoff would be directed to the reclaimed mining

area. As a part of the proposed Reclamation Plan, new stormwater detention basins would be provided within the western and eastern reclaimed agricultural areas of the site.
The project would require the following approvals by Yolo County:

- General Plan Amendment (GPA) to extend the Mineral Resource Overlay over the entire project site;
- Rezone to add a Sand and Gravel Overlay (SG-O) over the entire project site;
- Mining Permit (30-year Off-Channel Surface Mining Permit) for new excavation site, and continued operation at the Woodland Plant site;
- Transfer of annual permitted tonnage allocation from the Teichert Schwarzgruber and Teichert Esparto projects to the Teichert Shifler project;
- Reclamation Plan;
- Approval of 20 percent exceedance of annual production limits under County Code Section 10.4-405;
- Streambank Stabilization Plan; and
- Development Agreement.

In addition, the project would require the following approvals from responsible agencies:

- Approval of the proposed Moore Canal relocation (YCFCWCD Board of Directors);
- Clean Water Act Section 404 Permit (U.S. Army Corps of Engineers);
- Clean Water Act Section 401 Water Quality Certification (Central Valley RWQCB);
- Waste Discharge Requirements (WDRs) for use of sediment fines from the Woodland Plant site for reclamation of the project site (Central Valley RWQCB);
- SMARA Compliance Review (California Department of Conservation, Division of Mine Reclamation);
- Gas Well Abandonment Permit (California Department of Conservation, Division of Oil, Gas, and Geothermal Resources);
- Water Well Abandonment Permit (Yolo County Environmental Health Division).

1.3 PURPOSE OF THE EIR

As provided in CEQA Guidelines Section 15021, public agencies are charged with the duty to avoid or minimize environmental damage where feasible. The public agency has an obligation to balance a variety of public objectives, including economic, environmental, and social factors.

CEQA requires the preparation of an EIR prior to approving any discretionary project that may have a significant effect on the environment. For the purposes of CEQA, the term *project* refers to the whole of an action that has the potential for resulting in a direct physical change or a reasonably foreseeable indirect physical change in the environment. (CEQA Guidelines Section 15378(a)). With respect to the proposed project, the County has determined that the proposed development is a project that has the potential to result in significant environmental effects within the definition of CEQA.

The EIR is an informational document that apprises decision-makers and the general public of the potential significant environmental effects of a proposed project. An EIR must describe a reasonable range of potentially feasible alternatives to the project and identify feasible measures to minimize any significant effects. The lead agency, which is Yolo County for this project, is required to consider the information in the EIR in deciding whether to approve or deny the

application. The basic requirements for an EIR include discussions of the environmental setting, environmental impacts, mitigation measures, alternatives, growth inducing impacts, and cumulative impacts.

1.4 EIR PROCESS

The EIR process begins with the decision by the lead agency to prepare an EIR, either during a preliminary review of a project or at the conclusion of an Initial Study. Once the decision is made to prepare an EIR, the lead agency sends a Notice of Preparation (NOP) to appropriate government agencies and, when required, to the State Clearinghouse (SCH) in the Office of Planning and Research (OPR), which will ensure that responsible and trustee State agencies are properly notified regarding the project and provide responses, if merited, within the required time. The SCH assigns an identification number to the project, which then becomes the identification number for all subsequent environmental documents on the project. Commenting agencies have 30 days to respond to the NOP. An NOP and Initial Study (see Appendix A) were prepared for the proposed project and circulated from August 16, 2019 to September 16, 2019. A public scoping meeting was held on September 12, 2019 for the purpose of informing the public and receiving comments on the recommended scope of the environmental analysis to be prepared for the proposed project. See Section 1.6 below for a summary of comments received on the NOP.

The NOP/Initial Study analyzed and concluded that the following effects would be less-than-significant and therefore would not require additional analysis in the Draft EIR:

- *Aesthetics (b):* The project site is not located within the vicinity of an officially designated State Scenic Highway. Thus, Initial Study concluded that the project would not substantially damage scenic resources, including, but not limited to, trees, rock outcroppings, and historic buildings within a State Scenic Highway, and a *less-than-significant* impact would occur.

- *Agriculture and Forest Resources (b, c, and d):* Per Section 8-2.604.5(e) of the County Code of Ordinances, surface mining operations are conditionally allowed in the A-N zone with a Special Sand and Gravel Overlay Zone (SG-O) zone and a Use Permit. The proposed project includes a request for a Rezone to add the SG-O zone to the project site and an application for a Mining Permit to allow for mining of the site. With approval of both entitlements, the project would not conflict with the site's existing agricultural zoning. Thus, the Initial Study concluded that a *less-than-significant* impact would occur related to conflicting with existing zoning for agricultural use or a Williamson Act contract. Furthermore, the project area is not considered forest land (as defined in Public Resources Code section 12220[g]), timberland (as defined by Public Resources Code section 4526), and is not zoned Timberland Production (as defined by Government Code section 51104[g]). Therefore, the Initial Study concluded that the proposed project would have *no impact* with regard to conversion of forest land or any potential conflict with forest land, timberland, or Timberland Production zoning.

- *Geology and Soils (e):* The construction or operation of septic tanks or other alternative wastewater disposal systems is not included as part of the project. Portable toilet facilities would be provided at the project site and existing portable toilet facilities would continue to be used at the adjacent Woodland Plant. Therefore, the Initial Study concluded that *no impact* regarding the capability of soil to adequately support the use of septic tanks or alternative wastewater disposal systems would occur.

- *Hazards and Hazardous Materials (c, d, and g):* The nearest school to the project site is Willow Oak School, located approximately 1.5 miles east of the site. Therefore, the Initial Study concluded that proposed project would result in a *less-than-significant* impact related to hazardous emissions or the handling of hazardous or acutely hazardous materials, substances, or waste within one-quarter mile of an existing or proposed school. The project site is not identified on a list of hazardous materials sites compiled pursuant to Government Code Section 65962.5, and, thus, *no impact* would occur. Furthermore, the proposed project would not expose people or structures to the risk of loss, injury, or death involving wildland fires. Therefore, the Initial Study concluded that the proposed project would not expose people or structures to the risk of loss, injury or death involving wildland fires, including where wildlands are adjacent to urbanized areas or where residences are intermixed with wildlands, and a *less-than-significant* impact would occur.

- *Noise (c):* Per the Watts-Woodland Airport Comprehensive Land Use Plan, the northwestern portion of the project site north of the Moore Canal lies within Safety Area 2 (Approach-Departure Zone), while the remainder of the project site lies within Safety Area 3 (Overflight Zone). The proposed project would not include the construction of housing or habitable structures within the site. Therefore, the Initial Study concluded that the proposed project would not expose people residing or working in the project area to excessive noise levels related to air traffic, and a *less-than-significant* impact would occur.

- *Population and Housing (a and b):* The proposed project would not include the development of any new housing. Employees required for the proposed mining operations would be transferred from the existing Esparto Plant. The project would employ approximately 52 workers (28 currently employed at the Woodland Plant and Schwarzgruber site, and 24 currently employed at the Esparto plant and site). For this reason, this workforce would not represent an increase in the overall number of employees associated with aggregate mining and processing in the project area. In addition, the project site is located adjacent to the existing Woodland Plant facility, and other approved mining sites are located within close proximity to the site. Thus, the project would not be located within an undeveloped area. Furthermore, given that the project site is currently used for agricultural production and does not contain any existing habitable structures, the project would not displace existing people or housing. Therefore, the Initial Study concluded that the proposed project would not induce substantial unplanned population growth in the project area, either directly or indirectly, and would not displace substantial numbers of existing housing or people such that replacement housing would be required elsewhere in the County. A *less-than-significant* impact would occur.

- *Public Services (c):* The proposed project would not include the construction of new homes and, thus, would not introduce new residents to the project area. Therefore, the proposed project would have a *less-than-significant* impact related to the need for new or physically altered schools, the construction of which could cause significant environmental impacts.

- *Recreation (a):* The proposed project would not include residential development and would not induce population growth within the project area. Therefore, the project would not result in substantial physical deterioration of any existing neighborhood or regional parks or other recreational facilities. Consequently, the Initial Study concluded that a *less-than-significant* impact would occur.

- *Utilities and Service Systems (c, d, e):* As noted above, portable toilet facilities would be provided at the project site and existing portable toilet facilities would continue to be used at the adjacent Woodland Plant. Therefore, the project would not require connection to public wastewater conveyance and treatment infrastructure. In addition, the proposed mining and reclamation activities would not generate a substantial quantity of solid waste. Any minor increases in solid waste generation occurring as a result of the proposed project would be offset by equivalent reductions in solid waste generation due to planned closure of the nearby Schwarzgruber mining site. Therefore, the Initial Study concluded that a *less-than-significant* impact related to wastewater and solid waste would occur as a result of the proposed project.

- *Wildfire (All Sections):* According to the California Department of Forestry and Fire Protection (CAL FIRE) Fire and Resource Assessment Program, the project site is not located within or near a Very High or High FHSZ. Only the northernmost portion of the site adjacent to Cache Creek is mapped as a Moderate FHSZ, while the remainder of the site is not located within a FHSZ. Furthermore, the project would not include the development of housing or habitable structures within the project site. Thus, the Initial Study concluded that the proposed project would not be expected to be subject to or result in substantial adverse effects related to wildfires, and a *less-than-significant* impact would occur.

The Draft EIR provides an analysis of impacts determined to be potentially significant in the areas of: Aesthetics; Agricultural Resources; Air Quality, Greenhouse Gas Emissions, and Energy; Biological Resources; Cultural and Tribal Cultural Resources; Geology and Soils, Mineral Resources, and Paleontological Resources; Hazards and Hazardous Materials; Hydrology and Water Quality; Land Use and Planning; Noise; Public Services, Utilities, and Service Systems; and Transportation and Circulation.

The Draft EIR will be circulated for a minimum of 45 days, during which time reviewers may make comments. The review period for this Draft EIR is identified in the Notice of Availability inserted after the cover page. Following the public review period, the County will respond to comments in writing, describing the disposition of any significant environmental issues raised by the commenter. The Draft EIR will be revised, if needed, and a Final EIR (Response to Comments document) will be released.

The Final EIR will include a Mitigation Monitoring and Reporting Program (MMRP). The intent of the MMRP is to ensure the implementation of adopted mitigation measures. The MMRP will provide for monitoring of construction activities as necessary and in-the-field identification and resolution of environmental concerns. The applicant will be responsible for fully understanding and effectively implementing the mitigation measures contained within the MMRP.

The Yolo County Planning Commission will consider the project and provide a recommendation to the Board of Supervisors regarding certification of the EIR and action on the project. The Board of Supervisors will take final action on the project.

1.5 SCOPE OF THE EIR

This EIR constitutes a project-level analysis, and pursuant to CEQA Guidelines Section 15161, covers “all phases of the project including planning, construction, and operation.” State CEQA Guidelines Section 15126.2(a) states, in pertinent part:

> An EIR shall identify and focus on the significant environmental effects of the proposed project. In assessing the impact of a proposed project on the environment, the lead agency should normally limit its examination to changes in the existing physical conditions in the affected area as they exist at the time the NOP is published, or where no NOP is published, at the time environmental analysis is commenced.

Pursuant to these guidelines, the scope of this EIR addresses specific issues and concerns identified as potentially significant in the NOP prepared for the proposed project (see Appendix A). The County determined that the following issues will be addressed in the EIR:

- Aesthetics;
- Agricultural Resources;
- Air Quality, Greenhouse Gas Emissions, and Energy;
- Biological Resources:
- Cultural and Tribal Cultural Resources;
- Geology and Soils, Mineral Resources, and Paleontological Resources;
- Hazards and Hazardous Materials;
- Hydrology and Water Quality;
- Land Use and Planning;
- Noise;
- Public Services, Utilities, and Service Systems; and
- Transportation and Circulation.

The evaluation of effects is presented on a resource-by-resource basis in Chapters 4.1 through 4.12 of the EIR. Each of these chapters is divided into four sections: Introduction, Existing Environmental Setting, Regulatory Context, and Impacts and Mitigation Measures.

Impacts that are determined to be significant, and for which feasible mitigation measures are not available to reduce those impacts to a less-than-significant level, are identified as significant and unavoidable. Chapter 5 of the EIR presents a discussion of growth-inducing impacts, summary of cumulative impacts, and significant irreversible environmental changes associated with the project. Alternatives to the proposed project are also discussed in Chapter 6 of the EIR.

1.6 COMMENTS RECEIVED ON THE NOP

Yolo County received 53 timely comment letters, plus verbal comments presented at September 12, 2019 Planning Commission scoping meeting. Another six letters were received after the close of the comment period. Copies of all of these letters are provided in Appendix B and a list of the commenters is provided below:

1. Rigo Torres – 8.18.19
2. Matthew Pirtle – 8.18.19
3. Lisa Nicholas – 8.18.19
4. Pacific Gas and Electric Company – 8.19.19
5. Elise Brandwajn – 8.19.19
6. Gregory Ramirez – 8.19.19
7. Jon Huffine – 8.21.19
8. California Department of Conservation – Division of Oil, Gas, and Geothermal Resources – 8.22.19

9. California Department of Conservation – Division of Land Resource Protection – 8.26.19
10. Julie Frommelt Payne – 8.26.19
11. Aaron Johnson – 8.27.19
12. Pamela Van Brocklin – 8.29.19
13. Rudy Lopez – 8.29.19
14. Joyce and Ranse Reynolds – 8.29.19
15. Eric Dowdy – 8.29.19
16. Mark and Katherine Stinson – 8.30.19
17. Yolo-Solano Air Quality Management District – 9.3.19
18. Yolo County Environmental Health Division – 9.4.19
19. Tim and Barbara Sharp – 9.4.19
20. Annette Davis – 9.4.19
21. Dale Sumersille and Dawne Koranda – 9.4.19
22. Northwest Information Center – 9.5.19
23. California Department of Fish and Wildlife – 9.6.19
24. Heidi Frommelt Potter – 9.6.19
25. Bea Leonardi – 9.6.19
26. Cathy Stamey – 9.6.19
27. Julie Payne – 9.8.19
28. Native American Heritage Commission – 9.10.19
29. Margaret Kronenberg – 9.10.19
30. Ruth Schreiber (verbal comment) – 9.10.19
31. Monique Marin – 9.11.19
32. NOP Public Scoping Meeting – 9.12.19
33. Dayle Murray – 9.12.19
34. Joyce and Ranse Reynolds – 9.13.19
35. Diane Tauzer – 9.13.19
36. Jerry and Stacy Beckwith – 9.14.19
37. Lynn Shaw Reynolds – 9.14.19
38. Thomas Wilkop – 9.15.19
39. Keila Golden – 9.15.19
40. Sergio Hernandez – 9.15.19
41. Amanda Jarose – 9.15.19
42. Georgia Cochran – 9.16.19
43. Daren Robbins – 9.16.19
44. Barbara Koerber – 9.16.19
45. George Lu – 9.16.19
46. Ryan Payne – 9.16.19
47. Janet Levers – 9.16.19
48. Phil and Mary Beck – 9.16.19
49. Joyce Reynolds – 9.16.19
50. Alan Koerber – 9.16.19
51. Lori Sinor – 9.16.19
52. Cynthia Johe – 9.16.19
53. Paul Sinor – 9.16.19
54. Ryan Hall – 9.16.19

Letters Received After Close of the Comment Period

55. Monique Marin – 9.16.19
56. Rick and Janet Sitts – 9.16.19
57. Ruth Schreiber – 9.17.19
58. Laura Smyth – Wild Wings HOA, Community Association Manager – 9.18.19
59. Paul Crist – 9.19.19
60. California State Clearinghouse – 8.16.19

The following list, categorized by issue, summarizes the concerns brought forth in the comment letters and where the comments are addressed within this EIR:

Aesthetics (see Chapter 4.1)	Concerns related to: • Aesthetic impacts due to the loss of agricultural land and open space. • Visual impacts of the project site from the Monument Hill Memorial Park cemetery. • Views of mining equipment and fencing.
Agricultural Resources (see Chapter 4.2)	Concerns related to: • The conversion of prime farmland to non-agricultural uses. • Reclamation of the site back to farmland. • Conflict with agricultural zoning or the Williamson Act. • The percentage of agricultural land relative to total mining acreage of the site. • The Williamson Act Contract and State Reclamation regulations. • Health of topsoil post-reclamation. • Agricultural conservation easements regarding the removal of prime farmland. • Incremental impacts leading to cumulative impacts on agricultural land.
Air Quality, Greenhouse Gas Emissions, and Energy (see Chapter 4.3)	Concerns related to: • Increase in criteria pollutants and greenhouse gas (GHG) emissions. • Dust associated with mining operations. • Impacts on air quality from the use of heavy-duty mining equipment. • Impacts to animal health from air emissions. • Use of renewable energy at project site. • Use of electric vehicles to replace heavy-duty equipment. • Movement of mined material on railways rather than on-road hauling. • Compliance with the Environmental Protection Agency's (EPA) Tier 4 emission standards. • Compliance with the 2016 California Green Building Standards Code. • Provision of electric vehicle parking infrastructure. • Provision of electrical power to any long-haul heavy-duty trucks parked on-site. • Planting of vegetation at border of project site to potentially screen diesel particulate matter. • Use of carbon credits to offset potential GHG emissions. • Odor impacts from construction and operations of the proposed project. • Potential impacts on nearby sensitive receptors, including the school operated by the West Valley Baptist Church, and sensitive receptors along truck routes. • Construction of Class I Bicycle infrastructure to the project site.

Biological Resources (see Chapter 4.4)	Concerns related to: • The presence of listed rare, threatened, endangered, locally unique, and special-status species. • Potential impacts to wildlife habitat on the project site. • Potential impacts to rivers, streams, lakes, or other waterways in the area. • Potential impacts to migratory birds and birds of prey that may be present in the project area. • Impacts to wildlife movement corridors and migratory species. • Negative impacts to Cache Creek Nature Conservancy.
Cultural and Tribal Cultural Resources (see Chapter 4.5)	Concerns related to: • Potential impacts to tribal cultural resources. • Potential impacts to unknown archaeological resources. • Potential impacts to historical resources, specifically the Moore Canal.
Geology and Soils, Mineral Resources, and Paleontological Resources (see Chapter 4.6)	Concerns related to: • The depletion of minerals and natural resources. • Risk of soil erosion during mining operations. • Potential impacts to the relocation of the Moore Canal. • The erosion of Cache Creek from gravel mining and bank disturbances. • Potential impacts from the removal of topsoil and soil compaction.
Hazards and Hazardous Materials (see Chapter 4.7)	Concerns related to: • Potential impacts regarding the abandonment of existing well systems. • Increased mosquito population from the reclaimed lake. • Potential impacts from vector-borne diseases. • Potential impacts from the disposal of asphalt remnants. • Potential impacts from soil contamination. • Potential impacts from the handling of hazardous materials, hazardous waste generation, aboveground storage tanks, and waste tires. • Potential impacts related to emergency access and evacuation.
Hydrology and Water Quality (see Chapter 4.8)	Concerns related to: • Existing issues with water supply and quality. • Current concentrations of boron and arsenic in the water. • Water quality impacts regarding the removal of the natural filtering system of topsoil, natural rocks, and minerals. • Potential impacts to the groundwater table. • Potential impacts to water supply. • Depth to the groundwater table following reclamation of the site. • Potential impacts from the connectivity of the reclaimed lake and the active creek channel. • Sand and other debris which could enter water wells during mining operations. • Potential impacts to water supply in the event of a drought. • Potential impacts to water flows from the Moore Canal relocation. • Potential impacts regarding the rising water levels of Cache Creek.
Land Use and Planning (see Chapter 4.9)	Concerns related to: • Potential impacts to nearby schools, including the school operated by the West Valley Baptist Church. • Impacts to Yolo Fliers Club, which organizes activities for children. • Delay in completion of reclamation as compared to other mining sites. • Potential impacts on local schools and outdoor recreation areas. • Potential impacts to the Monument Hill Memorial Park cemetery.

Noise (see Chapter 4.10)	Concerns related to: • Potential noise impacts to neighboring residences from mining operations and increased traffic. • Noise impacts on the Monument Hill Memorial Park cemetery. • Mining and processing noise impacts during hours outside of the regular hours of operation. • Increased vibrations from on-site mining equipment and gravel trucks traveling on the roadways. • Impacts on farm animals and handlers from increased noise. • Outdoor events that could be impacted by noise pollution. • Noise generation from truck back-up beepers, conveyor belts, and security alarms. • Compliance with hours of operation.
Public Services, Utilities, and Service Systems (see Chapter 4.11)	Concerns related to: • Cumulative impacts related to wastewater, groundwater, and other utility services. • Violence and crime that could increase, particularly by people trespassing and breaking into private property. • The purchase of supplemental electricity from the grid which could be generated from solar, wind, geothermal, or small-scale hydroelectric generation sources. • Potential impacts to existing gas and electric facilities.
Transportation and Circulation (see Chapter 4.12)	Concerns related to: • Cumulative transportation and circulation impacts. • Potential impacts to County Roads 20, 21, 95B, 96, 97, and 98, State Route 16, and Kentucky Avenue. • Increased vehicle volumes leading to wear and tear on local roadways. • Increased hazards on roadways resulting from traffic congestion. • Trucks entering and exiting the project site from County Road 94B. • Damage to vehicles traveling on State Route 16 from large gravel trucks and increased debris on the roadways. • Potential impacts to State Route 16 and surrounding access to roads and highways. • Lack of traffic signal at the intersection of State Route 16 and County Road 94B. • Lack of access to Interstate 505. • On-site vehicle parking and electric vehicle charging (EVC) stations. • Pedestrian and bicycle infrastructure facilities. • Need for background traffic counts to accurately reflect seasonal variations in traffic volumes. • Compliance with the truck haul road regulations and standards. • Impacts to narrow roadways that already experience a substantial amount of traffic by farmers, residents, and commuters. • Reduction of the speed limit on County Road 96. • Potential impacts regarding the stability of the County Road 94B bridge.
Alternatives (see Chapter 6)	Concerns related to: • Project alternatives that include a different project site. • Project alternatives that incorporate a Reduced Footprint/Aggregate Tonnage Alternative.

All of these issues are addressed in this EIR, in the relevant chapters identified in the first column.

1.7 ORGANIZATION OF THE EIR

The EIR for the proposed project is organized into the following chapters:

Chapter 1 – Introduction

Provides an introduction and overview describing the intended use of the EIR and the review and certification process, as well as summaries of the chapters included in the EIR and summaries of the issues and concerns identified by the public and public agencies during the NOP review period.

Chapter 2 – Executive Summary

Summarizes the elements of the project and the environmental impacts that would result from implementation of the proposed project, summarizes significant and unavoidable impacts, describes proposed mitigation measures, and indicates the level of significance of impacts after mitigation. Summarizes the results of the analysis of alternatives.

Chapter 3 – Project Description

Provides a detailed description of the proposed project, including project location, background information, major objectives, technical characteristics, and discretionary approvals required for the project to proceed.

Chapter 4 – Existing Environmental Setting, Impacts, and Mitigation

Contains a project-level analysis of environmental issue areas associated with the proposed project. Each environmental issue chapter contains an introduction and description of the project setting, identifies impacts, and recommends appropriate mitigation measures, if needed.

Chapter 5 – Cumulative Impacts and Other Required Sections

Provides other analysis required by CEQA including cumulative impacts, potential growth-inducing impacts, and significant irreversible changes to the environment.

Chapter 6 – Alternatives Analysis

Describes the alternatives to the proposed project, their respective environmental effects, and a determination of the environmentally superior alternative.

Chapter 7 – EIR Authors and Persons Consulted

Lists EIR and technical report authors who provided technical assistance in the preparation and review of the Draft EIR.

Chapter 8 – References

Provides bibliographic information for all references and resources cited.

Appendices

Includes NOP, comments received during the NOP comment period, Initial Study and all technical reports prepared for the proposed project.