



**YOLO COUNTY
COMMUNITY SERVICES DEPARTMENT**

**Errata
and
Mitigation and Monitoring Program**

**For the
Final Initial Study/Mitigated Negative Declaration**

File #PW 2021-4589

**County Road 98 Bike and Safety
Improvement Project, Phase II**

**County Work Order 4589
Federal Project Number STPL-5922(102)
October 2021**

Table of Contents

1. Project Description.....	1
2. Errata and Changes to the Draft IS/MND.....	27
2.1 Changes to the First Draft IS/MND	27
2.2 Changes to the Second Draft IS/MND.....	31
3. Mitigation and Monitoring Reporting Program.....	32
3.1 Mitigation Monitoring and Reporting Requirements.....	32
3.2 Mitigation Monitoring and Reporting Procedures	32

Tables

Table 1 List of Comment Letters	3
Table 2 Mitigation Monitoring and Reporting Program.....	33

1. Project Description

Project Location

The Project is located within unincorporated Yolo County, California on County Road (CR) 98 from approximately 1300 feet south of CR 29 to the Solano County Line (Figures 1 and 2). The Project is located within the US Geological Survey (USGS) “Merritt” Quadrangle, Sections 1, 12, 13 and 24, Township 08N, Range 01E, Sections 6, 7, 18, and 19, Township 08N, Range 02E, Section 31, Township 09N, Range 02E, and Section 36, Township 09N, Range 01E.

History

The first phase of the CR 98 Bike and Safety Improvement Project was completed in 2014 and consisted of widening and improving shoulders between the City of Woodland boundary and the CR 98 and CR 29 intersection in an effort to provide safer access and improved visibility for vehicles and bicyclists. Three years following the completion of Phase I of the project, the improved roadway saw a 70% reduction in non-intersection accidents. The second proposed phase of this project will continue southward toward the Yolo County line. Phase II will implement shoulder widening as well as intersection improvements in an effort to reduce intersection-related accidents and injuries.

Project Purpose and Need

The purpose of the Project is to improve safety along the County Road (CR) 98 corridor for automobiles, farm equipment, farm-to-market trucking, aggregate product suppliers, commuters, residents, and bicyclists. The Project is the second phase of the overall CR 98 Bike and Safety Improvement Project, and will rehabilitate the entire width of the cross roads as part of the intersection improvements from CR 98 to an approximate length of 1,000 feet on either direction, except on the eastern segments of CR 31 and CR 32, which will extend to the City of Davis limits.

Project Description

Yolo County (County) is proposing to construct Phase II of the CR 98 Bike and Safety Improvement Project, which will extend improvements from the first phase of the CR 98 project completed in 2014, which included adding paved shoulders, clear recovery zones, and improved major intersections between the City of Woodland and CR 29/CR98 intersection. The extent of Phase II will be 4.1 miles, starting from approximately 1300± feet south of the CR 98/CR 29 intersection to the Solano County Line serving the needs of many diverse users, including farmers, aggregate suppliers, and other inter-region truckers, rural residents, commuters, and bicyclists.

Construction of the proposed Project will result in the addition of eight-foot paved shoulders as shared bike lanes, and an additional twelve-foot clear recovery zone along the entire length of both sides of the existing two-lane arterial road. The Project also proposes to construct a Class 1 shared path to close the gap between the existing Class 1 bike paths on Russell Blvd and the Class 2 bike lanes on Hutchison Drive on the University of California, Davis campus. The Project will reconstruct and improve the road structure throughout the extent of the Project. Roundabouts will be constructed at the intersections with CR 31, CR 32, and Hutchison Drive, calming entering speeds at the intersections and improving safety for all users. Implementation of the Project will require the relocation of drainage ditches and above-ground utilities outside the clear recovery zone,

which will include extension, replacement, and/or relocation of existing drainage structures to accommodate the widened road. This will also include relocation and/or abandonment of underground utilities, where they are in conflict with the Project. The Project may include the installation of high-speed internet as well as relocation of AT&T, PG&E (electric & gas), Wave, UC Davis facilities, and Slawson gas facilities.

All construction staging will occur within County right of way (ROW). Acquisition of ROW and Temporary Construction Easements (TCE) will necessitate coordination with affected property owners, restoration of temporarily impacted infrastructure, and compensation to landowners and easement holders to replace losses. Acquisition of property under a farmland conservation easement will necessitate coordination with the property owners as well as Yolo Land Trust.

The drainage slough/ditch on the east side of CR 98 north of CR 32 will be reconstructed and relocated to the east. Native trees will be planted along the corridor, and off-site to replace trees that will be removed by the Project.

Site Restoration

The construction documents will identify the locations of sensitive natural communities, roadside trees, shrubs, and other plants that are not to be removed or damaged, and all other improvements or facilities within or adjacent to the roadway. Suitable safeguards would be installed to protect existing features from injury or damage. Environmentally Sensitive Area (ESA) fencing will be used to delimit work areas in the vicinity of protected resources. Areas temporarily disturbed by construction will be restored and revegetated with native plant species. If an object or facility is damaged as a result of construction activities, the contractor or other Project-related responsible party will provide restoration that meets the equal or above quality conditions of the damaged property before the onset of work or degrading incident.

Public Review Period

First Public Review Period:	June 4, 2021 – July 6, 2021
Second Public Review Period for Recirculated Document:	August 23, 2021 – September 22, 2021

Comments and Responses

This section contains copies of the comment letters received during the public review period. The comments are divided into two comment periods (1st and 2nd document circulations). In conformance with Section 15088(a) of the State CEQA Guidelines, the County has considered comments on environmental issues from reviewers of the Draft IS/MND and has prepared written responses. Nine letters were received, commenting on the Draft IS/MND. The comments received do not raise substantial environmental issues as to the adequacy of the Draft IS/MND.

The letters received and the responses to the comments contained in the letters are provided in this section.

List of Comment Letters

A list of public agencies, organizations and individuals that provided comments on the Draft IS/MND is presented below. The letters and the responses to comments follow.

Table 1 List of Comment Letters

Letter Number	Draft CEQA Document Version	Sender	Date Received
1	1 st Circulation	Yolo Land Trust (Michele Clark)	August 9, 2021
2	1 st Circulation	California Department of Conservation (Monique Wilber)	June 24, 2021
3	1 st Circulation	Elisabeth Borgen –	June 11, 2021
4	1 st Circulation	Taormino and Associates (J David Taormino)	July 6, 2021
5	2 nd Circulation	Central Valley Regional Water Quality Control Board (Peter Minkel)	September 21, 2021
6	2 nd Circulation	Chad Roberts	August 25, 2021
7	2 nd Circulation	Pacific Gas & Electric (Justin Newell)	September 29, 2021
8	2 nd Circulation	Yolo-Solano Air Quality Management District (Paul Hensleigh)	August 26, 2021
9	2 nd Circulation	Peter Droubay	August 25, 2021

Letter 1 - Yolo Land Trust (Michele Clark) Received August 9, 2021



August 9, 2021

Via email: Stephanie.Cormier@yolocounty.org

Stephanie Cormier, Principal Planner
Yolo County Department of Community Services
292 West Beamer Street
Woodland, CA 95695

RE: Mitigated Negative Declaration for the County Road 98 Bike and Safety Improvement Project, Phase II, June 2021

Dear Ms. Cormier:

The Yolo Land Trust reviewed the Initial Study/Mitigated Negative Declaration for the County Road 98 Bike and Safety Improvement Project, Phase II (the "CR98 Project"), including Appendix B – Farmland Study Report, June 2021.

The Yolo Land Trust holds five agricultural conservation easements on farm properties that will be impacted by the CR98 Project. Each of these agricultural conservation easements is also co-held by the City of Davis.

Four of the agricultural conservation easement projects were funded by a combination of funds provided by the US Department of Agricultural Natural Resources Conservation Service, the California Department of Conservation, and the City of Davis. Attached to this letter as Attachment 1 is a list of the farm properties and the respective funders.

The agricultural conservation easement on the fifth farm property served as farmland mitigation for the benefit of the City of Davis and Yolo County in connection with the Bretton Woods development project. It is also referenced on Attachment 1.

Table 4 of Appendix B on page 3 identifies the impacts of CR98 Project on the surrounding properties. Table 4 states that two of our easement-encumbered farms are impacted by the CR98 Project, but the CR98 Project does not impact our easement acres. We disagree with this conclusion. We believe there will be an impact from the CR98 Project on our easement acres on APN 040-200-015.

With respect to APN 036-450-002, our intent at the time of recording the agricultural conservation easement was to exclude land within CR98 Project. The easement area was determined based on plans provided by Public Works. If those plans have not changed, the easement area on APN 036-450-002 will not be impacted by CR98.

We need further information to confirm the acres cited in Table 4 are accurate for each of our agricultural conservation easement properties.

221 West Court Street, Suite 5, Woodland, CA 95695
P.O. Box 1196, Woodland, CA 95776
530.662.1110 - www.TheYoloLandTrust.org

Stephanie Cormier, Principal Planner
August 9, 2021
Page 2

The Initial Study/Mitigated Negative Declaration states that CR98 Project will impact 2.93 acres (subject to confirmation) of permanently conserved farmland, but no mitigation is required. This conclusion fails to acknowledge that each recorded conservation easement requires prior notice, compliance with federal and state laws and appropriate compensation.

I first informed Yolo County Public Works in January 2016 that agricultural conservation easements Yolo Land Trust holds will be impacted by the CR98 Project. I similarly kept each funder listed below informed on the status of the CR98 Project as I received new information about the project.

Each funder will need to be part of the County's process and must approve the compensation or mitigation before the Yolo Land Trust and the City of Davis can agree to an amendment of the agricultural conservation easement to accommodate the CR98 Project or a subordination of the agricultural conservation easement for the acres within the CR98 Project.

Contact information for each of the funders is listed below.

I look forward to continuing to work with you and County staff.

Sincerely,



Michele Clark
Executive Director

Attachment

cc: Tracie Reynolds, City of Davis – treynolds@cityofdavis.org
Dean Kwasny, USDA - dean.kwasny@usda.gov
Elizabeth Palmer, USDA - elizabeth.palmer@usda.gov
Virginia Jameson, CA Dept of Conservation – Virginia.Jameson@conservation.ca.gov
Jessica Rader, CA Dept of Conservation – Jessica.Rader@conservation.ca.gov
Matthew Dunnahoe, CA Dept of Conservation - Matthew.Dunnahoe@conservation.ca.gov
Liz Heckles, Yolo Land Trust – lheckles@theyololandtrust.org

ATTACHMENT 1

**Yolo Land Trust Easements
County Road 98 - CR29 to CR31**

YLT No.	Easement Name	APN	Acres	Funders	Acres Impacted per EIR
47	Staib North	041-120-052	150.29	CA Dept of Conservation, USDA NRCS, City of Davis	0.59
48	Staib South	041-120-053	150.29	CA Dept of Conservation, USDA NRCS, City of Davis	0.36
54A	Eoff Farm	040-200-030	392	USDA NRCS, City of Davis	040-200-31 = 0.42
		040-200-032			1.57
56	Staib West	040-200-015	73.3	USDA NRCS, City of Davis	Says no impact.
66	Schuler Wantz	036-450-002 portion	134.7	Farmland mitigation for City of Davis and Yolo County	Says no impact.

Letter 1 – Response to Comment

The commenter provides an overview of the status of several agricultural conservation easements on farm properties that are partially within the project site. The letter identifies two issues with the content of the Draft IS/MND. Page 3 of Appendix B contains Table 4 which describes potential impacts to parcels that contain agricultural easements is identified as having incorrect information. The commenter asserts that there will be an impact from the CR98 Project on Yolo Land Trust easement on Assessor Parcel Number (APN) 040-200-015. The commenter also identifies potential impacts to APN 036-450-002 as a point of concern. The information contained within Appendix B (Farmland Study Memo) was a preliminary evaluation of the potential impacts to farmlands and associated agricultural easements. Final acreage and location impacts to farmlands and lands with agricultural easements are being addressed through coordination with land owners and easement holders during the right-of-way phase of the proposed project. Minor modifications to the acreages and impacts area expected to occur during this phase. The County is committed to working with the Yolo Land Trust to address modifications to the agricultural easement issues with the properties in question during the right -of-way process.

The commenter identifies as second issue of potential impacts to 2.93 acres of conserved land and cites the lack of mitigation required and the lack of acknowledgement that each recorded conservation easement requires prior notice, compliance with federal and state laws and appropriate compensation. The Draft IS/MND identified a significance threshold for potential impacts to farmlands which relies, in part, on the Yolo County Agricultural Conservation and Mitigation Program (Yolo County Code of Ordinances §8-2.404) that allows for facilities and infrastructure that do not generate revenue, such as this project, to be exempt from farmland conversion mitigation requirements [Yolo County Code Section 8-2.404(c)(2)(ii)]. For the purpose of establishing thresholds of significance criteria related to the protection of farmland, the County considers minimum parcel size requirements, maintaining viable farming operations, and compatibility factors, among other things. These thresholds of significance are reviewed through a three-step evaluation process: 1) does the Project remove more than 20 acres of farmland, 2) does the Project reduce the irrigated farmland of any given parcel to less than 40 acres, or 3) are there aspects of the project that are incompatible with agriculture on the affected parcel(s) or neighboring farmland?

None of the significance criteria established by the County for the purposes of satisfying CEQA were exceeded and the proposed Project will maintain consistency with the Yolo County Agricultural Conversion and Mitigation Program and compliance with federal and State laws.

The commenter goes on to review past communication efforts, and the need for coordination between Yolo County, Yolo Land Trust, the City of Davis and landowners as required by local, State and federal laws, none of which identify issues with the content of the CEQA document. As a result of this comment letter, acreages of anticipated impacts to agricultural land and land with agricultural easements were updated in the recirculated Draft MND (see Section 2.1 of this document) and the Final IS/MND. No other changes will be made to the Final IS/MND as a result of this comment.

Letter 2 – California Department of Conservation (Monique Wilber) Received June 24,2021



Gavin Newsom, Governor
David Shabazian, Director

JUNE 24, 2021

VIA EMAIL: STEPHANIE.CORMIER@YOLOCOUNTY.ORG

Stephanie Cormier, Principal Planner
Yolo County Department of Community Services
292 West Beamer Street
Woodland, CA 95695

Dear Ms. Cormier:

MITIGATED NEGATIVE DECLARATION FOR THE COUNTY ROAD 98 BIKE AND SAFETY
IMPROVEMENT PROJECT, PHASE II, SCH#2021060090

The Department of Conservation's (Department) Division of Land Resource Protection (Division) has reviewed the Initial Study/Mitigated Negative Declaration for the County Road 98 Bike and Safety Improvement Project, Phase II (Project). The Division monitors farmland conversion on a statewide basis, provides technical assistance regarding the Williamson Act, and administers various agricultural land conservation programs. We offer the following comments and recommendations with respect to the project's potential impacts on agricultural land and resources.

Project Description

The purpose of the project is to improve safety along the County Road (CR) 98 corridor for automobiles, farm equipment, farm-to-market trucking, aggregate product suppliers, commuters, residents, and bicyclists. The Project is the second phase of the overall CR 98 Bike and Safety Improvement Project, and will rehabilitate the entire width of the cross roads as part of the intersection improvements from CR 98 to an approximate length of 1,000 feet on either direction, except on the eastern segments of CR 31 and CR 32, which will extend to the City of Davis limits.

The first phase of the CR 98 Bike and Safety Improvement Project was completed in 2014 and consisted of widening and improving shoulders between the City of Woodland boundary and the CR 98 and CR 29 intersection in an effort to provide safer access and improved visibility for vehicles and bicyclists. The second proposed phase of this project will continue southward toward the Yolo County line. Phase II will implement shoulder widening as well as intersection improvements in an effort to reduce intersection-related accidents and injuries.

State of California Natural Resources Agency | Department of Conservation
801 K Street, MS 14-15, Sacramento, CA 95814
conservation.ca.gov | T: (916) 324-0850 | F: (916) 327-3430

The project site currently contains Prime Farmland as designated by the Department of Conservation's Farmland Mapping and Monitoring Program.¹ The site also contains lands encumbered by Williamson Act contracts and/or Agricultural Easements.

Department Comments

Although conversion of agricultural land is often an unavoidable impact under CEQA analysis, feasible alternatives and/or feasible mitigation measures must be considered. In some cases, the argument is made that mitigation cannot reduce impacts to below the level of significance because agricultural land will still be converted by the project, and therefore, mitigation is not required. However, reduction to a level below significance is not a criterion for mitigation under CEQA. Rather, the criterion is feasible mitigation that lessens a project's impacts. As stated in CEQA statute, mitigation may also include, "Compensating for the impact by replacing or providing substitute resources or environments, including through permanent protection of such resources in the form of conservation easements."²

The conversion of agricultural land represents a permanent reduction in the State's agricultural land resources. As such, the Department advises the use of permanent agricultural conservation easements on land of at least equal quality and size as partial compensation for the loss of agricultural land. Conservation easements are an available mitigation tool and considered a standard practice in many areas of the State. The Department highlights conservation easements because of their acceptance and use by lead agencies as an appropriate mitigation measure under CEQA and because it follows an established rationale similar to that of wildlife habitat mitigation.

Mitigation via agricultural conservation easements can be implemented by at least two alternative approaches: the outright purchase of easements or the donation of mitigation fees to a local, regional, or statewide organization or agency whose purpose includes the acquisition and stewardship of agricultural conservation easements. The conversion of agricultural land should be deemed an impact of at least regional significance. Hence, the search for replacement lands should not be limited strictly to lands within the project's surrounding area.

Of course, the use of conservation easements is only one form of mitigation that should be considered. Any other feasible mitigation measures should also be considered.

¹ California Department of Conservation, Division of Land Resource Protection, Farmland Mapping and Monitoring Program, <https://maps.conservation.ca.gov/DLRP/CIFF/>

² Public Resources Code Section 15370, Association of Environmental Professionals, 2020 CEQA, California Environmental Quality Act, Statute & Guidelines, page 284, https://www.califaep.org/docs/2020_ceqa_book.pdf

Conclusion

Prior to approval of the proposed project the Department recommends further discussion and consideration of the following issues:

- Proposed mitigation measures for all impacted agricultural lands within the proposed project area.
- Projects compatibility with, and/or, potential contract resolutions for lands within agricultural preserves and/or enrolled in a Williamson Act contract.
- Potential impacts, notification requirements, and proposed mitigation for lands held under agricultural easements, specifically APN#s 041-120-52 & 041-120-53.
- Notification of potential impacts to agricultural easements should be provided to the easement holders and funders early in the process.

Thank you for giving us the opportunity to comment on the Initial Study/Mitigated Negative Declaration for the County Road 98 Bike and Safety Improvement Project, Phase II. Please provide this Department with notices of any future hearing dates as well as any staff reports pertaining to this project. If you have any questions regarding our comments, please contact Farl Grundy, Associate Environmental Planner via email at Farl.Grundy@conservation.ca.gov.

Sincerely,

Monique Wilber

Monique Wilber
Conservation Program Support Supervisor

Letter 2 – Response to Comment

This commenter provides an overview of the of the Department of Conservation’s role in monitoring farmland conversion in California and a brief review of the overall CR98 Bike and Safety Improvement Project. The letter identifies the project site as containing Prime Farmland and lands encumbered by Williamson Act and/or Agricultural Easements.

The commenter identifies the need to reduce impacts to agricultural lands to a less than significant level and provides a range of methods to meet this need including feasible alternatives and feasible mitigation measures. Recommended mitigation measures identified included “compensating for the impact by replacing or providing substitute resource or environments, including through permanent protection of such resources in the form of conservation easements”. The commenter goes on to advise the use of permanent agricultural conservation easements on land of at least equal quality and size as partial compensation for the loss of agricultural land. Summarizing the content of the letter, the commenter provides a request that prior to approval of the proposed project the [Department of Conservation] recommends further discussion and consideration of the following issues:

- Proposed mitigation measures for all impacted agricultural lands within the proposed project area.
- Projects compatibility with, and/or, potential contract resolutions for lands within agricultural preserves and/or enrolled in a Williamson Act contract.
- Potential impacts, notification requirements, and proposed mitigation for lands held under agricultural easements, specifically APN#s 041-120-52 & 041-120-53.
- Notification of potential impacts to agricultural easements should be provided to the easement holders and funders early in the process.
- The Draft IS/MND identified a significance threshold for potential impacts to farmlands which relies, in part, on the Yolo County Agricultural Conservation and Mitigation Program (Yolo County Code of Ordinances §8-2.404) that allows for facilities and infrastructure that do not generate revenue, such as this project, to be exempt from farmland conversion mitigation requirements [Yolo County Code Section 8-2.404(c)(2)(ii)]. For the purpose of establishing thresholds of significance criteria related to the protection of farmland, the County considers minimum parcel size requirements, maintaining viable farming operations, and compatibility factors, among other things. These thresholds of significance are reviewed through a three-step evaluation process: 1) does the Project remove more than 20 acres of farmland, 2) does the Project reduce the irrigated farmland of any given parcel to less than 40 acres, or 3) are there aspects of the project that are incompatible with agriculture on the affected parcel(s) or neighboring farmland?

None of the CEQA significance criteria established by the County for the purposes of satisfying CEQA were exceeded and the proposed Project will maintain consistency with the Yolo County Agricultural Conversion and Mitigation Program and compliance with federal and State laws. As a result of this comment letter, additional clarification was added to the Project Description on Page 7 of the Draft IS/MND to better describe the existing requirement to coordinate right of way and temporary construction easements with affected property owners and, when necessary for acquisition of property under a farmland conservation easement, coordinate with the Yolo Land Trust (see item 2.1 Changes to the First Draft IS/MND).

Letter 3 – Elisabeth Bogen Received June 11, 2021

June 11, 2021

Stephanie Cormier,
I strongly oppose the
round-about planned for cactus
corner at Russell Blvd and
Road 98.

Elisabeth Bogen
(756-5703)



Elisabeth Bogen
3428 Breton Ave.
Davis CA 95616-2708
MarineMammalCenter.org

Letter 3 – Response to Comment

This comment identifies the commenters opposition to the round-about planned for the Cactus Corner intersection at Russel Boulevard and County Road 98. This comment does not identify an issue with the Draft IS/MND or the analysis of potential impacts contained within, but rather identifies an opposition to a component of the design of the proposed improvements without an explanation of the reasons. There were no specific comments on the content, analysis or findings of the Draft IS/MND, therefore no changes to the Draft IS/MND will be made as a result of this letter.

TAORMINO AND ASSOCIATES, INC.

July 6, 2021

Stephanie Cormier
Yolo County Department of Community Services
292 W. Beamer Street
Woodland, CA 95695

Dear Ms. Cormier,

Yolo County's Mitigated Negative Declaration does not adequately describe nor address the following:

1. Drainage and excess water flows (runoff) from Ag Land to the west of Road 98 and specifically:
 - A. Impacts of increased height of the Road 98 roadway: the potential "dam" impact on properties to the west.
 - B. Impacts of installation of new, larger, or additional culverts at the intersection of Road 98 and Covell Blvd.
 - C. Capacity and flowages changes to the roadside ditches west and east of the Road 98 along Covell Blvd.
2. The amount and timing of excess water flows from the Ag land to the west of Road 98 based on updated data and information regarding rainfall and runoff generated by Yolo County's consultant:

Norman Braithwaite
Braithwaite@flood.pro
Pacific Hydrologic Inc
County of Yolo – Third Party Technical Consultant for hydraulic and Hydrology
1062 Market Street
Redding, CA 96001
(530) 245-0864

Respectfully Submitted,



J David Taormino

260 Russell Blvd. Suite C
Davis, CA 95616
(530) 231-5519

Letter 4 – Response to Comment

The commenter asserts that the Draft IS/MND does not adequately describe nor address drainage and excess water flows (run-off) from Ag Land to the west of Road 98 and specifically:

- A. Impacts of increased height of the Road 98 roadway: the potential dam impact on properties to the west.
- B. Impacts of installation of new, larger, or additional culverts at the intersection of Road 98 and Covell Blvd.
- C. Capacity and flowages [sic] changes to the roadside ditches west and east of the Road 98 along Covell Blvd.

The commenter also asserted that the amount and timing of excess water flows from the Ag land to the west of Road 98, based on updated data and information regarding rainfall and runoff generated by Yolo County’s consultant [Pacific Hydrologic Inc.], were not addressed.

While the scope and content of CEQA review does not require specific analysis of hydrological issues pertaining to modifications of intersections, roadways, culverts and ditches to be defined, additional information could have been included to describe the standards of design, engineering, internal review and approval process to ensure that any potential impacts resulting from changes to the local hydrology from the proposed Project would be adequately addressed. The Draft IS/MND was updated (see item 2.1 Changes to the First Draft IS/MND) and recirculated to include reference and discussion on the ongoing technical review performed by Pacific Hydrologic Incorporated as well as reference to the Federal Emergency Management Agency’s (FEMA) “no increase” requirement in relation to inundation, floodplain limits and water surface elevations as a result of the project. Through the standard process of design, peer review and meeting the requirements of FEMA, there will be a less than significant impact regarding to this issue area.

Letter 5 – Central Valley Regional Water Quality Control Board (Peter Minkel) Received September 21, 2021



Central Valley Regional Water Quality Control Board

21 September 2021

Stephanie Cormier
Yolo County Department of Community Services
292 West Beamer Street
Woodland, CA 95695
stephanie.cormier@yolocounty.org

COMMENTS TO REQUEST FOR REVIEW FOR THE MITIGATED NEGATIVE DECLARATION, COUNTY ROAD 98 BIKE AND SAFETY IMPROVEMENT PROJECT, PHASE II, SCH#2021060090, YOLO COUNTY

Pursuant to the State Clearinghouse's 23 August 2021 request, the Central Valley Regional Water Quality Control Board (Central Valley Water Board) has reviewed the *Request for Review for the Mitigated Negative Declaration* for the County Road 98 Bike and Safety Improvement Project, Phase II, located in Yolo County.

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

I. Regulatory Setting

Basin Plan

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

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

KARL E. LONGLEY ScD, P.E., CHAIR | PATRICK PULUPA, ESQ., EXECUTIVE OFFICER

11020 Sun Center Drive #200, Rancho Cordova, CA 95670 | www.waterboards.ca.gov/centralvalley

Administrative Law (OAL) and in some cases, the United States Environmental Protection Agency (USEPA). Basin Plan amendments only become effective after they have been approved by the OAL and in some cases, the USEPA. Every three (3) years, a review of the Basin Plan is completed that assesses the appropriateness of existing standards and evaluates and prioritizes Basin Planning issues. For more information on the *Water Quality Control Plan for the Sacramento and San Joaquin River Basins*, please visit our website:

http://www.waterboards.ca.gov/centralvalley/water_issues/basin_plans/

Antidegradation Considerations

All wastewater discharges must comply with the Antidegradation Policy (State Water Board Resolution 68-16) and the Antidegradation Implementation Policy contained in the Basin Plan. The Antidegradation Implementation Policy is available on page 74 at:

https://www.waterboards.ca.gov/centralvalley/water_issues/basin_plans/sacsjr_2018_05.pdf

In part it states:

Any discharge of waste to high quality waters must apply best practicable treatment or control not only to prevent a condition of pollution or nuisance from occurring, but also to maintain the highest water quality possible consistent with the maximum benefit to the people of the State.

This information must be presented as an analysis of the impacts and potential impacts of the discharge on water quality, as measured by background concentrations and applicable water quality objectives.

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

II. Permitting Requirements

Construction Storm Water General Permit

Dischargers whose project disturb one or more acres of soil or where projects disturb less than one acre but are part of a larger common plan of development that in total disturbs one or more acres, are required to obtain coverage under the General Permit for Storm Water Discharges Associated with Construction and Land Disturbance Activities (Construction General Permit), Construction General Permit Order No. 2009-0009-DWQ. Construction activity subject to this permit includes clearing, grading, grubbing, disturbances to the ground, such as stockpiling, or excavation, but does not include regular maintenance activities performed to restore the original line, grade, or capacity of the facility. The Construction General Permit requires the development and implementation of a Storm Water Pollution Prevention Plan (SWPPP). For more information on the Construction General Permit, visit the State Water Resources Control Board website at:

http://www.waterboards.ca.gov/water_issues/programs/stormwater/constpermits.shtml

Phase I and II Municipal Separate Storm Sewer System (MS4) Permits¹

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

For more information on which Phase I MS4 Permit this project applies to, visit the Central Valley Water Board website at:

http://www.waterboards.ca.gov/centralvalley/water_issues/storm_water/municipal_permits/

For more information on the Phase II MS4 permit and who it applies to, visit the State Water Resources Control Board at:

http://www.waterboards.ca.gov/water_issues/programs/stormwater/phase_ii_municipal.shtml

Industrial Storm Water General Permit

Storm water discharges associated with industrial sites must comply with the regulations contained in the Industrial Storm Water General Permit Order No. 2014-0057-DWQ. For more information on the Industrial Storm Water General Permit, visit the Central Valley Water Board website at:

http://www.waterboards.ca.gov/centralvalley/water_issues/storm_water/industrial_general_permits/index.shtml

Clean Water Act Section 404 Permit

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

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

Section 404 permits, please contact the Regulatory Division of the Sacramento District of USACE at (916) 557-5250.

Clean Water Act Section 401 Permit – Water Quality Certification

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

https://www.waterboards.ca.gov/centralvalley/water_issues/water_quality_certification/

Waste Discharge Requirements – Discharges to Waters of the State

If USACE determines that only non-jurisdictional waters of the State (i.e., “non-federal” waters of the State) are present in the proposed project area, the proposed project may require a Waste Discharge Requirement (WDR) permit to be issued by Central Valley Water Board. Under the California Porter-Cologne Water Quality Control Act, discharges to all waters of the State, including all wetlands and other waters of the State including, but not limited to, isolated wetlands, are subject to State regulation. For more information on the Waste Discharges to Surface Water NPDES Program and WDR processes, visit the Central Valley Water Board website at: https://www.waterboards.ca.gov/centralvalley/water_issues/waste_to_surface_water/

Projects involving excavation or fill activities impacting less than 0.2 acre or 400 linear feet of non-jurisdictional waters of the state and projects involving dredging activities impacting less than 50 cubic yards of non-jurisdictional waters of the state may be eligible for coverage under the State Water Resources Control Board Water Quality Order No. 2004-0004-DWQ (General Order 2004-0004). For more information on the General Order 2004-0004, visit the State Water Resources Control Board website at:

https://www.waterboards.ca.gov/board_decisions/adopted_orders/water_quality/2004/wqo/wqo2004-0004.pdf

Dewatering Permit

If the proposed project includes construction or groundwater dewatering to be discharged to land, the proponent may apply for coverage under State Water Board General Water Quality Order (Low Threat General Order) 2003-0003 or the Central Valley Water Board’s Waiver of Report of Waste Discharge and Waste Discharge Requirements (Low Threat Waiver) R5-2018-0085. Small temporary construction dewatering projects are projects that discharge groundwater to land from excavation activities or dewatering of underground utility vaults. Dischargers seeking coverage

under the General Order or Waiver must file a Notice of Intent with the Central Valley Water Board prior to beginning discharge.

For more information regarding the Low Threat General Order and the application process, visit the Central Valley Water Board website at:
http://www.waterboards.ca.gov/board_decisions/adopted_orders/water_quality/2003/wqo/wqo2003-0003.pdf

For more information regarding the Low Threat Waiver and the application process, visit the Central Valley Water Board website at:
https://www.waterboards.ca.gov/centralvalley/board_decisions/adopted_orders/waivers/r5-2018-0085.pdf

Limited Threat General NPDES Permit

If the proposed project includes construction dewatering and it is necessary to discharge the groundwater to waters of the United States, the proposed project will require coverage under a National Pollutant Discharge Elimination System (NPDES) permit. Dewatering discharges are typically considered a low or limited threat to water quality and may be covered under the General Order for *Limited Threat Discharges to Surface Water* (Limited Threat General Order). A complete Notice of Intent must be submitted to the Central Valley Water Board to obtain coverage under the Limited Threat General Order. For more information regarding the Limited Threat General Order and the application process, visit the Central Valley Water Board website at:
https://www.waterboards.ca.gov/centralvalley/board_decisions/adopted_orders/general_orders/r5-2016-0076-01.pdf

NPDES Permit

If the proposed project discharges waste that could affect the quality of surface waters of the State, other than into a community sewer system, the proposed project will require coverage under a National Pollutant Discharge Elimination System (NPDES) permit. A complete Report of Waste Discharge must be submitted with the Central Valley Water Board to obtain a NPDES Permit. For more information regarding the NPDES Permit and the application process, visit the Central Valley Water Board website at: <https://www.waterboards.ca.gov/centralvalley/help/permit/>

If you have questions regarding these comments, please contact me at (916) 464-4684 or Peter.Minkel2@waterboards.ca.gov.



Peter Minkel
Engineering Geologist

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

Letter 5 – Response to Comment

The commenter provided a review of the rules and regulations of the Central Valley Regional Water Quality Control Board (CVRWQCB). There were no specific comments on the content, analysis or findings of the Draft IS/MND, therefore no changes to the Draft IS/MND will be made as a result of this letter.

Letter 6 – Chad Roberts Received August 25, 2021

From: Stephanie Cormier <Stephanie.Cormier@yolocounty.org>
Sent: Wednesday, August 25, 2021 10:38 AM
To: Kevin Sevier
Cc: Lilia Razo
Subject: FW: Notice of Intent to Adopt a Mitigated Negative Declaration

Comment received by Yolo Audubon.

From: Chad Roberts [mailto:recp@cal.net]
Sent: Wednesday, August 25, 2021 10:15 AM
To: Stephanie Cormier <Stephanie.Cormier@yolocounty.org>; Lilia Razo <Lilia.Razo@yolocounty.org>; Nicholas Burton <Nicholas.Burton@yolocounty.org>
Cc: Humberto Izquierdo <Humberto.Izquierdo@yolocounty.org>; David Guerrero <David.Guerrero@yolocounty.org>; George Galang <George.Galang@yolocounty.org>; Sheryl Hardy-Salgado <Sheryl.Hardy-Salgado@yolocounty.org>; Eric May <Eric.May@yolocounty.org>; Matt Davis <Matt.Davis@yolocounty.org>; 'Charlie Tschudin' <charlie@yolohabitatconservancy.org>; psandholdt@cityofdavis.org; wpl30@wpfd.net; sbravo@wpfd.net; 'PGE Plan Review' <PGEPlanReview@pge.com>; jreed@ycfcwd.org; 'Ashley Feeney' <AFeeney@cityofdavis.org>; smetzker@cityofdavis.org; 'Dianna Jensen' <DJensen@cityofdavis.org>; 'Omar Carrillo' <OCarrillo@yochadehe-nsn.gov>; 'Gayle Totton' <GTotton@yochadehe-nsn.gov>; mluken@yctd.org; 'Paul Hensleigh' <PHensleigh@ysaqmd.org>; 'Michele Clark' <mclark@theyololandtrust.org>; 'Hogan, Phil - NRCS, Woodland, CA' <phil.hogan@usda.gov>; 'Adams, Broadwell Joseph & Cardozo' <jlaurain@adamsbroadwell.com>; yolocounty4local185@gmail.com; project.tracking@nccrc.org; michael@lozeaudrury.com; hannah@lozeaudrury.com; sophie@lozeaudrury.com; D3PlanningSouth@dot.ca.gov; 'Buckley, Andrea@DWR' <Andrea.Buckley@water.ca.gov>; centralvalleysacramento@waterboards.ca.gov; LCA@conservation.ca.gov; R2CEQA@wildlife.ca.gov; Don Saylor <Don.Saylor@yolocounty.org>; Tara Thronson <Tara.Thronson@yolocounty.org>; Angel Barajas <Angel.Barajas@yolocounty.org>; Monica Rivera <Monica.Rivera@yolocounty.org>; Bob Schneider <verve2006@comcast.net>
Subject: RE: Notice of Intent to Adopt a Mitigated Negative Declaration

Stephanie,

Thank you for the NOI. I've reviewed the IS/MND and the attached appendices, have concluded that the documentation fully supports the conclusion that the proposed project is consistent with relevant standards and protection measures adopted by the County (including those in the HCP/NCCP), and have no further comments. The environmental review carried out by the County and Caltrans for this Phase II project illustrates a well-done CEQA assessment process, such as we should see for other proposed actions in the County.

Best,

Chad Roberts, Ph.D., Conservation Ecologist
Senior Professional Wetland Scientist, Society of Wetland Scientists
Senior Ecologist, Ecological Society of America

"If you don't like all of the climate disasters happening in 2020, I have some bad news for you about the rest of your life"
— Andrew Dessler, climate scientist, Texas A&M University

Letter 6 – Response to Comment

The commenter provided a review of the Draft IS/MND and had no comments on the content of the document. There were no specific comments on the content, analysis or findings of the Draft IS/MND, therefore no changes to the Draft IS/MND will be made as a result of this letter.

Letter 7 – Pacific Gas & Electric (Justin Newell) Received September 29, 2021



Plan Review Team
Land Management

PGEPlanReview@pge.com

September 29, 2021

Stephanie Cormier
County of Yolo
292 W Beamer St
Woodland, CA 95695

Re: CR98-ISMND-NOI
County Road 98

Dear Stephanie:

Thank you for giving us the opportunity to review the subject plans. The proposed CR98-ISMND-NOI is within the same vicinity of PG&E's existing facilities that impact this property.

Yolo County has already contacted PG&E regarding utility conflicts along County Road 98. The county will need to continue to work with Land Agent Nick Morlock (Nick.Morlock@pge.com) regarding the relocation of any facilities along County Road 98 for phase II of the bike and safety improvement project.

Please contact the Building and Renovation Center (BRSC) for facility map requests by calling 1-877-743-7782 and PG&E's Service Planning department at www.pge.com/cco for any modification or relocation requests, or for any additional services you may require.

As a reminder, before any digging or excavation occurs, please contact Underground Service Alert (USA) by dialing 811 a minimum of 2 working days prior to commencing any work. This free and independent service will ensure that all existing underground utilities are identified and marked on-site.

If you have any questions regarding our response, please contact me at Justin.Newell@pge.com.

Sincerely,

A handwritten signature in blue ink that reads 'J Newell'.

Justin Newell
Land Management
916-594-4068

Letter 7 – Response to Comment

The commenter confirmed their review of the Draft IS/MND and had no comments on the content of the document. There were no specific comments on the content, analysis or findings of the Draft IS/MND, therefore no changes to the Draft IS/MND will be made as a result of this letter.

Letter 8 – Yolo-Solano Air Quality Management District (Paul Hensleigh) Received August 26, 2021

From: Stephanie Cormier <Stephanie.Cormier@yolocounty.org>
Sent: Thursday, August 26, 2021 2:47 PM
To: Paul Hensleigh; Lilia Razo; Nicholas Burton; Kevin Sevier
Subject: RE: Notice of Intent to Adopt a Mitigated Negative Declaration

Hi Paul,

Thank you for commenting on the Initial Study/Mitigated Negative Declaration (MND) for the County Road 98 Bike and Safety Improvement Project, Phase II, and for offering corrections. Copied on this response is the Project Engineer, Lilia Razo, Public Works Director, Nick Burton, and the County's CEQA consultant, Kevin Sevier, Gallaway Enterprises – your comments will be included in the MND. We will also ensure that all future Initial Studies/MNDs are consistent with the information provided below.

Sincerely,
Stephanie

From: Paul Hensleigh [mailto:PHensleigh@ysaqmd.org]
Sent: Thursday, August 26, 2021 2:04 PM
To: Stephanie Cormier <Stephanie.Cormier@yolocounty.org>; Lilia Razo <Lilia.Razo@yolocounty.org>; Nicholas Burton <Nicholas.Burton@yolocounty.org>
Cc: Humberto Izquierdo <Humberto.Izquierdo@yolocounty.org>; David Guerrero <David.Guerrero@yolocounty.org>; George Galang <George.Galang@yolocounty.org>; Sheryl Hardy-Salgado <Sheryl.Hardy-Salgado@yolocounty.org>; Eric May <Eric.May@yolocounty.org>; Matt Davis <Matt.Davis@yolocounty.org>; Charlie Tschudin <charlie@yolohabitatconservancy.org>; psandholdt@cityofdavis.org; wpl30@wpfd.net; sbravo@wpfd.net; PGE Plan Review <PGEPlanReview@pge.com>; jreed@ycfcwcd.org; Ashley Feeney (AFeeney@cityofdavis.org) <AFeeney@cityofdavis.org>; smetzker@cityofdavis.org; Dianna Jensen <DJensen@cityofdavis.org>; Omar Carrillo <OCarrillo@yochadehe-nsn.gov>; Gayle Totton <GTotton@yochadehe-nsn.gov>; mluken@yctd.org; Michele Clark <mclark@theyololandtrust.org>; Hogan, Phil - NRCS, Woodland, CA <phil.hogan@usda.gov>; Adams, Broadwell Joseph & Cardozo (jlaurain@adamsbroadwell.com) <jlaurain@adamsbroadwell.com>; yolocounty4local185@gmail.com; project.tracking@nccrc.org; michael@lozeaudrury.com; hannah@lozeaudrury.com; sophie@lozeaudrury.com; D3PlanningSouth@dot.ca.gov; Buckley, Andrea@DWR (Andrea.Buckley@water.ca.gov) <Andrea.Buckley@water.ca.gov>; centralvalleysacramento@waterboards.ca.gov; LCA@conservation.ca.gov; R2CEQA@wildlife.ca.gov; Don Saylor <Don.Saylor@yolocounty.org>; Tara Thronson <Tara.Thronson@yolocounty.org>; Angel Barajas <Angel.Barajas@yolocounty.org>; Monica Rivera <Monica.Rivera@yolocounty.org>
Subject: RE: Notice of Intent to Adopt a Mitigated Negative Declaration

Hi Stephanie,

Yolo-Solano Air Quality Management District offers the following comments on this project:

- 1) In table 1 (Attainment Status) on page 18, the national designation for PM2.5 is incorrect – most of our district (including where this project is located) is in non-attainment. Here is a map of the federal non-attainment area: http://www.ysaqmd.org/wp-content/uploads/Graphics/Sacramento_PM2.5_Nonattainment.jpg
- 2) On that same page, there is a typo – Rule 9.8 has a title of “Asbestos – Serpentine Rock”:

- **Rule 2.32 Stationary Internal Combustion Engines:** The purpose of this Rule is to limit the emission of oxides of nitrogen (NOx) and carbon monoxide (CO) from stationary internal combustion engines.
- **Rule 9.8 Stationary Internal Combustion Engines:** The purpose of this Rule is to limit asbestos emissions to the atmosphere from serpentine rock by prohibiting the use or sale of serpentine rock containing more than one percent (1%) asbestos for surfacing applications.

3) The document discusses air compressor, generator set, and other mobile equipment. Please be aware that for mobile equipment (which doesn't provide self propulsion), if the engine is rated over 50 horsepower, it requires a District permit or registration in the statewide Portable Equipment Registration Program (PERP) – for more info see <https://www.vsaqmd.org/permits/perp/>

Thanks,
Paul Hensleigh
(530) 757-3665

Letter 8 – Response to Comment

The commenter provided a succinct review of the content of the Draft IS/MND document which included the identification of two minor errors in the Air Quality section of the document. One is the national designation for PM2.5 in Table 1, Page 18, which should have been described as non-attainment. The second is the title of Rule 9.8 on Page 18 which should have read “Stationary Internal Combustion Engines”. Both of these typos are revised in Section 2.2 Changes to the Second Draft IS/MND of this document and will be edited in the Final IS/MND. Neither of these typos affect the analysis, findings or resulting mitigation measures of the Draft IS/MND.

The commenter goes on to advise that there are Yolo-Solano Air Quality Management District (District) rules regarding the use and operation of mobile equipment if the engine is rated over 50 horsepower which require a District permit or registration in the statewide Portable Equipment Registration Program. It is expected that owner/operators of such equipment, if they are to be used during the proposed Project, will be operating their equipment according to the existing District rules. This portion of the comment letter does not affect the content, analysis or findings of the Draft IS/MND, therefore no changes to the Draft IS/MND will be made as a result of this component of the comment letter.

Letter 9 – Peter Droubay Received August 25, 2021

-----Original Message-----

From: Peter Droubay [mailto:drdroubay@omsoft.com]

Sent: Wednesday, August 25, 2021 3:27 PM

To: Stephanie Cormier <Stephanie.Cormier@yolocounty.org>

Subject: road 98 bike improvement

I am much in favor of this project; however I must say that the 2 mile stretch of road 99 between covell and road 29 is much more travelled by cyclists and has had at least 2 cyclist dead from cars hitting them; the rest of road 99 from road 29 to Woodland has a nice bike lane, but the deaths on the stretch noted above would make me urge the county to make this stretch of road a bit wider so our cyclists can be safe!!! there is still one cross on this stretch and the other is no longer there.

[THIS EMAIL ORIGINATED FROM OUTSIDE YOLO COUNTY. PLEASE USE CAUTION AND VALIDATE THE AUTHENTICITY OF THE EMAIL PRIOR TO CLICKING ANY LINKS OR PROVIDING ANY INFORMATION. IF YOU ARE UNSURE, PLEASE CONTACT THE HELPDESK (x5000) FOR ASSISTANCE]

Letter 9 – Response to Comment

The commenter expresses their favor of the proposed Project and identifies other roads in the region that are utilized by cyclists and associated accident information. There were no specific comments on the content, analysis or findings of the Draft IS/MND, therefore no changes to the Draft IS/MND will be made as a result of this letter.

2. Errata and Changes to the Draft IS/MND

The Draft Initial Study/Mitigated Negative Declaration is updated to reflect additional information, clarification of the project description, and corrections to content.

2.1 Changes to the First Draft IS/MND

Page 7 – Project Description

Provided additional information on the standard procedures regarding right of way and temporary construction easement acquisition to read:

“All construction staging will occur within County right of way (ROW). Acquisition of ROW and Temporary Construction Easements (TCE) will necessitate coordination with affected property owners, restoration of temporarily impacted infrastructure, and compensation to landowners and easement holders to replace losses. Acquisition of property under a farmland conservation easement will necessitate coordination with the property owners as well as Yolo Land Trust.”

Page 14 through 16 – Section 5.2 Agricultural Resources

Provided updated information to reflect the results of consultation with the Natural Resource Conservation Service on the topic of farmland conversion to read:

When farmland is affected on State-funded projects, Caltrans consults with the U.S. Department of Agriculture’s Natural Resources Conservation Service. Caltrans uses the U.S. Department of Agriculture’s Farmland Conversion Impact Rating Form NRCS-CPA-106 to determine impacts to farmland. The evaluation form is submitted to the U.S. Department of Agriculture’s Natural Resources Conservation Service, which assigns a score for a site’s relative value. The Natural Resources Conservation Service returns the evaluation form, and Caltrans completes a site assessment with the score assigned from the Natural Resources Conservation Service. A combined score in part V and part VI under 160 indicates no further consideration for protection. A total score of between 160 and 220 requires two alternative corridors to be evaluated. The proposed Project will permanently impact 16.97 acres of prime farmland, which includes 3.19 acres containing Farmland Conservation Easements. A Farmland Conversion Impact Rating Form was submitted to Caltrans to utilize and consult with the Natural Resource Conservation Service. Based on the amount of impacts to farmlands, the U.S. Department of Agriculture’s Farmland Conversion Impact Rating was 175, above the 160 score threshold for minimal impacts. The Farmland Protection Policy Act (Title 7 Code of Federal Regulation 658.4(c)(3)), states that “sites receiving scores totaling 160 or more be given increasingly higher levels of consideration for protection,” and therefore a review of alternatives was required to evaluate impacts to farmlands.

The alternatives analysis for farmland impacts included the review of two alternatives and a no-project alternative. The first alternative (Proposal/Alternative B) considered for this plan, but dropped from consideration, was to utilize standard drainage ditch slopes which resulted in a larger impact to farmlands and associated resources. Proposal/Alternative B resulted in 25.63 acres of impacts to farmlands as shown on Exhibit B. Alternative A was

developed to increase the slope of the drainages with the intended goal of reducing the total impact on the surrounding farmland. Implementing this alternative would not have a negative impact on the purpose of this project to improve public safety by widening and improving the shoulders along County Road (CR) 98. Increasing the slope of the drainages reduces the impacts to FMMP farmland by 8.66 acres. The third alternative is a no project alternative. The no project alternative does not meet the operational and safety goals established in the County's General Plan or SACOG's Metropolitan Transportation Plan, to provide a corridor that meets the travel demand model and vehicle miles travelled (VMT) reduction and therefore does not meet the project purpose and is removed from consideration.

After review of the alternatives analysis for impacts to farmlands, NRCS determined that no further evaluation is required and no further steps were needed to mitigate or reduce impacts to agricultural lands. The Yolo County Agricultural Conversion and Mitigation Program (Yolo County Ordinance §8-2404) requires mitigation for conversion of agricultural lands to predominately non-agricultural use. Section 8-2404 (c)(2)(ii) of the ordinance allow for facilities and infrastructure that do not generate revenue, such as this project, to be exempt from farmland conversion mitigation requirements.

In determining whether an impact is considered substantial or not, the County has discretion in choosing a threshold of significance. Yolo County does not have a specific threshold of significance to assess potentially significant impacts to farmland for purposes of analysis under CEQA. However, the County has established different criteria for protecting farmland in different contexts. First, the County's Agricultural Conservation and Mitigation Program (County Code Sec. 8-2.404 & 405) sets an impact threshold of 20 acres for projects that require the acquisition of a permanent conservation easement, rather than the payment of in-lieu fees.

Second, the County's Agricultural Zoning Regulations (County Code Sec. 8-2.302) sets forth minimum parcel size for new parcels in the agricultural zones of 40 acres for irrigated parcels in permanent crops, 80 acres for irrigated parcels, and 160 acres for uncultivated and not irrigated. Similarly, the County does not allow new Williamson Act contracts that are less than 40 acres of irrigated farmland; 80 gross acres where the soils are capable of cultivation but are not irrigated; and 160 acres where the soils are not capable of cultivation. These thresholds show that parcels typically require a certain minimum size to contain viable farming operations.

Finally, the County's Williamson Act Guidelines determine a project's compatibility with agriculture based on the principles of compatibility in Government Code section 51238.1:

- (1) The use will not significantly compromise the long-term productive agricultural capability of the subject contracted parcel or parcels or on other contracted lands in agricultural preserves.
- (2) The use will not significantly displace or impair current or reasonably foreseeable agricultural operations on the subject contracted parcel or parcels or on other contracted lands in agricultural

preserves. Uses that significantly displace agricultural operations on the subject contracted parcel or parcels may be deemed compatible if they relate directly to the production of commercial agricultural products on the subject contracted parcel or parcels or neighboring lands, including activities such as harvesting, processing, or shipping.

(3) The use will not result in the significant removal of adjacent contracted land from agricultural or open-space use.

Accordingly, significance under CEQA can be evaluated through a three-step evaluation: 1) does the Project remove more than 20 acres of farmland, 2) does the Project reduce the irrigated farmland of any given parcel to less than 40 acres, or 3) are there aspects of the project that are incompatible with agriculture on the affected parcel(s) or neighboring farmland?

Potential Environmental Effects

a) Less Than Significant Impact. The proposed Project will permanently impact 16.97 acres of land designated as Prime Farmland by the California Department of Conservation Farmland Mapping & Monitoring Program (FMMP) which includes 10.18 acres of land that falls under the Williamson Act and 3.19 acres of Farmland Conservation Easements. There is no farmland designated as “Unique” or “Of Statewide Significance.” The permanent impacts to farmland do not remove more than 20 acres of farmland, do not reduce the size of a parcel to the 40 acres applicable to irrigated farmland, and will not significantly compromise the long-term productive agricultural capability of any parcel, displace any current or foreseeable farming operations, or remove adjacent agricultural or open space land. Due to the relatively minor amount of farmland conversion, this impact is considered to be less than significant.

b) Less Than Significant Impact. The affected parcels within the Project area are zoned by Yolo County as Agricultural Intensive (A-N) and are designated for Agriculture (AG) in the Yolo County General Plan. Roads are not separately zoned and are included in any zone without the need for a special designation. Construction activities are expected to permanently impact approximately 16.97 acres of agricultural land, which includes 10.18 acres of land enrolled in the Williamson Act and 3.19 acres of farmland protected under conservation easement(s). Based on data from the California Department of Conservation, the proposed Project will permanently impact 10.18 acres of Prime Farmland with Williamson Act contracts. The removal of Williamson Act contracted land to accommodate the Project is authorized by the California Land Conservation Act, and therefore does not conflict with the Williamson Act (California Department of Conservation 2020).

c) No Impact. The proposed Project consists solely of roadway improvements and does not include any rezoning activities.

d) No Impact. The proposed Project will not result in the loss of conversion of forest land.

e) No Impact. The Project does not include other activities that could result in conversion of Farmland to non-agricultural use or conversion of forest land to non-forest use.

Mitigation Measures: None required

Page 50 – Section 5.11 Hydrology and Water Quality

Provided a summary of the peer review process conducted by Pacific Hydrologic Incorporated regarding the flood hydraulic conditions to determine peak flood elevations resulting from the proposed project:

Pacific Hydrologic Incorporated (PHI) performed an evaluation of flood hydraulic conditions to determine the final centerline grade elevations of County Road 98 along with replacing and adding culverts (Hydraulics Report). The complete report is included as Appendix E. This study consists of a flood hydrologic analysis using a rainfall-runoff model to identify runoff approaching the County Road 98 corridor from six sub-basins to the west followed by a two dimensional (2D) backwater model identifying existing and proposed condition flood hydraulic characteristics through the study area. The 2D study area consists of a corridor approximately one mile wide extending the full reach of anticipated improvements. The County has modified the proposed road centerline elevations and removed and or replaced the culverts identified in the hydraulic report to negate any increase in the extent of inundation and flood impacts to structures. The Changes to the design are sufficient to meet FEMA’s “no increase” requirement and will ensure there are less than significant impacts as they pertain to hydraulic conditions, potential flooding and stormwater issues.

Page 51 - Section 5.11 c) Hydrology and Water Quality

Provided clarification on subsection c) to include reference to existing rules, reference to the peer review process conducted by Pacific Hydrologic Incorporated regarding the flood hydraulic conditions to determine peak flood elevations resulting from the proposed project, and FEMAs “no increase ” requirement in relation to inundation, floodplain limits and water surface elevations.

c) i Less Than Significant Impact. The proposed project’s grading and excavation are not anticipated to results in substantial erosion or siltation, on or off-site. Through the implementation and compliance with the various requirements of the SWRCB statewide general permit for construction (which include water pollution control, erosion control and the development of a SWPPP) will ensure that erosion or siltation on- or off-site during the construction phase of the proposed Project would be less than significant.

c)ii Less Than Significant Impact. The proposed Project includes widening the paved section of CR98 to include bicycle lanes and improved roadway infrastructure which will result in an increase in impervious surfaces. These increases in impervious surfaces are not a substantial increase when compared to existing conditions. The recontouring and re-establishment of roadway drainage facilities are designed to accommodate the predicted runoff from the proposed Project. The Project will not contribute to a substantial increase in water runoff from the site. Project impacts are less than significant.

c)iii Less Than Significant Impact. As mentioned above the proposed Project would include minor increases in runoff water, however the runoff water would not exceed the capacity of existing or planned stormwater drainage systems. The propose Project includes the widening of an existing road to include improved bicycle facilities and roadway conditions and will not introduce a substantial additional source of polluted runoff, since the exiting use is similar to the proposed used of the project site. Project impacts are less than significant.

c)iv Less Than Significant Impact. The proposed Project has been designed to avoid obstructions or redirection of flood flows. The proposed project design has gone through several revisions based on the results of third-party reviews conducted by PHI to ensure there are less than significant impacts as they pertain to hydraulic conditions, impediments, potential flooding and stormwater issues. The Federal Emergency Management Agency (FEMA) has a “no increase” requirement in relation to inundation, floodplain limits and water surface elevations as a result of the project. Through the standard process of design, peer review and meeting the requirements of FEMA, there will be a less than significant impact in regards to this topic.

Appendix E – Hydraulics Report

Provided the results of the Hydraulics Report prepared by Pacific Hydrologic Incorporated as an appendix to the Draft IS/MND.

2.2 Changes to the Second Draft IS/MND

Page 18 – Section 5.3 Air Quality

Provided updated information as a result of Letter 8 – Yolo-Solano Air Quality Management District (Paul Hensleigh) Received August 26, 2021 to correct the National Designation status for PM2.5 to “Nonattainment”

Table 1. Attainment Status for SVAB in Yolo County

Pollutant	National Designation	State Designation
Ozone	Nonattainment (8 hr.)	Nonattainment-Transitional
PM ₁₀	Unclassified	Nonattainment
PM _{2.5}	Nonattainment	Unclassified
CO	Unclassified/ Attainment	Attainment
NO ₂	Unclassified/ Attainment	Attainment
SO ₂	Unclassified/ Attainment	Attainment
Sulfates	NA	Attainment
Lead	Unclassified/ Attainment	Attainment
Hydrogen Sulfide	NA	Unclassified
Visibility Reducing Particles	NA	Unclassified

(Source: CARB 2020)

Provided corrected title for Rule 9.8 to “Asbestos - Serpentine Rock”:

Rule 9.8 Asbestos - Serpentine Rock: The purpose of this Rule is to limit asbestos emissions to the atmosphere from serpentine rock by prohibiting the use or sale of serpentine rock containing more than one percent (1%) asbestos for surfacing applications.

3. Mitigation and Monitoring Reporting Program

3.1 Mitigation Monitoring and Reporting Requirements

Public Resources Code (PRC) Section 21081.6 mandates that the following requirements shall apply to all reporting or mitigation monitoring programs:

- The public agency shall adopt a reporting or monitoring program for the changes made to the project or conditions of project approval in order to mitigate or avoid significant effects on the environment. The reporting or monitoring program shall be designed to ensure compliance during project implementation. For those changes which have been required or incorporated into the project at the request of a Responsible Agency or a public agency having jurisdiction by law over natural resources affected by the project, that agency shall, if so requested by the Lead Agency or a Responsible Agency, prepare and submit a proposed reporting or monitoring program.
- The Lead Agency shall specify the location and custodian of the documents or other material, which constitute the record of proceedings upon which its decision is based. A public agency shall provide the measures to mitigate or avoid significant effects on the environment that are fully enforceable through permit conditions, agreements, or other measures. Conditions of project approval may be set forth in referenced documents which address required mitigation measures or in the case of the adoption of a plan, policy, regulation, or other project, by incorporating the mitigation measures into the plan, policy, regulation, or project design.
- Prior to the close of the public review period for a draft Environmental Impact Report (EIR) or Mitigated Negative Declaration (MND), a Responsible Agency, or a public agency having jurisdiction over natural resources affected by the project, shall either submit to the Lead Agency complete and detailed performance objectives for mitigation measures which would address the significant effects on the environment identified by the Responsible Agency or agency having jurisdiction over natural resources affected by the project, or refer the Lead Agency to appropriate, readily available guidelines or reference documents. Any mitigation measures submitted to a Lead Agency by a Responsible Agency or an agency having jurisdiction over natural resources affected by the project shall be limited to measures that mitigate impacts to resources, which are subject to the statutory authority of, and definitions applicable to, that agency. Compliance or noncompliance by a Responsible Agency or agency having jurisdiction over natural resources affected by a project with that requirement shall not limit that authority of the Responsible Agency or agency having jurisdiction over natural resources affected by a project, or the authority of the Lead Agency, to approve, condition, or deny projects as provided by this division or any other provision of law.

3.2 Mitigation Monitoring and Reporting Procedures

The Mitigation Monitoring and Reporting Program (MMRP) has been prepared in compliance with PRC Section 21081.6. It describes the requirements and procedures to be followed by the Yolo County Community Services Department to ensure that all mitigation measures or required project design features (PDF) adopted as part of the proposed project will be carried out as described in this IS/MND. Table 2 lists each of the mitigation measures or project design features specified in this document and identifies the party or parties responsible for implementation and monitoring of each measure.

Table 2 Mitigation Monitoring and Reporting Program

Mitigation Measures	Responsible Party	Timing for Standard Condition or Mitigation Measure	Compliance Verification (Date and Signature Required)
1. Aesthetics			
The proposed project would not result in significant adverse impacts related to aesthetics. No mitigation would be required.			
2. Agricultural and Forestry Resources			
The proposed project would not result in significant adverse impacts related to agriculture and forest resources. No mitigation would be required.			
3. Air Quality			
The proposed project would not result in significant adverse impacts related to air quality. No mitigation would be required.			
4. Biological Resources			
MM BIO-1: Valley Elderberry Longhorn Beetle (Yolo HCP/NCCP AMM12: Minimize Take and Adverse Effects on Habitat of Valley Elderberry Longhorn Beetle) The following avoidance and minimization measures will be implemented to minimize the potential for adverse impacts on VELB to the maximum extent possible: The elderberry shrub will be transplanted to a USFWS- and Conservancy-approved beetle conservation bank in accordance with the guidelines set forth in AMM12. Impacts to 0.71 acres of Great Valley Oak Riparian habitat, which is designated as VELB habitat, will be mitigated for in accordance with the Yolo HCP/NCCP. The specific acreage of compensatory mitigation credits are subject to change depending on consultation with the USFWS and the Conservancy.	Yolo County Community Services Department or designee	Prior to commencement of on-site Project activities	
MM BIO-2: Western Pond Turtle (Yolo HCP/NCCP AMMs 4 and 14: Cover Trenches and Holes during Construction and Maintenance; Minimize Take and Adverse Effects on Habitat of Western Pond Turtle) The following measures will reduce potential impacts to western pond turtles: A pre-construction survey for western pond turtle shall be conducted by a qualified biologist. If a	Yolo County Community Services Department or designee	Prior to commencement of and during on-site Project activities	

Mitigation Measures	Responsible Party	Timing for Standard Condition or Mitigation Measure	Compliance Verification (Date and Signature Required)
<p>western pond turtle nest is identified during the survey, the biologist shall flag the site and determine if construction activities can avoid affecting the nest. If the nest cannot be avoided, it will be excavated and re-buried at a suitable location outside of the construction impact zone by a qualified biologist. The County will inform CDFW if the nest cannot be avoided and such an activity must occur. If a qualified biologist determines that there is a moderate to high likelihood of western pond turtle nests within the disturbance area, the qualified biologist will monitor all initial ground-disturbing activity for nests that may be unearthed during the disturbance, and will move out of harm's way any turtles or hatchlings found. To prevent injury and mortality of western pond turtle, workers will cover open trenches and holes associated with implementation of covered activities that affect habitat for these species or design the trenches and holes with escape ramps that can be used during non-working hours. The construction contractor will inspect open trenches and holes prior to filling and contact a qualified biologist to remove or release any trapped wildlife found in the trenches or holes.</p>			
<p>MM BIO-3: Swainson's Hawk and White-Tailed Kite (Yolo HCP/NCCP AMM16: Minimize Take and Adverse Effects on Habitat of Swainson's Hawk and White-Tailed Kite) The following avoidance and minimization measures will be implemented to minimize the potential for adverse impacts on Swainson's hawk and white-tailed kite to the maximum extent possible: The Project proponent will retain a qualified biologist to conduct preconstruction surveys for active nests consistent with guidelines provided by the Swainson's Hawk Technical Advisory Committee (2000), between March 1 and August 30, within 15 days prior to the beginning of the construction activity. The results of the survey will be submitted to the Conservancy and CDFW. If active nests are</p>	<p>Yolo County Community Services Department or designee</p>	<p>Prior to commencement of and during on-site Project activities</p>	

Mitigation Measures	Responsible Party	Timing for Standard Condition or Mitigation Measure	Compliance Verification (Date and Signature Required)
<p>found during preconstruction surveys, a 1,320-foot initial temporary nest disturbance buffer shall be established. If Project-related activities within the temporary nest disturbance buffer are determined to be necessary during the nesting season, then the qualified biologist will monitor the nest and will, along with the Project proponent, consult with CDFW to determine the best course of action necessary to avoid nest abandonment or take of individuals. Work may be allowed only to proceed within the temporary nest disturbance buffer if Swainson’s hawk or white-tailed kite are not exhibiting agitated behavior, such as defensive flights at intruders, getting up from a brooding position, or flying off the nest, and only with the agreement of CDFW and USFWS. The designated on-site biologist/monitor shall be on-site daily while construction-related activities are taking place within the 1,320-foot buffer and shall have the authority to stop work if raptors are exhibiting agitated behavior. If active nests are found during preconstruction surveys, no tree pruning or removal of the nest tree will occur during the period between March 1 and August 30 within 1,320 feet of an active nest, unless a qualified biologist determines that the young have fledged and the nest is no longer active.</p>			
<p>MM BIO-4: Tricolored Blackbird (Yolo HCP/NCCP AMM21: Minimize Take and Adverse Effects on Habitat of Tricolored Blackbird) The following avoidance and minimization measures will be implemented to minimize the potential for adverse impacts on tricolored blackbird to the maximum extent possible: The qualified biologist will conduct visual surveys to determine if an active colony is present, during the period from March 1 to July 30, consistent with protocol described by Kelsey (2008). If active colony is present or has been present within the last 5 years, implement a species protection buffer within 1,300 feet of the colony site(s) from March 1 to July 30, unless a shorter</p>	<p>Yolo County Community Services Department or designee</p>	<p>Prior to commencement of and during on-site Project activities</p>	

Mitigation Measures	Responsible Party	Timing for Standard Condition or Mitigation Measure	Compliance Verification (Date and Signature Required)
<p>distance is approved, based on site-specific conditions, by the Conservancy and CDFW. Per the Yolo HCP/NCCP, there is 12.95 acres of Cultivated Land and Grassland Alliance land cover types that could potentially serve as tricolored blackbird nesting and foraging habitat. Impacts to tricolored blackbird suitable habitat land cover types will be mitigated for in accordance with the Yolo HCP/NCCP. The specific acreage of compensatory mitigation credits are subject to change depending on consultation with the USFWS and the Conservancy.</p>			
<p>MM BIO-5: Special-Status Bird Species, Migratory Birds, and Raptors The following measures will be implemented to further reduce the potential for impacts on special-status and migratory birds and raptors that may nest in or near the Project area, including northern harrier: Project activities and vegetation removal within the Project area shall be initiated outside of the bird nesting season (February 1 – August 31). If Project activities and vegetation removal cannot be initiated outside of the bird nesting season than the following will occur: A qualified biologist will conduct a pre-construction survey within 7 days prior to the initiation of Project activities. If an active avian nest (i.e., with egg[s] or young) is observed within 250 feet of the Project area during the pre-construction survey, then a species protection buffer will be established. The species protection buffer will be defined by the qualified biologist in consultation with CDFW. Construction activity shall be prohibited within the buffer zones until the young have fledged or the nest fails. Nests shall be monitored once per week and a report submitted to the lead agency weekly.</p>	<p>Yolo County Community Services Department or designee</p>	<p>Prior to commencement of and during on-site Project activities</p>	
<p>MM BIO-6: Wetlands and Waters (Yolo HCP/NCCP AMMs 1, 2, 3, 8, 9, and 10: Establish Buffers around Sensitive Natural Communities; Confine and Delineate Work Area to Avoid and Minimize Effects of Construction Staging Areas</p>	<p>Yolo County Community Services Department or designee</p>	<p>Prior to commencement of and during on-site Project activities</p>	

Mitigation Measures	Responsible Party	Timing for Standard Condition or Mitigation Measure	Compliance Verification (Date and Signature Required)
<p>and Temporary Work Areas; Avoid and Minimize Effects on Wetlands and Waters) The following measures shall be implemented to avoid or minimize the potential for Project-related impacts on wetlands and waters: The County will comply with the terms of a Clean Water Act Section 404 permit issued by the Corps and Section 401 water quality certification issued by the RWQCB for activities involving the discharge of fill material into jurisdictional drainages. The County will also comply with terms of a Streambed Alteration Agreement with the CDFW (if determined necessary by the CDFW). Prior to any discharge into drainages, the required permits and authorizations will be obtained from the respective agencies. All terms and conditions of the required permits and authorizations will be implemented. The County will designate all wetlands outside the area of permanent impact as Environmentally Sensitive Areas (refer to MM BIO-8). These areas will be identified on construction drawings and demarcated in the field with flagging and/or signs identifying the area as off limits to all personnel, equipment, and ground-disturbing activities. In addition, water quality BMPs will be installed around the wetlands (outside the wetland boundaries) in a manner that prevents water, sediment, and chemicals from draining into the features, and all staging, storage, stockpile areas, and off-road travel routes will be located as far as practicable away from the wetlands. Mitigation for 0.27 acres (1,483 linear feet) of permanent impacts to jurisdictional WOTUS will be addressed through the purchase of credits at a Corps-approved mitigation bank or payment to a Corps-approved in-lieu fund. Impacts to Lacustrine and Riverine and Fresh Emergent Wetland Sensitive Natural Communities will be mitigated for through the Yolo HCP/NCCP Natural Community and Land Cover Impacts Mitigation Fees. The specific acreage of compensatory mitigation credits are</p>			

Mitigation Measures	Responsible Party	Timing for Standard Condition or Mitigation Measure	Compliance Verification (Date and Signature Required)
subject to change depending on consultation with the USFWS and the Conservancy.			
MM BIO-7: Sensitive Natural Communities (Yolo HCP/NCCP AMM9, Establish Buffers around Sensitive Natural Communities) Environmentally Sensitive Area (ESA) fencing will be established around the following Sensitive Natural Communities where they occur within or adjacent to the Project area, when feasible. These areas will be identified on construction drawings and demarcated in the field with flagging and/or signs identifying the area as off limits to all personnel, equipment, and ground-disturbing activities. Per Yolo HCP/NCCP AMM9, the buffers for each Sensitive Natural Community are as follows: Valley foothill riparian: 100 feet from canopy drip-line. If avoidance is infeasible, a lesser buffer than is stipulated in the AMMs may be approved by the Conservancy, USFWS, and CDFW if they determine that the sensitive natural community or covered species is avoided to an extent that is consistent with the Project purpose (e.g., if the purpose of the Project is to provide a stream crossing or replace a bridge, the Project may encroach into the buffer and the natural community or species habitat to the extent that is necessary to fulfill the Project purpose). Transportation or utility crossings may encroach into this sensitive natural community provided effects are minimized and all other applicable AMMs are followed. Lacustrine and riverine: Outside urban planning units, 100 feet from the top of banks. Within urban planning units, 25 feet from the top of the banks. Fresh emergent wetland: 50 feet from the edge of the natural community.	Yolo County Community Services Department or designee	Prior to commencement of and during on-site Project activities	
MM BIO-8: Worker Environmental Training Program (Yolo HCP/NCCP AMM6: Conduct Worker Training) All construction personnel will participate in a worker environmental training program approved/authorized by the Conservancy and administered by a qualified biologist. The training will provide education regarding sensitive	Yolo County Community Services Department or designee	Prior to construction personnel working on the Project	

Mitigation Measures	Responsible Party	Timing for Standard Condition or Mitigation Measure	Compliance Verification (Date and Signature Required)
<p>natural communities and covered species and their habitats, the need to avoid adverse effects, state and federal protection, and the legal implications of violating the FESA and NCCPA Permits. A pre-recorded video presentation by a qualified biologist shown to construction personnel may fulfill the training requirement.</p>			
<p>MM BIO-9 – Tree Removal Documentation and Replacement The following measures shall be implemented to compensate for the removal of protected trees and to avoid or minimize the potential for Project-related impacts on tree resources. Final plans will identify the number, size and species of protected trees to be removed and include a planting plan, to ensure replacement of trees in a manner consistent with County and Resource Agencies policies. If replanting cannot completely compensate for the number of trees removed within the project site or on County managed land, purchase of compensatory mitigation credits will be required for the remainder of trees. The replanting plan must be approved by the County and any compensatory mitigation credits for tree resources must be purchased prior to vegetation clearing activities. A plan for avoidance and minimization of trees that are in the area of direct impact, but not removed shall be developed by an International Society of Arboriculture (ISA) Arborist and implemented by the County prior to vegetation clearing activities and throughout the construction of the Project.</p>	<p>Yolo County Community Services Department or designee</p>	<p>Prior to commencement of and during on-site Project activities</p>	
<p>MM BIO-10 Control Nighttime Lighting Implements Yolo HCP/NCCP AMM7: (Control Nighttime Lighting of Project Construction Sites) Workers will direct all lights for nighttime lighting of project construction sites into the project construction area and minimize the lighting of natural habitat areas adjacent to the project construction area.</p>	<p>Yolo County Community Services Department or designee</p>	<p>During on-site Project activities</p>	
<p>5. Cultural Resources</p>			

Mitigation Measures	Responsible Party	Timing for Standard Condition or Mitigation Measure	Compliance Verification (Date and Signature Required)
The proposed project would not result in significant adverse impacts related to cultural resources. No mitigation would be required.			
6. Energy			
The proposed project would not result in significant adverse impacts related to energy. No mitigation would be required.			
7. Geology and Soils			
The proposed project would not result in significant adverse impacts related to geology and soils. No mitigation would be required.			
8. Greenhouse Gas Emissions			
The proposed project would not result in significant adverse impacts related to greenhouse gas emissions. No mitigation would be required.			
9. Hazards and Hazardous Materials			
The proposed project would not result in significant adverse impacts related to hazards and hazardous materials. No mitigation would be required.			
10. Hydrology and Water Quality			
The proposed project would not result in significant adverse impacts related to hydrology and water quality. No mitigation would be required.			
11. Land Use and Planning			
The proposed project would not result in significant adverse impacts related to land use and planning. No mitigation would be required.			
12. Mineral Resources			
The proposed project would not result in significant adverse impacts related to mineral resources. No mitigation would be required.			
13. Noise			
The proposed project would not result in significant adverse impacts related to noise. No mitigation would be required.			
14. Population and Housing			
The proposed project would not result in significant adverse impacts related to population and housing. No mitigation would be required.			

Mitigation Measures	Responsible Party	Timing for Standard Condition or Mitigation Measure	Compliance Verification (Date and Signature Required)
15. Public Services			
The proposed project would not result in significant adverse impacts related to public services. No mitigation would be required.			
16. Recreation			
The proposed project would not result in significant adverse impacts related to recreation. No mitigation would be required.			
17. Transportation			
The proposed project would not result in significant adverse impacts related to transportation. No mitigation would be required.			
18. Tribal Cultural Resources			
MM TCR-1: Sensitivity Training Prior to the start of the Project, Project personnel will attend cultural sensitivity training from the Yocha Dehe Wintun Nation. Contact Yocha Dehe Wintun Nation Tribal Monitor Supervisor, Office: (530) 215-6180.	Yolo County Community Services Department or designee	Prior to construction personnel working on the Project	
19. Utilities/ Service Systems			
The proposed project would not result in significant adverse impacts related to utilities/ service systems. No mitigation would be required.			
20. Wildfire			
The proposed project would not result in significant adverse impacts related to wildfire. No mitigation would be required.			