



**YOLO COUNTY PLANNING, RESOURCES &
PUBLIC WORKS DEPARTMENT**

**INITIAL STUDY/ NEGATIVE DECLARATION
ZONE FILE # 2006-077
ELKHORN PARK TRAIL PROJECT**

October 17, 2006

Negative Declaration / Initial Environmental Study

1. **Project Title:** Zone File No. 2006-077 (Elkhorn Park Trail Project)
2. **Lead Agency Name and Address:**
Yolo County Planning, Resources and Public Works Department
292 West Beamer Street
Woodland, CA 95695
3. **Contact Person and Phone Number:** Stephanie Berg, Associate Planner, at (530) 666-8850 or Stephanie.Berg@yolocounty.org
4. **Project Location:** The project site is located at 18989 Old River Road, directly east of Woodland near the Sacramento River (APN: 042-310-12). (See Figure 1, Vicinity Map.)
5. **Project Sponsor's Name and Address:**
(Same as lead agency.)
6. **General Plan Designation(s):** AG (Agricultural)
7. **Zoning:** A-1 (Agricultural General)

Description of the Project: In response to a requirement of the grant application process announced by the California Resources Agency for funds available through the River Parkways Program, Yolo County has prepared this Initial Study. California voters approved the Water Security, Clean Drinking Water, Coastal and Beach Protection Act of 2002 (Proposition 50) and authorized the appropriation of funds for the acquisition, restoration, protection and development of river parkways.

This grant application proposes construction of a non-motorized pedestrian trail through a mature riparian forest at Elkhorn Regional Park, adjacent to the Sacramento River, and includes habitat protection and restoration measures. Elkhorn Park, maintained by the Parks and Natural Resources Management Division of the Yolo County Planning, Resources and Public Works Department, provides riverside and open space access to the Sacramento River. A boat ramp and boarding floats are provided for boat launching and access to the river, with a picnic area, parking lot, and sanitary facilities. The site includes 40± acres of riparian habitat and public access for fishing, picnicking, bird watching, boating, and nature study. The riparian areas adjacent to the Sacramento River include remnant stands of gallery forests. The Yolo County Open Space and Recreation Element (2002), and the Parks and Open Space Masterplan (2006) calls for creating expanded public access to the open space areas along the Sacramento River. The proposed project would serve to accommodate an increase in the public's interest for access to these public open space areas, as well as provide educational opportunities for increased awareness of the area's rich natural resources.

Proposed construction at Elkhorn Park includes a 1,500-foot long raised platform (universally accessible) trail constructed of post consumer waste lumber (recycled plastic). An additional 400 feet of the trail will also provide accessibility by utilizing an existing paved portion of the parking lot and picnic area. The raised platform trail will be partially constructed in the location of a natural hummock where the soil is stable and

elevated well above the forest floor along the west end of the park. The trail will be sited in areas with minimal vegetation and maximum restorative capabilities. Riparian restoration efforts will include native seeding of grasses, sedges, vines, shrubs, and trees at disturbed portions of the site to stabilize the soil and promote wildlife habitat.

Through the grant application process and project scoping, Yolo County Parks Division staff will commit to various conservation and restorative measures necessary to regulate and protect the ecological diversity of the project area. This commitment includes standards that will be included as requirements for construction specifications. Additionally, should the grant be awarded, the County will contract with riparian forest specialists from the University of California at Davis Department of Wildlife Conservation to perform wildlife assessments prior to construction of the trail. Thus, the trail will be sited accordingly to minimize impacts to wildlife and habitat.

- 8. Surrounding Land Uses and Setting:** Land uses surrounding the site primarily consist of agricultural and recreational areas. The Sacramento River bounds the project site on the eastern boundary, and Old River Road lies to the west. The General Plan land use designation, the zoning designation, and the existing land uses for the subject site and surrounding properties are summarized below.

Direction from Project	Existing Use	Zoning	General Plan
Project Site	Recreational (Elkhorn Regional Park and Boat Ramp)	A-1 (Agricultural General)	Agricultural
North	Open Space (Elkhorn Park)	A-1 (Agricultural General)	Agricultural
South	Farmland	A-1 (Agricultural General)	Agricultural
East	Sacramento River	River	River
West	Farmland	A-1 (Agricultural General)	Agricultural

- 10. Other public agencies whose approval is required:** The Yolo County Parks, Recreation, and Wildlife Advisory Committee; Yolo County Board of Supervisors.
- 11. Other Project Assumptions:** The Initial Study assumes compliance with all applicable State, Federal, and Local Codes and Regulations including, but not limited to, County of Yolo Improvement Standards, the California Building Code, the State Health and Safety Code, and the State Public Resources Code.

ENVIRONMENTAL FACTORS POTENTIALLY AFFECTED:

The environmental factors checked below would be potentially affected by this project, involving at least one impact that is a "Potentially Significant Impact" as indicated by the checklist on the following pages.

- | | | |
|--|---|---|
| <input type="checkbox"/> Aesthetics | <input type="checkbox"/> Agricultural Resources | <input type="checkbox"/> Air Quality |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Biological Resources | <input type="checkbox"/> Cultural Resources | <input type="checkbox"/> Geology / Soils |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Hazards & Hazardous Materials | <input type="checkbox"/> Hydrology / Water Quality | <input type="checkbox"/> Land Use / Planning |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Mineral Resources | <input type="checkbox"/> Noise | <input type="checkbox"/> Population / Housing |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Public Services | <input type="checkbox"/> Recreation | <input type="checkbox"/> Transportation / Traffic |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Utilities / Service Systems | <input type="checkbox"/> Mandatory Findings of Significance | |

DETERMINATION: (To be completed by the Lead Agency)

On the basis of this initial evaluation:

- I find that the proposed project COULD NOT have a significant effect on the environment, and a NEGATIVE DECLARATION will be prepared.
- I find that although the proposed project could have a significant effect on the environment, there will not be a significant effect in this case because revisions in the project have been made by or agreed to by the project proponent. A MITIGATED NEGATIVE DECLARATION will be prepared.
- I find that the proposed project MAY have a significant effect on the environment, and an ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACT REPORT is required.
- I find that the proposed project MAY have a "potentially significant impact" or "potentially significant unless mitigated" impact on the environment, but at least one effect 1) has been adequately analyzed in an earlier document pursuant to applicable legal standards, and 2) has been addressed by mitigation measures based on the earlier analysis as described on attached sheets. An ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACT REPORT is required, but it must analyze only the effects that remain to be addressed.
- I find that although the proposed project could have a significant effect on the environment, because all potentially significant effects (a) have been analyzed adequately in an earlier EIR or NEGATIVE DECLARATION pursuant to applicable standards, and (b) have been avoided or mitigated pursuant to the earlier EIR or NEGATIVE DECLARATION, including revisions or mitigation measures that are imposed upon the proposed project, nothing further is required.

Planner's Signature

Date

Planner's Printed name

PURPOSE OF THIS INITIAL STUDY

This Initial Study has been prepared consistent with CEQA Guidelines Section 15063, to determine if the project as described herein may have a significant effect upon the environment.

EVALUATION OF ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACTS

1. A brief explanation is required for all answers except “No Impact” answers that are adequately supported by the information sources a lead agency cites in the parentheses following each question. A “No Impact” answer is adequately supported if the referenced information sources show that the impact simply does not apply to projects like the one involved (e.g. the project falls outside a fault rupture zone). A “No Impact” answer should be explained where it is based on project-specific factors as well as general standards (e.g., the project will not expose sensitive receptors to pollutants, based on a project-specific screening analysis).
2. All answers must take account of the whole action involved, including off-site as well as on-site, cumulative as well as project-level, indirect as well as direct, and construction as well as operational impacts.
3. Once the lead agency has determined that a particular physical impact may occur, then the checklist answers must indicate whether the impact is potentially significant, less than significant with mitigation, or less than significant. “Potentially Significant Impact” is appropriate if there is substantial evidence that an effect is significant. If there are one or more “Potentially Significant Impact” entries when the determination is made, an EIR is required.
4. “Negative Declaration: Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporated” applies where the incorporation of mitigation measures has reduced an effect from “Potentially Significant Impact” to a “Less Than Significant Impact.” The lead agency must describe the mitigation measures, and briefly explain how they reduce the effect to a less than significant level (mitigation measures from Section XVII, “Earlier Analyses,” may be cross-referenced).
5. A determination that a “Less Than Significant Impact” would occur is appropriate when the project could create some identifiable impact, but the impact would be less than the threshold set by a performance standard or adopted policy. The initial study should describe the impact and state why it is found to be “less than significant.”
6. Earlier analyses may be used where, pursuant to the tiering, program EIR, or other CEQA process, an effect has been adequately analyzed in an earlier EIR or negative declaration, pursuant to Section 15063 (c)(3)(D) of the California Government Code. Earlier analyses are discussed in Section XVII at the end of the checklist.
7. Lead agencies are encouraged to incorporate into the checklist references to information sources for potential impacts (e.g. general plans, zoning ordinances). Reference to a previously prepared or outside document should, where appropriate, include a reference to the page or pages where the statement is substantiated.
8. Supporting Information Sources: A source list should be attached, and other sources used or individuals contacted should be cited in the discussion.

I. AESTHETICS

Would the project:	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporated	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
a) Have a substantial adverse effect on a scenic vista?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
b) Substantially damage scenic resources, including, but not limited to, trees, rock outcroppings, and historic buildings within a state scenic highway?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
c) Substantially degrade the existing visual character or quality of the site and its surroundings?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
d) Create a new source of substantial light or glare which would adversely affect day or nighttime views in the area?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>

Discussion of Impacts

- (a)(b) *No Impact.* The proposed project is located adjacent to the Sacramento River. The project will provide trail access through a riparian corridor. The proposal, which includes construction of a raised platform trail and restoration of riparian habitat, is intended to better serve the recreational experience of visitors to the area. The proposed project is not within the vicinity of a scenic highway and will not impact any scenic vistas or resources.
- c) *No Impact.* The project site is currently used as a river access/boat launch facility, which contains a parking lot, picnic area, and sanitary facilities. The proposal includes construction of a 1,900-foot non-motorized accessible trail through a riparian corridor, as well as habitat restoration. The developed trail and restored vegetation would serve to enhance visitor usage and would not impact the visual character of the site and its surroundings.
- d) *No Impact.* The project would not provide additional light and glare to the site. The park closes at dusk and overnight camping is prohibited.

II. AGRICULTURAL RESOURCES:

In determining whether impacts to agricultural resources are significant environmental effects, lead agencies may refer to the California Agricultural Land Evaluation and Site assessment Model (1997) prepared by the California Department of Conservation as an optional model to use in assessing impacts on agriculture and farmland. Would the project:

Would the project:	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporated	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
(a) Convert Prime Farmland, Unique Farmland, or Farmland of Statewide Importance, as shown on the maps prepared pursuant to the Farmland Mapping and Monitoring Program of the California Resources Agency, to non-agricultural use?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
(b) Conflict with existing zoning for agricultural use or a Williamson Act contract?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
(c) Involve other changes in the existing environment which due to their location or nature, could result in conversion of farmland, to non-agricultural use?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>

Discussion of Impacts

(a)(b)(c) *No Impact.* The proposed project would not result in the conversion of any agricultural land uses. The site of the proposed project is currently used as a boat launch facility and for access to the Sacramento River. Approximately 1,900 feet of trail construction will be developed for non-motorized riparian forest access. This is an agricultural/recreational-related use permitted by existing zoning.

III. AIR QUALITY:

Where applicable, the significance criteria established by the applicable air quality management or air pollution control district may be relied upon to make the following determinations. Would the project:

	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporated	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
a) Conflict with or obstruct implementation of the applicable air quality plan?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
b) Violate any air quality standard or contribute substantially to an existing or projected air quality violation?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
c) Result in a cumulatively considerable net increase of any criteria pollutant for which the project region is non-attainment under an applicable federal or state ambient air quality standard (including releasing emissions which exceed quantitative thresholds for ozone precursors)?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
d) Expose sensitive receptors to substantial pollutant concentrations?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
e) Create objectionable odors affecting a substantial number of people?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>

Discussion of Impacts

The Yolo Solano Air Quality Management District (YSAQMD) has published a set of recommendations that provide specific guidance on evaluating projects under CEQA relative to the above general criteria (YSAQMD, 2002). The Guidelines identify quantitative and qualitative long-term significance thresholds for use in evaluating the significance of criteria air pollutant emissions from project-related mobile and area sources. These thresholds include:

Reactive Organic Gases (ROG)	82 pounds per day (ppd)
Oxides of Nitrogen (NOx)	82 ppd
Particulate Matter (PM ₁₀)	150 ppd
Carbon Monoxide (CO)	550 ppd

Development projects are considered cumulatively significant if:

1. The project requires a change in the existing land use designation (i.e., general plan amendment, rezone); and
2. Projected emissions (ROG, NOx, or PM₁₀) of the project are greater than the emissions anticipated for the site if developed under the existing land use designation.

a) *No Impact.* The project would not substantially conflict with or obstruct implementation of the Yolo Solano Air Quality Management District Air Quality Attainment Plan (1992), the Sacramento Area Regional Ozone Attainment Plan (1994), or the goals and objectives of the County's General Plan.

- b) *Less than Significant Impact.* The Yolo-Solano Region is a non-attainment area for state particulate matter (PM₁₀) and ozone standards, and the Federal ozone standard. The project may contribute to air quality impacts, including PM₁₀, during construction of the recreational trail; however, construction activities, such as hand grubbing and vehicular traffic, would generate a temporary or short-term increase in PM₁₀. Yolo County Parks Division staff would require the incorporation of standard dust and emissions suppression practices established by the Air Pollution Control District for the proposed recreational facility improvements. These standards will be included as requirements in construction specifications. This impact is considered less than significant because only minor amounts of construction dust and equipment emissions would be generated for short periods of time with no long-term exposure to potentially affected groups. Thresholds for project-related air pollutant emissions would not exceed significant levels as set forth in the 2002 YSAQMD Guidelines.
- c) *Less than Significant Impact.* Effects on air quality can be divided into short-term construction-related effects and those associated with long-term aspects of the project. Short-term construction impacts are addressed in (b) above. Long-term mobile source emissions from vehicular traffic from visitor usage would not exceed thresholds established by the Yolo-Solano Air Quality Management District Guidelines (2002) and would not be cumulatively considerable for any non-attainment pollutant from the project. Therefore, the proposed project would not result in a cumulatively considerable net increase of any criteria pollutant.
- d) *No Impact.* The air pollutants generated by the proposed project would be primarily dust and particulate matter during hand grubbing and construction of the recreational trail, as described in (b) above. Dust will be controlled through effective management practices, such as water spraying during construction activity. There are no known sensitive receptors in the project vicinity; therefore the project would not expose sensitive receptors to substantial pollutant concentrations.
- e) *No Impact.* The proposed project and associated uses would not create objectionable odors.

IV. BIOLOGICAL RESOURCES

Would the project:	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporated	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
a) Have a substantial adverse effect, either directly or through habitat modifications, on any species identified as a candidate, sensitive, or special status in local or regional plans, policies, or regulations, or by the California Department of Fish and Game or U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
b) Have a substantial adverse effect on any riparian habitat or sensitive natural community identified in local or regional plans, policies, or regulations, or by the California Department of Fish and Game or U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
c) Have a substantial adverse effect on federally protected wetlands as defined by Section 404 of the Clean Water Act (including, but not limited to, marsh, vernal pool, coastal, etc.) through direct removal, filling, hydrological interruption, or other means?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
d) Interfere substantially with the movement of any native resident or migratory fish or wildlife species or with established native residents or migratory wildlife corridors or impede the use of native wildlife nursery sites?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
e) Conflict with any local policies or ordinances protecting biological resources, such as a tree preservation policy or ordinance?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>

- f) Conflict with the provisions of an adopted Habitat Conservation Plan, Natural Community Conservation Plan, or other approved local, regional, or state habitat conservation plan?

Discussion of Impacts

a) *Less than Significant Impact.* The proposed project includes construction of a 1,900-foot non-motorized accessible trail in the southwestern portion of the park. The site supports native grasses, vines, shrubs, and multiple oak, black walnut, cottonwood, willow, box elder, and non-native species of plants. According to the Yolo County Open Space & Recreational Element, the project site supports a heron rookery in a tall stand of trees north of the boat ramp. A western yellow-billed cuckoo has also been sighted at the park. The riparian vegetation provides a varied habitat for wildlife and supports the overall biological diversity of the area. As a preliminary measure, Yolo County Parks Division staff commissioned the services of a qualified biologist (Craig D. Thomsen, M.S., Natural Resource Management). In October 2006, he conducted a biological survey of the project vicinity in order to identify any sensitive species that could be affected by the project’s proposal. According to Mr. Thomsen’s evaluation (October 12, 2006), the ecology of the underlying forest would not be significantly impacted by development of the trail because the trail is proposed as an elevated platform above the forest floor, will not require the removal of any trees, and will not be installed through the use of heavy equipment. Vegetation within the vicinity of the proposed project, consisting primarily of California blackberry (*Rubus ursinus*), regenerates quickly after minor disturbances, such as cutting or trampling involved in trail construction. Productivity and growth rates in riparian forests are generally high. Due to the raised profile of the trail, vegetative recovery from understory plants would be rapid. Long-term impacts to wildlife and vegetation from visitor usage are also expected to be minimal. The County will incorporate Best Management Practices into the project’s construction specifications in order to reduce any potential impacts to sensitive or special status species to a less than significant level. The County will also ensure that conservation and land stewardship issues are addressed and maintained through the park’s recreational enhancement features.

Swainson’s Hawk

The Swainson’s hawk (*Buteo swainsoni*) is a State-listed threatened species known to occur within the vicinity of the project area. The Swainson’s hawk is a large, broad-winged raptor that frequents undeveloped open space. The species migrates annually between its nesting grounds in the western United States, northwestern Canada and Mexico and its wintering grounds in South America. In California, Swainson’s hawks nest throughout most of the Central Valley floor, however, the majority of the known nesting sites (more than 85 percent) are found within the riparian systems of Sacramento, Yolo, and San Joaquin Counties. Nest sites are generally adjacent to or within easy flying distance of open agricultural fields that provide suitable foraging opportunities. Swainson’s hawks typically begin arriving and establishing nesting territories in the Sacramento region in early March and nest construction and courtship continues through April. The young fledge approximately 42 to 44 days after hatching and remain with their parents until they depart in the fall.

In the event that active nests are identified during the project’s breeding bird surveys and/or biological assessments, Yolo County will consult with the California Department of Fish and Game (CDFG) in order to determine a course of action that will ensure that impacts to the hawk are less than significant. As a condition of construction specifications, the County will require three pre-construction bird surveys that will identify any nests within proximity of the site [see (b) below].

Impacts to Heron Rookery

The park’s dense riparian forest supports a heron rookery located in the tall trees north of the boat ramp in an area restricted from development. (An agreement with the State Reclamation Board prevents any development in the northern region of the park.) The trail is proposed to locate in the southwestern portion of the park, just beyond the picnic areas (nearly 1,000 feet away from the rookery). No trees are proposed for removal and it is unlikely that construction activities will impact the rookery. However, should the pre-construction bird surveys and/or biological assessment find otherwise, construction will be phased to avoid any breeding activity.

Impacts to Fish Species

The project site is located adjacent the Sacramento River. There will be no in channel construction and/or removal of any in channel riparian vegetation as a result of the site construction activities. However, construction of the proposed trail through a riparian corridor has the potential to affect individual fish of three protected species: steelhead trout (*Oncorhynchus mykiss*), chinook salmon (fall-run) (*Oncorhynchus tshawytscha*), and delta smelt (*Hypomesus transpacificus*). Potential affects include increases in turbidity and water temperature, or the release of pollutants from the construction site.

A variety of construction practices will be implemented through the project's construction specifications to ensure that any potential impacts to the protected species listed above, as well as other fish species, are less than significant. The practices will consist of erosion control measures to prevent soil and sediment from entering the river.

- b) *Less than Significant Impact.* The dominant natural features in the vicinity of the project site are the Sacramento River and the riparian forest that parallels its western bank. The ecological value of riparian forests to wildlife, including neo-tropical migratory birds (some of which are special-status species), is well documented. Riparian habitats provide food, nesting sites, cover, and migration corridors. Over 135 species of California birds either completely depend upon or use riparian habitats at some stage of their life. According to Mr. Thomsen's biological evaluation (October 12, 2006), the site's habitat quality is such that other special-status or "focal" riparian bird species are also likely to occur at the site. Prior to any trail construction, the County will contract with a riparian forest specialist to conduct breeding bird surveys to identify species and fully assess the use of the site by nesting birds. Wildlife specialists from the University of California at Davis Department of Wildlife Conservation will be commissioned by the County to perform the wildlife assessments. The survey will consist of three spring visits at well-defined intervals during migration and the breeding season. The survey will be used as a guide for visitor access and trail alignment, while providing information for educational use.

As indicated above, the greatest potential impact to the site's habitat communities will be during the trail construction period. Ground disturbance will be minimal and will include placing a platform trail on stabilized soil with no existing areas of erosion. A natural hummock will be used to align and elevate a majority of the trail above the forest floor. Although some disturbance to native vegetation is inevitable, construction specifications included in the project scope will include avoiding outright removal of important habitat plants such as wild grape (*Vitis californica*) or Dutchman's pipe (*Aristolochia californica*) should they occur in the path of the trail. According to Mr. Thomsen's biological evaluation, evidence of vegetation disturbance from trail construction would be unlikely after one growing season due to rapid regrowth rates in a riparian forest. Prior to construction of the trail, County staff will conduct an additional biological assessment to further evaluate potential vegetation disturbance. Findings of the additional biological survey and the above mentioned breeding bird surveys will be used to determine seasonal use, visitor numbers, and ultimate trail location.

Enhancing recreational opportunities may provide visitors with a better understanding for the area's natural resources and thus minimize impacts to sensitive areas. In addition, the County may provide installation of an educational panel to increase awareness of the project's sensitive areas. In order to maintain a less than significant impact to on-site resources, the County will incorporate the following practices in the construction specifications: (1) Existing vegetation will be fenced off during construction; (2) Disturbed areas will be revegetated with native seeds; (3) Specified areas of riparian habitat will undergo restoration; and, (4) Three bird surveys and one additional biological assessment will be conducted prior to construction and trail alignment to determine nesting grounds and establish areas of sensitivity.

- c) *Less than Significant Impact.* The Sacramento River is classified as navigable water of the United States. Actions affecting the river require evaluation and permitting according to Section 10 of the Rivers and Harbors Act and Sections 301, 402 and 404 of the Clean Water Act, which are administered by the U.S. Army Corps of Engineers (USACOE). Construction of an accessible trail

through the riparian corridor adjacent to the river will not require dredging or discharging activities. However, development of a trail on a natural hummock and revegetation of existing riparian areas may require Yolo County to obtain a permit pursuant to Section 404 of the Clean Water Act prior to construction activities.

d) *Less than Significant Impact.* See (a) and (b) above.

(e)(f) *Less than Significant Impact.* Constructing a universally accessible trail would not conflict with any local policies or ordinances, or with the provisions of any adopted Habitat Conservation Plan (HCP), Natural Community Conservation Plan (NCCP), or other approved local, regional, or state habitat conservation plan. The executive director of the Yolo County HCP/NCCP concurs with the project's proposal to conduct spring bird surveys and an additional biological assessment prior to development of a trail through the riparian forest (Maria Wong, October 2006). Aligning the trail in accordance with these wildlife assessments will ensure that impacts to biological resources remain less than significant.

V. CULTURAL RESOURCES

Would the project:	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporated	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
a) Cause a substantial adverse change in the significance of a historical resource as defined in §15064.5?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
b) Cause a substantial adverse change in the significance of an archaeological resource pursuant to §15064.5?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
c) Directly or indirectly destroy a unique paleontological resource or site or unique geologic feature?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
d) Disturb any human remains, including those interred outside of formal cemeteries?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>

Discussion of Impacts

a) *No impact.* The project site is not known to have any historical significant or significant characteristics as defined by the criteria within the CEQA Guidelines.

(b)(c) *Less than Significant Impact.* The project site provides access to areas along the Sacramento River. Many Native American villages existed on the banks of the Sacramento River, prior to the settlement of western Europeans. A detailed investigation of the potential archaeological resources will be conducted by the Northwest Resources Center at Sonoma State University. The County will incorporate the following requirements into the construction specifications: (1) Trail enhancement/development will be routed away from any identified archaeologically sensitive areas; (2) Yolo County staff will pursue any necessary agreements with local Native American representatives to assist with periodic monitoring of any potential sensitive site(s); (3) Any interpretive and/or educational materials that may be provided will emphasize the value of preserving sensitive areas by discouraging high use in these areas. Since the project proposes no grading activity, it is unlikely impacts to archaeological or paleontological resources would be significant.

d) *Less than Significant Impact.* No human remains are known or predicted to exist in the project area. However, the potential exists during construction to uncover previously unidentified resources. The County will incorporate the following requirements into the construction specifications: Section 7050.5 of the California Health and Safety Code states that when human remains are discovered, no further site disturbance shall occur until the County coroner has determined that the remains are not subject to the provisions of Section 27491 of the Government Code or any other related provisions of law concerning investigation of the circumstances, manner and cause of any death, and the

recommendations concerning the treatment and disposition of the human remains have been made to the person responsible for the excavation, in the manner provided in Section 5097.98 of the Public Resources Code. If the coroner determines that the remains are not subject to his or her authority and the remains are recognized to be those of a Native American, the coroner shall contact the Native American Heritage Commission within 24 hours.

VI. GEOLOGY AND SOILS

Would the project:	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporated	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
a) Expose people or structures to potential substantial adverse effects, including the risk of loss, injury, or death involving:	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
i) Rupture of a known earthquake fault, as delineated on the most recent Alquist-Priolo Earthquake Fault Zoning Map issued by the State Geologist for the area or based on other substantial evidence of a known Fault? Refer to Division of Mines and Geology Special Publication 42.				
ii) Strong seismic ground shaking?				
iii) Seismic-related ground failure, including liquefaction?				
iv) Landslides?				
b) Result in substantial soil erosion or the loss of topsoil?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
c) Be located on a geologic unit or soil that is unstable or that would become unstable as a result of the project, and potentially result in on- or off-site landslide, lateral spreading, subsidence, liquefaction or collapse?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
d) Be located on expansive soil, as defined in Table 18-1-B of the Uniform Building Code (1994), creating substantial risks to life or property?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
e) Have soils incapable of adequately supporting the use of septic tanks or alternative wastewater disposal systems where sewers are not available for the disposal of wastewater?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>

Discussion of Impacts

a) *Less than Significant Impact.*

- (i) The project site can be expected to experience moderate to strong ground shaking during future seismic events along major active faults throughout Northern California or on smaller active faults located in the project vicinity. However, the project will comply with all applicable Uniform Building Code and County Improvement Standards and Specifications requirements.
- (ii) Any major earthquake damage on the project site is likely to occur from ground shaking, and seismically related ground and structural failures. Local soil conditions, such as soil strength, thickness, density, water content, and firmness of underlying bedrock affect seismic response. Seismically induced shaking and some damage should be expected to occur during a major event but damage should be no more severe in the project area than elsewhere in the region. No structures are proposed for construction. Therefore, people and structures would not be exposed to potential substantial adverse effects involving strong seismic ground shaking.

- (iii) Geologic hazard impacts that are associated with expansive soils include long-term differential settlement and cracking of foundations, disruption and cracking of paved surfaces, underground utilities, canals, and pipelines. No structures are proposed for construction. Any future proposals for construction of a structure will require building permits that will be issued in compliance with the Yolo County Planning, Resources and Public Works Department.
- (iv) The project site is relatively level; approval of the project would not expose people or structures to potential landslides.
- b) *No Impact.* Existing Yolo County regulations require that a Storm Water Pollution Prevention Plan be obtained before grading on one acre or more can occur, which requires the use of soil erosion control techniques in order to reduce the possibility of any significant soil erosion from occurring.
- c) *No Impact.* The project site is not located on unstable geologic materials, and will not affect the stability of the underlying materials or the underlying materials to potentially result in on- or off-site landslide, lateral spreading, subsidence, liquefaction or collapse. Since the project proposes no construction of any permanent facilities or dwelling units the potential for exposure to a geological event is unlikely.
- d) *No Impact.* Geologic hazard impacts that are associated with expansive soils include long-term differential settlement and cracking of foundations, disruption and cracking of paved surfaces, underground utilities, canals, and pipelines. However, the project proposes no construction of permanent structures or dwelling units and as such would not pose a threat to people or property.
- e) *No Impact.* No septic tanks are proposed for the project. The project site is currently equipped with sanitary facilities already in use by the public.

VII. HAZARDS AND HAZARDOUS MATERIALS

Would the project:	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporated	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
a) Create a significant hazard to the public or the environment through the routine transport, use, or disposal of hazardous materials?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
b) Create a significant hazard to the public or the environment through reasonably foreseeable upset and accident conditions involving the release of hazardous materials into the environment?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
c) Emit hazardous emissions or handle hazardous or acutely hazardous materials, substances, or waste within one-quarter mile of an existing or proposed school?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
d) Be located on a site which is included on a list of hazardous materials sites compiled pursuant to Government Code Section 65962.5 and, as a result, would it create a significant hazard to the public or the environment?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
e) For a project located within an airport land use plan or, where such a plan has not been adopted, within two miles of a public airport or public use airport, would the project result in a safety hazard for people residing or working in the project area?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
f) For a project within the vicinity of a private airstrip, would the project result in a safety hazard for people residing or working within the project area?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>

- | | | | | |
|--|--------------------------|--------------------------|--------------------------|-------------------------------------|
| g) Impair implementation of or physically interfere with an adopted emergency response plan or emergency evacuation plan? | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> |
| h) Expose people or structures to a significant risk of loss, injury or death involving wildland fires, including where wildlands are adjacent to urbanized areas or where residences are intermixed with wildlands? | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> |

Discussion of Impacts

- a) *No Impact.* The proposed project would not result in any new transport, use or disposal of hazardous materials beyond existing levels, and all hazardous materials will be stored and handled in accordance with all applicable federal, state, and local requirements, including Yolo County Environmental Health Department regulations.
- b) *Less than Significant Impact.* Construction of the proposed accessible trail will involve the use of equipment that uses small amounts of oils and fuels and other potentially flammable substances typically associated with construction activities. The project would not, however, result in a significant risk of explosion or accidental release of hazardous substances. Therefore, impacts from the accidental release of hazardous materials into the environment are less than significant.
- c) *No Impact.* The proposed project would not result in any new hazardous emissions or hazardous materials. Normal construction techniques and materials would be used and no hazardous materials would be used or removed from the site. The project is not located within a quarter mile of a school.
- d) *No Impact.* The project site is not located on a site that is included on a list of hazardous materials sites compiled by the Yolo County Environmental Health Department-Hazardous Waste Site Files pursuant to Government Code 65962.5. The proposed project would not expose people to known existing sources of potential health hazards.
- e) *No Impact.* The project is located within the overflight zone of the Sacramento International Airport. However, the proposed project is a compatible land use for airport safety standards set by the Sacramento County General Plan Airport Land Use Policy and will not result in a safety hazard for people residing or working within the vicinity. Additionally, the project site is an existing recreational area in use as a regional park.
- f) *No Impact.* The project site is not located within the vicinity of a private airstrip.
- g) *No impact.* The project would not interfere with any adopted emergency response or evacuation plans.
- h) *No Impact.* The project site is located in a riparian forest adjacent to the Sacramento River in an area where groundwater recharge is significant and fuel levels remain low. Risk of wildland fire in the project vicinity is unlikely.

VIII. HYDROLOGY AND WATER QUALITY

Would the project:	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporated	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
a) Violate any water quality standards or waste discharge requirements?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
b) Significantly deplete groundwater supplies or interfere substantially with groundwater recharge such that there would be a net deficit in aquifer volume or a lowering of the local groundwater table level (e.g., the production rate of pre-existing nearby wells would drop to a level which would not support existing land uses or planned uses for which permits have been granted)?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
c) Substantially alter the existing drainage pattern of the site or area, including through the alteration of the course of a stream or river, in a manner which would result in substantial erosion or siltation on- or off-site?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
d) Substantially alter the existing drainage pattern of the site or area, including through the alteration of the course of a stream or river, or substantially increase the rate or amount of surface runoff in a manner which would result in flooding on- or off-site?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
e) Create or contribute runoff water which would exceed the capacity of existing or planned stormwater drainage systems or provide substantial additional sources of polluted runoff?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
f) Otherwise substantially degrade water quality?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
g) Place housing within a 100-year flood hazard area as mapped on a federal Flood Hazard Boundary or Flood Insurance Rate Map or other flood hazard delineation map?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
h) Place within a 100-year flood hazard area structures which would impede or redirect flood flows?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
i) Expose people or structures to a significant risk of loss, injury or death involving flooding, including flooding as a result of the failure of a levee or dam?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
j) Inundation by seiche, tsunami, or mudflow?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>

Discussion of Impacts

- a) *No Impact.* There will be no project related runoff associated with the proposal. The project would not cause violations of existing water quality standards or waste discharge requirements.
- b) *No Impact.* The proposed uses would not deplete groundwater supplies or interfere with groundwater recharge. Therefore, there will be no impacts to groundwater production rates.
- c) *Less than Significant Impact.* The project includes development of a raised platform trail that includes approximately 1,500 feet of raised wood (recycled plastic) on stabilized soil areas and 400 feet of existing paved areas. The project may be required to submit a SWPPP for regulation under the National Pollutant Discharge Elimination System (NPDES) for the disturbance of an area greater than one acre. In addition, grading plans would be required for any future proposed construction and would address erosion control and drainage, as a requirement of construction specifications. To alleviate

potential erosion impacts to the Sacramento River, the project would be designed and constructed to address Best Management Practices (BMPs) as included in the Yolo County Storm Water Management Program prepared by the Yolo County Planning, Resources, and Public Works Department (last revised in March 2004). Prior to the start of construction, Yolo County would prepare an Erosion and Sediment Control Plan which describes the implementation schedule and maintenance schedule for erosion control measures selected to prevent siltation impacts on the Sacramento River as a result of uncontrolled runoff from disturbed areas on the site. The BMPs may include, but are not limited to, silt fences, hay bales, sediment detention traps/basins, berms and revegetation. Therefore, the project would not provide significant additional sources of runoff pollution and impacts would be less than significant.

- d) *No Impact.* The proposed project will not change absorption rates, drainage patterns, and the rate and amount of surface runoff. Revegetation of the riparian areas would prevent further erosion and promote absorption. The overall effect of the proposed project would not substantially alter the existing drainage pattern of the project site or the surrounding area and would not, therefore, result in substantial erosion or siltation on- or off-site. The project would not result in any additional flooding on- or off-site.
- e) *No Impact.* The project site does not have access to any existing or proposed storm water drainage systems.
- f) *No Impact.* See (a) and (e) above. No additional impacts to water quality are anticipated.
- g) *No Impact.* A significant portion of the project site is located within the 100-year floodplain, as designated by the Federal Emergency Management Agency (FEMA). However, no permanent structures, other than the raised platform trail, are proposed for this project.
- h) *No Impact.* See g) above. The trail, proposed for location in areas of flood zone 'A' as designated by FEMA, will not impede flood flows.
- i) *Less than Significant Impact.* The project site is located immediately adjacent to a levee that could expose individuals to risk from flooding. The Sacramento River is a watercourse subject to severe flood events. The levee system is managed by local reclamation district 827 for irrigation purposes. The structures are annually inspected by the State and inspected and managed daily by the Yolo County Flood Control Districts. In the event of a flood condition, the park would be closed and the trail would be inaccessible. Thus, exposure to people to a significant risk of injury due to flooding is less than significant.
- j) *No Impact.* The project area is not located near any large bodies of water that would pose a seiche or tsunami hazard.

IX. LAND USE AND PLANNING

Would the project:	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporated	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
a) Physically divide an established community?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
b) Conflict with any applicable land use plan, policy, or regulation of an agency with jurisdiction over the project (including, but not limited to the general plan, specific plan, local coastal program, or zoning ordinance) adopted for the purpose of avoiding or mitigating an environmental effect?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
c) Conflict with any applicable habitat conservation plan or natural community conservation plan?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>

Discussion of Impacts

- a) *No impact.* The project is a proposal for enhancements to a recreational area, located within an agricultural/river district and surrounded by recreational and open space uses.
- b) *No Impact.* The project site is zoned for agricultural use with a history of recreational and open space uses.
- c) *No Impact.* The County does not have an adopted HCP or NCCP. The project would not conflict with the Yolo County Draft Natural Community Conservation Plan.

X. MINERAL RESOURCES

Would the project:	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporated	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
a) Result in the loss of availability of a known mineral resource that would be of value to the region and the residents of the state?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
b) Result in the loss of availability of a locally-important mineral resource recovery site delineated on a local general plan, specific plan or other land use plan?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>

Discussion of Impacts

- a) *No impact.* The project site is not designated as an area of significant aggregate deposits, as classified by the State Department of Mines and Geology.
- b) *No Impact.* See response to X(a).

XI. NOISE

Would the project result in:	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporated	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
a) Exposure of persons to or generation of noise levels in excess of standards established in the local general plan or noise ordinance, or applicable standards of other agencies?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
b) Exposure of persons to or generation of excessive groundborne vibration noise levels?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
c) A substantial permanent increase in ambient noise levels in the project vicinity above levels existing without the project?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
d) A substantial temporary or periodic increase in ambient noise levels in the project vicinity above levels existing without the project?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
e) For a project located within an airport land use plan or, where such a plan has not been adopted within two miles of a public airport or public use airport, would the project expose people residing or working in the project area to excessive noise levels?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
f) For a project within the vicinity of a private airstrip, would the project expose people residing or working in the project area to excessive noise levels?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>

Discussion of Impacts

- a) *No Impact.* The construction of a non-motorized accessible trail will not generate excessive levels of new noise. Noise levels at the recreational area will negligible.
- b) *No Impact.* Potential ground borne vibration may occur during construction of the project. However, construction of the trail would primarily occur through hand grubbing and is not expected to be significant.

- c) *No Impact.* See (a) above. The proposed recreational trail would not increase overall ambient noise within the immediate vicinity and would not create a substantial permanent noise source.
- d) *Less than Significant Impact.* Construction of the trail may involve the use of trucks and equipment that create noise, as indicated in (b) above. However, temporary and periodic impacts related to construction noise are expected to be less than significant.
- e) *Less than Significant Impact.* The project is located within the vicinity of the Sacramento International Airport. However, the project will not expose people residing or working in the project area to aircraft noise levels in excess of applicable standards.
- f) *No Impact.* The project site is not located near a private airstrip and would not be exposed to noise from any private airstrip.

XII. POPULATION

Would the project:	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporated	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
a) Induce substantial population growth in an area, either directly (e.g., by proposing new homes and businesses) or indirectly (e.g., through the extension of roads or other infrastructure)?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
b) Displace substantial numbers of existing housing, necessitating the construction of replacement housing elsewhere?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
c) Displace substantial numbers of people, necessitating the construction of replacement housing elsewhere?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>

Discussion of Impacts

(a)(b)(c) *No Impact.* The proposed project includes enhancements to a recreational/open space setting. The project site is a regional park with a boat ramp launch currently in public use. Construction of an accessible trail would not induce substantial population growth in the area, would not displace any existing housing, and would not displace any people.

XIII. PUBLIC SERVICES

Would the project result in substantial adverse physical impacts associated with the provision of new or physically altered governmental facilities, need for new or physically altered governmental facilities, the construction of which could cause significant environmental impacts, in order to maintain acceptable service rations, response time or other performance objectives for any of the public services:

	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporated	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
a) Fire protection?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
b) Police Protection?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
c) Schools?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
d) Parks?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
e) Other public facilities?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>

Discussion of Impacts

- a) *No Impact.* The Elkhorn Fire District provides primary service to the project site. Construction of an accessible use trail would not create an impact to fire protection services.
- b) *Less than Significant Impact.* The proposed trail may increase visitor usage, however the increase in use would not be expected to significantly impact police services provided by the Yolo County Sheriff's Department.
- (c)(d)(e) *No Impact.* The proposed development of a trail would provide further recreational opportunities and would not increase the need for schools, parks or other public facilities and services.

XIV. RECREATION

	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporated	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
a) Would the project increase the use of existing neighborhood and regional parks or other recreational facilities such that substantial physical deterioration of the facility would occur or be accelerated?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
b) Does the project include recreational facilities or require the construction or expansion of recreational facilities which might have been an adverse physical effect on the environment?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>

Discussion of Impacts

- a) *No Impact.* The proposed project would add to recreational opportunities in the area and is a response to an overall regional need for increased access to recreational and open space areas.
- b) *No Impact.* The project would not require the construction of nor include additional recreational facilities. The project proposes an enhancement to existing recreational and open space uses and includes restoration and revegetation provisions.

XV. TRANSPORTATION/TRAFFIC

Would the project:	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporated	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
a) Cause an increase in traffic which is substantial in relation to the existing traffic load and capacity of the street system (i.e., result in a substantial increase on either the number of vehicle trips, the volume to capacity ratio on roads, or congestion at intersections)?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
b) Exceed, either individually or cumulatively, a level of service standard established by the county congestion management agency for designated roads or highways?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
c) Result in a change in air traffic patterns, including either an increase in traffic levels or a change in location that results in substantial safety risks?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
d) Substantially increase hazards due to a design feature (e.g., sharp curves or dangerous intersections) or incompatible uses (e.g., farm equipment)?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>

- | | | | | |
|--|--------------------------|--------------------------|--------------------------|-------------------------------------|
| e) Result in inadequate emergency access? | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> |
| f) Result in inadequate parking capacity? | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> |
| g) Conflict with adopted policies, plans, or programs supporting alternative transportation (e.g., bus turnouts, bicycle racks)? | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> |

Discussion of Impacts

- a) *Less than Significant Impact.* Development of a non-motorized accessible trail may generate additional truck trips for the construction period. However, this increase is only temporary during construction activity, and is not expected to significantly impact existing levels of traffic in the project vicinity. The proposed project is not anticipated to increase vehicle trips to the project site.
- b) *No Impact.* Long-term changes to local traffic circulation resulting from the proposed project will be negligible. The project site is currently in operation as a regional park and boat launch facility with an established parking area. The addition of an accessible pedestrian trail will not affect levels of service on any nearby State or County roads.
- c) *No Impact.* The project would not affect air traffic patterns.
- d) *No Impact.* The project does not incorporate design features that would substantially increase hazards or introduce incompatible uses.
- e) *No Impact.* The proposed project would not result in inadequate emergency access.
- f) *No Impact.* On-site parking is available in an existing paved parking lot established for the regional park and boat launch facility. Demand is not expected to exceed the lot's parking capacity.
- g) *No Impact.* The project would not conflict with adopted policies, plans, or programs supporting alternative transportation.

XVI. UTILITIES AND SERVICE SYSTEMS

Would the project:	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporated	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
a) Exceed wastewater treatment requirements of the applicable Regional Water Quality Control Board?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
b) Require or result in the construction of new water or wastewater treatment facilities or expansion of existing facilities, the construction of which could cause significant environmental effects?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
c) Require or result in the construction of new storm water drainage facilities or expansion of existing facilities, the construction of which could cause significant environmental effects?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
d) Have sufficient water supplies available to serve the project from existing entitlements and resources, or are new or expanded entitlements needed?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>

NEGATIVE DECLARATION/INITIAL STUDY CHECKLIST

- | | | | | |
|---|--------------------------|--------------------------|--------------------------|-------------------------------------|
| e) Result in a determination by the wastewater treatment provider which serves or may serve the project that it has adequate capacity to serve the project's projected demand in addition to the provider's existing commitments? | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> |
| f) Be served by a landfill with sufficient permitted capacity to accommodate the project's solid waste disposal needs? | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> |
| g) Comply with federal, state, and local statutes and regulations related to solid waste. | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> |

Discussion of Impacts

(a)(b)(c) *No Impact.* The project would not exceed any wastewater treatment requirements, require construction of new water or wastewater treatment facilities, or require the construction or expansion of storm water drainage facilities.

(d)(e) *No Impact.* No new water entitlements or wastewater services are required to accommodate the project.

(f)(g) *No Impact.* The existing County landfill would adequately accommodate refuse from the project. Thus, the project would not impact disposal capacity at the landfill. Additionally, the proposed project would be required to comply with all solid waste regulations as implemented and enforced by Yolo County.

Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporated	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
--------------------------------------	---	------------------------------------	--------------

XVII. MANDATORY FINDINGS OF SIGNIFICANCE --

- | | | | | |
|--|--------------------------|--------------------------|-------------------------------------|-------------------------------------|
| a) Does the project have the potential to degrade the quality of the environment, substantially reduce the habitat of a fish or wildlife species, cause a fish or wildlife population to drop below self-sustaining levels, threaten to eliminate a plant or animal community, reduce the number or restrict the range of a rare or endangered plant or animal or eliminate important examples of the major periods of California history or prehistory? | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> |
| b) Does the project have impacts that are individually limited, but cumulatively considerable? ("Cumulatively considerable" means that the incremental effects of a project are considerable when viewed in connection with the effects of past projects, the effects of other current projects, and the effects of probably future projects)? | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> |
| c) Does the project have environment effects which will cause substantial adverse effects on human beings, either directly or indirectly? | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> |

Discussion of Impacts

a) *Less than Significant Impact.* Based on the information provided in this Initial Study, potential environmental impacts of the project would be less than significant. Important examples of major

periods of California history or prehistory in California include Native American villages located along the Sacramento River before 1854. However, requirements in the project scope will ensure protection of archaeological resources. Based on the analysis provided in this Initial Study and the regulatory agencies involved with the project, the habitat and/or range of any special status plants, habitat, or plants would not be substantially reduced or eliminated. Restoration and conservation provisions provided in the project scope ensure impacts to habitat would be less than significant.

- b) *No Impact.* Based on the analysis provided in this Initial Study, there would be no potential cumulative impacts of the project.
- c) *No Impact.* Based on the analysis provided in this Initial Study, the project would not have substantial adverse effects on human beings, either directly or indirectly.

REFERENCES

- Grant application materials and project scope
- Yolo County General Plan and Open Space & Recreational Element
- Sacramento County Airport Land Use Policy
- Evaluation of Proposed Trail at Elkhorn Regional Park, Yolo County (Craig D. Thomsen, M.S. October 12, 2006)