

EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

INTRODUCTION

This document is the Final Environmental Impact Statement/Environmental Impact Report (EIS/EIR) for the Yolo Habitat Conservation Plan/Natural Community Conservation Plan (HCP/NCCP or Plan). The Draft EIS/EIR was circulated for public review for 90-days from June 1, 2017 to August 30, 2017. All comments received are provided in Chapter 24, *Responses to Comments*, of this Final EIS/EIR. Consistent with the requirements of the National Environmental Policy Act (NEPA) and the California Environmental Quality Act (CEQA), responses are provided to all comments. Comments received on the Draft HCP/NCCP during the public review period, and responses to those comments, are also provided in Chapter 24. Edits to the Draft EIS/EIR resulting from responses to comments, edits to the Draft HCP/NCCP, or other sources (e.g., spelling or grammatical corrections identified by document preparers) are reflected in this Final EIS/EIR.

The Yolo Habitat Conservancy (Conservancy) is a joint powers agency organized under California law which consists of Yolo County and the incorporated cities of Davis, West Sacramento, Winters, and Woodland. The Conservancy, as well as individual member agencies developed the Yolo HCP/NCCP (or Plan). This HCP/NCCP provides the basis for issuance of long-term species “take” permits under the federal Endangered Species Act (FESA) and California Natural Community Conservation Planning Act (NCCPA) that cover an array of public and private activities, including activities that are essential to the ongoing viability of Yolo County’s agricultural and urban economies. Specifically, the Permittees (i.e., Yolo County, the four incorporated cities, and the Conservancy) are applying for permits from both the U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service (USFWS) and the California Department of Fish and Wildlife (CDFW) for take of 12 covered species resulting from five categories of covered activities. This action is pursuant to Section 10(a)(1)(B) of the FESA and Section 2835 of the NCCPA chapter of the California Fish and Game Code (Fish & Game Code). The purpose of developing the Yolo HCP/NCCP is to facilitate obtaining an incidental take permit (ITP) from the USFWS and a NCCPA permit from CDFW and to develop a long-term conservation strategy to protect and contribute to the conservation and management of covered species and natural communities in Yolo County while allowing for development and maintenance activities that are compatible with other local policies and regulations. The area covered by the proposed HCP/NCCP encompasses all of Yolo County, California (Exhibit ES-1. *Location of the Plan Area*).

This EIS/EIR evaluates the potential impacts of the Proposed Action and alternatives to approving the Proposed Action (including a No Action Alternative). The Plan (or Proposed Action Alternative) would include issuance of permits by USFWS and CDFW (collectively referred to as the Wildlife Agencies) for take of 12 covered species resulting from five categories of covered activities, and approval of an implementing agreement (IA) for the proposed Plan. The EIS/EIR has been prepared pursuant to NEPA (42 United States Code [USC 4321; 40 Code of Federal Regulations [CFR] 1500.1); the President’s Council on Environmental Quality (CEQ) guidelines on implementing NEPA; CESA (Fish and Game Code, Sections 86 and 2050-2085); CEQA (Pub. Res. Code Secs. 21000-21178.1); and the State CEQA Guidelines.

As explained in more detail in the following section, the purpose of this EIS/EIR is to inform agency decision makers and the public regarding the potential environmental effects of the Proposed Action and alternatives, whether such effects are significant, potential measures to mitigate significant effects, and potential alternatives that could reduce significant adverse environmental impacts.

OVERVIEW OF NEPA AND CEQA COMPLIANCE

National Environmental Policy Act

NEPA provides an interdisciplinary framework for federal agencies to inform themselves, other federal, state, tribal, and local governmental entities, and the public of the possible effects upon the environment that may result from implementing proposed federal actions. NEPA also contains action-forcing procedures to ensure that federal agency decision makers consider environmental values alongside technical and economic considerations that are inherent factors in federal decision making when making a decision on whether and to what extent a proposed action, or an alternative, should be implemented. NEPA applies to all federal agencies in the executive branch and to most of the activities they manage, regulate, or fund that affect the human environment. It requires all agencies to consider the potential environmental consequences of their proposed actions, to disclose those potential effects to the public and, when required by law or regulation, seek public comment and input on those effects. It is also intended to foster intergovernmental coordination and cooperation and to enhance public participation in government planning and decision making. CEQ has adopted regulations and other guidance that provides detailed procedures that federal agencies must follow to implement NEPA. In addition to the CEQ's NEPA regulations, each agency has implemented their own NEPA implementing procedures, frequently through the issuance of regulations, that recognize each agency's unique mandate and mission.

A primary intent of this joint EIS/EIR is to support Lead Agency compliance with NEPA. The USFWS, as the Lead Agency under NEPA, has determined that the decision to permit a regional HCP/NCCP in Yolo County may result in a significant effect upon the environment, and that an EIS must be prepared in order to fully comply with their NEPA obligations. NEPA requires federal agencies to consider and disclose the environmental effects of their proposed actions (in this instance, USFWS issuance of an ITP), and include public participation in the planning and implementation of their actions.

California Environmental Quality Act

CEQA requires state and local agencies to estimate and evaluate the environmental implications of their actions and seeks to prevent adverse environmental impacts of those actions by requiring those agencies, when feasible, to avoid or reduce significant environmental impacts. The State CEQA Guidelines are the primary source of rules and, together with published court decisions, interpretation of CEQA.

A primary intent of this joint EIS/EIR is to support Lead Agency compliance with CEQA. According to CEQA, if a lead agency determines that a project may have a significant effect on the environment, the lead agency shall prepare an EIR (CCR Section 15064(f)(1)). The Conservancy, as the Lead Agency under CEQA, has determined that the proposed HCP/NCCP may result in a significant impact on the environment, and an EIR must be prepared. A primary intent of this EIS/EIR is to support Conservancy and Responsible/Trustee Agency compliance with CEQA (Responsible and Trustee Agencies are listed below in the section titled *Joint NEPA/CEQA Document*).

An EIR is an informational document used to inform public agency decision-makers and the general public of the significant environmental effects of a project, identify possible ways to mitigate or avoid the significant effects, and describe a range of reasonable alternatives to the project that could feasibly attain most of the basic objectives of the project while substantially lessening or avoiding any of the significant environmental impacts. State and local government agencies are required to consider the information presented in the EIR when determining whether to approve a project.

CEQA requires that state and local government agencies consider the environmental effects of projects over which they have discretionary authority before taking action on those projects. CEQA also requires that each

public agency avoid or mitigate to less-than-significant levels, wherever feasible, the significant environmental effects of projects it approves or implements. If a project would result in significant and unavoidable environmental impacts (i.e., significant effects that cannot be feasibly mitigated to less-than-significant levels), the project can still be approved, but the lead agency must prepare and issue a “statement of overriding considerations” explaining in writing the specific economic, social, or other considerations that make those significant effects acceptable (PRC Section 21000 et seq.; CCR Section 15093).

Joint NEPA/CEQA Document

When a project is subject to review under both NEPA and CEQA, state and local agencies are encouraged to cooperate with federal agencies in the environmental review process and to prepare a joint environmental document. NEPA refers to the activity evaluated in an EIS as a proposal for *action* by a federal entity, whereas CEQA refers to the activity as a proposed *project* undertaken, supported, or permitted by a public agency. This document uses the term Proposed Action Alternative to refer to the HCP/NCCP and all federal, state, and local agency actions or approvals that would be issued or undertaken based on it.

As stated previously, USFWS is the Lead Agency responsible for compliance under NEPA, and the Conservancy is the Lead Agency with responsibility for compliance under CEQA. Several other agencies have responsibility for implementing or approving the proposed Plan and are considered Responsible Agencies under CEQA. CDFW is the Responsible Agency with responsibility for approving the NCCP portion of the Plan and issuing take permits for state-listed species. The member agencies of the Conservancy, Yolo County, and the Cities of Davis, West Sacramento, Winters, and Woodland, are also Responsible Agencies with responsibility for approving and implementing the proposed Plan. Although representatives of the member agencies are on the Conservancy Board of Directors, and will make decisions related to the HCP/NCCP and EIS/EIR as the CEQA lead agency, the member agencies themselves must make decisions and findings after the Conservancy, as CEQA responsible agencies. All lead and responsible agencies must make findings that they have independently reviewed this document and that it is adequate for decision making.

CEQA also identifies Trustee Agencies, which are state agencies “having jurisdiction by law over natural resources affected by a project which are held in trust for the people of the State of California.” (CEQA Guidelines Section 15386). CDFW is a Trustee Agency as well as a Responsible Agency relative to the Plan and this EIS/EIR. If any Plan activities would occur on State owned “sovereign” lands such as the beds of navigable waters and state school lands, the California State Lands Commission could act as a Trustee Agency. The State Department of Parks and Recreation and the University of California (U.C.) are also considered Trustee Agencies, but there are no State Parks potentially affected by the Plan, U.C. Davis is not a participant in the Plan and no U.C. lands would be affected by the Plan.

PLAN AREA AND PROJECT ALTERNATIVES

The alternatives evaluated in this EIS/EIR are summarized below. For a detailed discussion of the proposed action, and alternatives, see Chapter 2, *Proposed Action and Alternatives*. As the lead agencies, the Conservancy and USFWS, in conjunction with the other federal and state agencies, have developed the following alternatives for consideration.

- ▲ Alternative A—No Action Alternative (No Permit/No Plan Implementation)
- ▲ Alternative B—Proposed Action Alternative (Permit Issuance/Plan Implementation)
- ▲ Alternative C—Reduced Take Alternative
- ▲ Alternative D—Reduced Development Alternative

Plan Area

For purposes of this EIS/EIR, the Plan Area boundary includes all of Yolo County (Exhibit ES-1), located in the northern reach of California's Central Valley mid-way between San Francisco Bay and the Lake Tahoe basin. This also constitutes the area for which the Conservancy is requesting authorization from USFWS and CDFW for take of covered species.

As described in Chapter 2, the Plan also includes the potential for purchase of conservation easements and establishment of preserves along a portion of the south side of Putah Creek in Solano County, as illustrated in Exhibit ES-1. No other private or public projects within Solano County will be eligible for take coverage under the Wildlife Agency permits for the Plan. This location is referred to as the expanded Plan Area. In most cases, the Plan Area is the key term used in this document and the expanded Plan Area is only mentioned when it plays a role in the effects analysis.

Alternative A—No Action Alternative (No Permit/No Plan Implementation)

Under the No Action Alternative, permits would not be issued by USFWS or CDFW for incidental take of the proposed covered species through a regional HCP or NCCP. As a result, the Permit Applicants, private developers within their jurisdictions, and other public agencies in the Plan Area would remain subject to the take prohibition for federally listed species under FESA and for state-listed species under CESA. The Permit Applicants and others that have ongoing activities or future actions in the Plan Area that may result in the incidental take of federally listed species would apply, on a project-by-project basis, for incidental take authorization from USFWS through FESA Section 7 (when a federal agency is involved) or Section 10 (for nonfederal actions). Similarly, Permit Applicants and others whose ongoing activities or future actions have the potential for incidental take of state-listed species in the Plan Area would apply for incidental take authorization under CESA through a Section 2081(b) permit.

Under the No Action Alternative, development would occur over the 50-year study period consistent with the local general plans and other applicable planning documents (e.g., general plans, specific plans, master plans, parkway plans, bicycle plans, area plans, infrastructure plans, and similar adopted plans that are consistent with the applicable general plans). The 50-year study period extends beyond the horizon year for the available plans and it is assumed that growth and development would continue beyond each plan's horizon consistent with past growth rates assumed in each applicable planning document.

Under the No Action Alternative, because the Permit Applicants, other local agencies, and private developers would generate environmental documentation and apply for permits on a project-by-project basis, there would be no established comprehensive means to coordinate and standardize mitigation and compensation requirements of FESA, NCCPA, CEQA, and NEPA within the Plan Area. This is anticipated to result in a more costly, and less efficient project review process that would be unlikely to maximize conservation benefits. Coordinated conservation planning and implementation would not happen on a Plan Area-wide basis as proposed in the Yolo HCP/NCCP. Consequently, the establishment of a system of conservation lands to meet the needs of the species covered by the Yolo HCP/NCCP would not occur. In addition, in the absence of regulatory incentives provided by the Plan, the integration of species conservation into the existing agricultural working landscape contemplated in the Plan may not occur.

Alternative B—Proposed Action Alternative (Permit Issuance/Plan Implementation)

This alternative consists of issuance of ITPs by USFWS and CDFW; approval and execution of the IA for the Yolo HCP/NCCP; and approval and implementation of the HCP/NCCP by the Permittees. The Yolo HCP/NCCP is a regional, comprehensive plan that establishes a framework for complying with state and federal endangered species requirements for the Permittees while accommodating compatible future land use and development under the general plans and other applicable planning documents of the local agencies. The Yolo HCP/NCCP is intended to establish and implement a program to conserve ecologically important resources in the Plan Area. The Permit Applicants preparing the Plan are listed below.

- ▲ Yolo County
- ▲ City of Davis
- ▲ City of West Sacramento
- ▲ City of Winters
- ▲ City of Woodland
- ▲ Yolo Habitat Conservancy

The Yolo HCP/NCCP identifies a range of covered activities which are specific projects and activities within the jurisdictions listed above in the Plan Area that may result in the take of listed species or species that may become listed during the 50-year permit term (covered species). For the purpose of the HCP/NCCP, covered activities are organized into the following categories and subcategories.

- ▲ Urban projects and activities.
 - General urban development
 - Urban public services, infrastructure, and utilities
 - Urban projects in rural areas
- ▲ Rural projects and activities.
 - General rural development
 - Rural public services, infrastructure, and utilities
 - Agricultural economic development
 - Open space
 - Aggregate mining
- ▲ Public and private operations and maintenance
- ▲ Conservation strategy implementation and covered activities on reserve lands
- ▲ Neighboring landowner protection program

These activities are considered when assessing the total amount of take of covered species that would be expected in the Plan Area and in developing the overall Yolo HCP/NCCP conservation strategy. A summary of the proposed action is presented in Chapter 2, describing the Plan Area, the covered activities, the covered species, and the proposed conservation strategy.

Alternative C-Reduced Take Alternative

The Reduced Take Alternative (Alternative C) would include the same categories of covered activities as the Proposed Action Alternative (Alternative B); however, under Alternative C, there are eight geographic areas (shown in six insets in Exhibit 2-6) designated for development under the Proposed Action Alternative in which activities that would result in take of covered species would not be permitted. These locations are in the vicinity of Clarksburg, Davis, Dunnigan, West Sacramento, and Woodland and are shown in Exhibit 2-6. Table 2-10 identifies the size of each of the eight areas. The total area in which take would not be permitted under the Reduced Take Alternative is 1,335 acres.

It is assumed for the purposes of this alternative that any currently planned development that does not occur in the eight locations due to the take restriction could be displaced to another location within the Plan Area. However, any displaced development would also be subject to the take restriction and no take of covered species would be permitted at any new locations.

Other than assuming that no take of covered species would occur in the identified 1,335 acres, and that development could be displaced to another location under the same take restriction, all other elements of the Plan (e.g., covered species, covered activities, Plan Area, conservation strategy, Avoidance and Minimization Measures (AMMs), monitoring, funding) remain the same under this alternative.

Alternative D-Reduced Development Alternative

The Reduced Development Alternative (Alternative D) would include the same categories of covered activities as the Proposed Action Alternative (Alternative B), but under Alternative D, development within a portion of the Dunnigan area, and the Elkhorn Specific Plan Area, are assumed to not be included in the covered activities (insets A and B respectively in Exhibit 2-7). The portion of the Dunnigan area selected for exclusion from covered activities under this Alternative covers approximately 1,012 acres and the Elkhorn Specific Plan Area covers approximately 383 acres. In each of these two areas it is assumed that some type of development could potentially occur within the term of the permit. If such development were to occur, it would not be considered a covered activity under the Yolo HCP/NCCP; therefore, the HCP/NCCP would not be available as a mechanism to address losses of covered species. Any permitting required for compliance with FESA or CESA for future development would be undertaken for each of these two areas individually on a project by project basis. Permitting and mitigation would be implemented in a manner similar to the No Action Alternative.

Other than characteristics described above, all other elements of the Plan (e.g., covered species, remaining covered activities, Plan Area, conservation strategy, AMMs, monitoring, funding) remain the same under this alternative.

ENVIRONMENTAL CONSEQUENCES

A key issues analysis was completed early in the EIS/EIR planning process to identify environmental resource topics warranting analysis in the EIS/EIR. The list of potential resources considered was derived from the CEQ regulations for implementing NEPA, Appendix G of the CEQA Guidelines, and input received from the public during the project scoping period. The key issues analysis identified the following resources that could be affected by the proposed action or alternatives or were identified during scoping as resources of concern and are addressed in the following EIS/EIR chapters:

- ▲ Chapter 4 – Biological Resources
- ▲ Chapter 5 – Land Use
- ▲ Chapter 6 – Agricultural and Forestry Resources
- ▲ Chapter 7 – Public Services and Utilities
- ▲ Chapter 8 – Recreation and Open Space
- ▲ Chapter 9 – Hydrology and Water Quality
- ▲ Chapter 10 – Population and Housing
- ▲ Chapter 11 – Socioeconomics and Environmental Justice
- ▲ Chapter 12 – Cultural and Paleontological Resources
- ▲ Chapter 13 – Transportation
- ▲ Chapter 14 – Noise
- ▲ Chapter 15 – Air Quality
- ▲ Chapter 16 – Climate Change
- ▲ Chapter 17 – Geology, Soils, and Mineral Resources

- ▲ Chapter 18 – Visual Resources
- ▲ Chapter 19 – Hazardous Materials

Each chapter describes the existing environment that could be affected by the Proposed Action and alternatives, regulatory conditions that could affect the impact analysis, impact analysis methods and assumptions, criteria used to assess the significance of environmental effects, environmental effects of the action and alternatives, and mitigation measures to address effects that are identified as significant.

All covered activities are subject to the approval authority of one or more of the Permittees with jurisdiction over such projects. Issuance of permits by the Wildlife Agencies provides compliance only with FESA and the NCCPA. Approval of the proposed HCP/NCCP does not confer or imply approval to implement the covered activities. Rather, as part of the standard approval process, individual projects will be considered for further environmental analysis and generally will receive separate, project-level environmental analysis under CEQA and, in some cases, NEPA for those projects involving federal agencies. This EIS/EIR is intended to provide compliance with CEQA and NEPA for all covered activities regarding impacts to covered species and other biological resources that would be authorized by a Section 10(a)(1)(B) permit pursuant to the FESA and Section 2835 of the NCCPA chapter of the Fish & game Code. As the Proposed Action facilitates the covered activities by addressing certain of the various statutory and regulatory requirements tied to project authorization, reasonably foreseeable environmental effects of the covered activities are discussed herein to provide context for the analysis of the Proposed Action and various alternatives.

Table ES-1 summarizes impacts on species discussed in Chapter 4, *Biological Resources*. In general, biological resources conservation under the Proposed Action, Reduced Take, and Reduced Development Alternatives would be better than if no HCP/NCCP were in place (i.e., the No Action Alternative). Therefore, the impacts associated with these alternatives is frequently considered beneficial.

Table ES-2 summarizes the environmental impacts of the alternatives for each environmental resource topic evaluated in this EIS/EIR and identifies any mitigation measures applied to reduce significant adverse impacts. Impacts are summarized for the Proposed Action, Reduced Take, and Reduced Development Alternatives.

Species Common Name	Covered Species?	Proposed Action Alternative Impacts	Reduced Take Alternative Impacts	Reduced Development Alternative Impacts
Palmate-bracted bird's-beak	Yes	NEPA = B CEQA = LTS	NEPA = B CEQA = LTS	NEPA = B CEQA = LTS
Valley elderberry longhorn beetle	Yes	NEPA = B CEQA = LTS	NEPA = B CEQA = LTS	NEPA = B CEQA = LTS
California tiger salamander	Yes	NEPA = B CEQA = LTS	NEPA = B CEQA = LTS	NEPA = B CEQA = LTS
Western pond turtle	Yes	NEPA = B CEQA = LTS	NEPA = B CEQA = LTS	NEPA = B CEQA = LTS
Giant garter snake	Yes	NEPA = B CEQA = LTS	NEPA = B CEQA = LTS	NEPA = B CEQA = LTS
Swainson's hawk	Yes	NEPA = B CEQA = LTS	NEPA = B CEQA = LTS	NEPA = B CEQA = LTS
White-tailed kite	Yes	NEPA = B CEQA = LTS	NEPA = B CEQA = LTS	NEPA = B CEQA = LTS
Western burrowing owl	Yes	NEPA = B CEQA = LTS	NEPA = B CEQA = LTS	NEPA = B CEQA = LTS
Least Bell's vireo	Yes	NEPA = B CEQA = LTS	NEPA = B CEQA = LTS	NEPA = B CEQA = LTS
Bank swallow	Yes	NEPA = B CEQA = LTS	NEPA = B CEQA = LTS	NEPA = B CEQA = LTS
Tricolored blackbird	Yes	NEPA = B CEQA = LTS	NEPA = B CEQA = LTS	NEPA = B CEQA = LTS
Western yellow-billed cuckoo	Yes	NEPA = B CEQA = LTS	NEPA = B CEQA = LTS	NEPA = B CEQA = LTS
Special-status plants	No	NEPA = B CEQA = LTS	NEPA = B CEQA = LTS	NEPA = B CEQA = LTS
Special-status vernal pool invertebrates	No	NEPA = LTS CEQA = LTS	NEPA = LTS CEQA = LTS	NEPA = LTS CEQA = LTS

Table ES-1 Impacts on Species Considered

Species Common Name	Covered Species?	Proposed Action Alternative Impacts	Reduced Take Alternative Impacts	Reduced Development Alternative Impacts
Special-status amphibians	No	NEPA = B CEQA = LTS	NEPA = B CEQA = LTS	NEPA = B CEQA = LTS
Special-status birds	No	NEPA = B CEQA = LTS	NEPA = B CEQA = LTS	NEPA = B CEQA = LTS
Special-status bats	No	NEPA = B CEQA = LTS	NEPA = B CEQA = LTS	NEPA = B CEQA = LTS
American badger	No	NEPA = B CEQA = LTS	NEPA = B CEQA = LTS	NEPA = B CEQA = LTS
Special-status fish species	No	NEPA = B CEQA = LTS	NEPA = B CEQA = LTS	NEPA = B CEQA = LTS
Sensitive habitat types including wetlands and other waters of the United States	No	NEPA = B CEQA = LTS	NEPA = B CEQA = LTS	NEPA = B CEQA = LTS
Wildlife movement corridors	No	NEPA = B CEQA = LTS	NEPA = B CEQA = LTS	NEPA = B CEQA = LTS

Notes: B = Beneficial, LTS = Less than significant, PS = Potentially significant, S = Significant, SU = Significant and unavoidable

Table ES-2 Summary of Impacts and Mitigation Measures

Impact	Significance before Mitigation		Mitigation Measure
	NEPA	CEQA	
4 Biological Resources			
Effect Bio-1: Palmate-bracted bird's-beak.	PAA, RTA, RDA = B	PAA, RTA, RDA = LTS	No mitigation is required.
Effect Bio-2: Valley elderberry longhorn beetle.	PAA, RTA, RDA = B	PAA, RTA, RDA = LTS	No mitigation is required.
Effect Bio-3: California tiger salamander.	PAA, RTA, RDA = B	PAA, RTA, RDA = LTS	No mitigation is required.
Effect Bio-4: Western pond turtle.	PAA, RTA, RDA = B	PAA, RTA, RDA = LTS	No mitigation is required.
Effect Bio-5: Giant garter snake.	PAA, RTA, RDA = B	PAA, RTA, RDA = LTS	No mitigation is required.
Effect Bio-6: Swainson's hawk.	PAA, RTA, RDA = B	PAA, RTA, RDA = LTS	No mitigation is required.
Effect Bio-7: White-tailed kite.	PAA, RTA, RDA = B	PAA, RTA, RDA = LTS	No mitigation is required.
Effect Bio-8: Western burrowing owl.	PAA, RTA, RDA = B	PAA, RTA, RDA = LTS	No mitigation is required.
Effect Bio-9: Least bell's vireo.	PAA, RTA, RDA = B	PAA, RTA, RDA = LTS	No mitigation is required.
Effect Bio-10: Bank swallow.	PAA, RTA, RDA = B	PAA, RTA, RDA = LTS	No mitigation is required.
Effect Bio-11: Tricolored blackbird.	PAA, RTA, RDA = B	PAA, RTA, RDA = LTS	No mitigation is required.
Effect Bio-12: Western yellow-billed cuckoo.	PAA, RTA, RDA = B	PAA, RTA, RDA = LTS	No mitigation is required.
Effect Bio-13: Special-status plants not covered by Yolo HCP/NCCP.	PAA, RTA, RDA = B	PAA, RTA, RDA = LTS	No mitigation is required.
Effect Bio-14: Special-status vernal pool invertebrates.	PAA, RTA, RDA = LTS	PAA, RTA, RDA = LTS	No mitigation is required.
Effect Bio-15: Special-status amphibians not covered by Yolo HCP/NCCP.	PAA, RTA, RDA = B	PAA, RTA, RDA = LTS	No mitigation is required.
Effect Bio-16: Special-status birds not covered by Yolo HCP/NCCP.	PAA, RTA, RDA = B	PAA, RTA, RDA = LTS	No mitigation is required.
Effect Bio-17: Special-status bats.	PAA, RTA, RDA = LTS	PAA, RTA, RDA = LTS	No mitigation is required.
Effect Bio-18: American badger.	PAA, RTA, RDA = B	PAA, RTA, RDA = LTS	No mitigation is required.
Effect Bio-19: Special-status fish species.	PAA, RTA, RDA = B	PAA, RTA, RDA = LTS	No mitigation is required.
Effect Bio-20: Sensitive habitat types including wetlands and other waters of the United States.	PAA, RTA, RDA = B	PAA, RTA, RDA = LTS	No mitigation is required.
Effect Bio-21: Wildlife movement corridors.	PAA, RTA, RDA = B	PAA, RTA, RDA = LTS	No mitigation is required.
Cumulative Effects	PAA, RTA, RDA = B	PAA, RTA, RDA = LTS	

Proposed Action Alternative = PAA		Reduced Take Alternative = RTA		Reduced Development Alternative = RDA	
B = Beneficial	LTS = Less than significant	PS = Potentially significant	S = Significant	SU = Significant and unavoidable	

Table ES-2 Summary of Impacts and Mitigation Measures

Impact	Significance before Mitigation		Mitigation Measure
	NEPA	CEQA	
5 Land Use			
Effect LAND-1: Physically divide an established community.	PAA, RTA, RDA = LTS	PAA, RTA, RDA = LTS	No mitigation is required.
Effect LAND-2: Conflict with any applicable land use plan, policy, or regulation of an agency with jurisdiction over the project (including, but not limited to, a general plan, specific plan, local coastal program, or zoning ordinance) adopted for the purpose of avoiding or mitigating an environmental effect.	PAA, RTA, RDA = LTS	PAA, RTA, RDA = LTS	No mitigation is required.
Effect LAND-3: Conflict with any applicable habitat conservation plan or natural community conservation plan.	PAA = PS RTA = LTS RDA = LTS	PAA = PS RTA = LTS RDA = LTS	Mitigation Measure LAND-1: Agreement with SCWA Before adopting the HCP/NCCP, the Conservancy must enter into an agreement with SCWA recognizing that the Conservancy's acquisition areas must not conflict with the covered activities of the Solano Multi-Species HCP. The agreement should ensure that implementing the Yolo HCP/NCCP would not preclude the implementation of the Solano Multi-Species HCP. <i>Impact reduced to less than significant with mitigation.</i>
Cumulative Effects	PAA, RTA, RDA = LTS	PAA, RTA, RDA = LTS	
6 Agricultural and Forestry Resources			
Effect AG-1: Potential to convert farmland to non-agricultural use.	PAA = LTS RTA = LTS RDA = LTS	PAA = SU RTA = SU RDA = SU	No further mitigation is feasible.
Effect AG-2: Conflict with existing zoning for agricultural use or conflict with a Williamson Act contract.	PAA, RTA, RDA = LTS	PAA = LTS RTA = SU RDA = SU	No mitigation is required.
Effect AG-3: Conflict with existing zoning/loss of forest land.	PAA = B RTA = LTS RDA = LTS	PAA = B RTA = SU RDA = SU	No mitigation is required.
Cumulative Effects	PAA = B RTA = LTS RDA = LTS	PAA = SU RTA = SU RDA = SU	

Proposed Action Alternative = PAA		Reduced Take Alternative = RTA		Reduced Development Alternative = RDA	
B = Beneficial	LTS = Less than significant	PS = Potentially significant	S = Significant	SU = Significant and unavoidable	

Table ES-2 Summary of Impacts and Mitigation Measures

Impact	Significance before Mitigation		Mitigation Measure
	NEPA	CEQA	
7 Public Services and Utilities			
Effect PSU-1: Changes in the Demand for, or Provision of, Public Services and Utilities.	PAA, RTA, RDA = LTS	PAA, RTA, RDA = LTS	No mitigation is required.
Cumulative Effects	PAA, RTA, RDA = LTS	PAA, RTA, RDA = LTS	
8 Recreation and Open Space			
Effect REC-1: Potential increase in use of recreation facilities or demand for recreation opportunities such that substantial deterioration would occur.	PAA, RTA, RDA = B	PAA, RTA, RDA = B	No mitigation is required.
Effect REC-2: Potential construction or expansion of recreational facilities.	PAA, RTA, RDA = B	PAA, RTA, RDA = B	No mitigation is required.
Cumulative Effects	PAA, RTA, RDA = B	PAA, RTA, RDA = B	
9 Hydrology and Water Quality			
Effect HYDRO-1: Result in a violation of any water quality standard or waste discharge requirement.	PAA = B RTA = LTS RDA = LTS	PAA = B RTA = LTS RDA = LTS	No mitigation is required.
Effect HYDRO-2: Substantially deplete groundwater supplies or interfere substantially with groundwater recharge.	PAA, RTA, RDA = LTS	PAA, RTA, RDA = LTS	No mitigation is required.
Effect HYDRO-3: Substantially alter the existing drainage pattern in a manner that would result in substantial erosion, siltation, and/or environmental harm, or substantially increase the rate or amount of surface runoff in a manner that would result in flooding.	PAA = B RTA = LTS RDA = LTS	PAA = B RTA = LTS RDA = LTS	No mitigation is required.
Effect HYDRO-4: Create or contribute runoff water that would provide substantial additional sources of polluted runoff, exceed the capacity of existing or planned stormwater drainage systems or otherwise substantially degrade water quality.	PAA = B RTA = LTS RDA = LTS	PAA = B RTA = LTS RDA = LTS	No mitigation is required.
Effect HYDRO-5: Place housing, or place structures that would impede or redirect flood flows 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, or within the 200-year flood hazard boundary as defined by the Central Valley Flood Protection Plan in urban areas; within a 100-year flood hazard area.	PAA = LTS RTA = B RDA = B	PAA, RTA, RDA = LTS	No mitigation is required.
Effect HYDRO-6: Expose people or structures to a substantial risk of loss, injury or death involving flooding from the failure of a levee or dam.	PAA, RTA, RDA = LTS	PAA, RTA, RDA = LTS	No mitigation is required.

Proposed Action Alternative = PAA		Reduced Take Alternative = RTA		Reduced Development Alternative = RDA	
B = Beneficial	LTS = Less than significant	PS = Potentially significant	S = Significant	SU = Significant and unavoidable	

Table ES-2 Summary of Impacts and Mitigation Measures

Impact	Significance before Mitigation		Mitigation Measure
	NEPA	CEQA	
Cumulative Effects	PAA = LTS RTA = B RDA = B	PAA, RTA, RDA = LTS	
10 Population and Housing			
Effect HP-1: Potential to induce substantial population growth in the Plan Area, either directly (for example, by proposing new homes and businesses) or indirectly (for example, through extension of roads or other infrastructure).	PAA, RTA, RDA = LTS	PAA, RTA, RDA = LTS	No mitigation is required.
Effect HP-2: Potential to displace substantial numbers of existing housing or people, necessitating the construction of replacement housing elsewhere.	PAA, RTA, RDA = LTS	PAA, RTA, RDA = LTS	No mitigation is required.
Cumulative Effects	PAA, RTA, RDA = LTS	PAA, RTA, RDA = LTS	
11 Socioeconomics and Environmental Justice			
Effect SOC-1: Substantially change economic activity within the Plan Area	PAA = B RTA = LTS RDA = LTS	—	No mitigation is required.
Effect EJ-1: Substantially affect property tax revenue.	PAA, RTA, RDA = LTS	—	No mitigation is required.
Effect EJ-2: Substantially disproportionately affect minority or low-income populations.	PAA, RTA, RDA = LTS	—	No mitigation is required.
Cumulative Effects	PAA, RTA, RDA = LTS	—	
12 Cultural and Paleontological Resources			
Effect CUL-1: Change in the significance of historical resources	PAA, RTA, RDA = LTS	PAA, RTA, RDA = LTS	No mitigation is required.
Effect CUL-2: Disturb archaeological resources and human remains.	PAA, RTA, RDA = LTS	PAA, RTA, RDA = LTS	No mitigation is required.
Effect CUL-3: Disturb a paleontological resource.	PAA, RTA, RDA = LTS	PAA, RTA, RDA = LTS	No mitigation is required.
Cumulative Effects	PAA, RTA, RDA = LTS	PAA, RTA, RDA = LTS	
13 Transportation			
Effect TRAN-1: Conflict with an applicable plan, ordinance, or policy establishing measures of effectiveness for the performance of the circulation system.	PAA, RTA, RDA = LTS	PAA, RTA, RDA = LTS	No mitigation is required.
Effect TRAN-2: Conflict with an applicable congestion management program.	PAA, RTA, RDA = LTS	PAA, RTA, RDA = LTS	No mitigation is required.

Proposed Action Alternative = PAA		Reduced Take Alternative = RTA		Reduced Development Alternative = RDA	
B = Beneficial	LTS = Less than significant	PS = Potentially significant	S = Significant	SU = Significant and unavoidable	

Table ES-2 Summary of Impacts and Mitigation Measures

Impact	Significance before Mitigation		Mitigation Measure
	NEPA	CEQA	
Effect TRAN-3: Result in a substantial increase in hazards because of incompatible uses.	PAA, RTA, RDA = LTS	PAA, RTA, RDA = LTS	No mitigation is required.
Effect TRAN-4: Result in inadequate emergency access.	PAA, RTA, RDA = LTS	PAA, RTA, RDA = LTS	No mitigation is required.
Effect TRAN-5: Conflict with adopted policies, plans, or programs supporting public transit, bicycle or pedestrian facilities.	PAA, RTA, RDA = LTS	PAA, RTA, RDA = LTS	No mitigation is required.
Cumulative Effects	PAA, RTA, RDA = LTS	PAA, RTA, RDA = LTS	
14 Noise			
Effect NOISE-1: Expose people to excessive groundborne vibration or noise levels in excess of standards established in the local general plan or noise ordinance, or applicable standards of other agencies.	PAA, RTA, RDA = LTS	PAA, RTA, RDA = LTS	No mitigation is required.
Effect NOISE-2: Create a substantial permanent increase in ambient noise levels in the project vicinity as compared to without the project.	PAA, RTA, RDA = LTS	PAA, RTA, RDA = LTS	No mitigation is required.
Effect NOISE-3: Create a substantial temporary increase in ambient noise levels in the project vicinity as compared to without the project.	PAA, RTA, RDA = LTS	PAA, RTA, RDA = LTS	No mitigation is required.
Effect NOISE-4: Expose people to excessive noise associated with air travel.	PAA, RTA, RDA = LTS	PAA, RTA, RDA = LTS	No mitigation is required.
Cumulative Effects	PAA, RTA, RDA = LTS	PAA, RTA, RDA = LTS	
15 Air Quality			
Effect AQ-1: Conflict with or obstruct implementation of an applicable air quality plan.	PAA, RTA, RDA = LTS	PAA, RTA, RDA = LTS	No mitigation is required.
Effect AQ-2: Violate any air quality standard or contribute substantially to an existing or projected air quality violation.	PAA, RTA, RDA = LTS	PAA, RTA, RDA = LTS	No mitigation is required.
Effect AQ-3: 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	PAA, RTA, RDA = LTS	PAA, RTA, RDA = LTS	No mitigation is required.
Effect AQ-4: Expose sensitive receptors to substantial pollutant concentrations.	PAA, RTA, RDA = LTS	PAA, RTA, RDA = LTS	No mitigation is required.
Effect AQ-5: Create objectionable odors affecting a substantial number of people.	PAA, RTA, RDA = LTS	PAA, RTA, RDA = LTS	No mitigation is required.
Cumulative Effects	PAA, RTA, RDA = LTS	PAA, RTA, RDA = LTS	

Proposed Action Alternative = PAA		Reduced Take Alternative = RTA		Reduced Development Alternative = RDA	
B = Beneficial	LTS = Less than significant	PS = Potentially significant	S = Significant	SU = Significant and unavoidable	

Table ES-2 Summary of Impacts and Mitigation Measures

Impact	Significance before Mitigation		Mitigation Measure		
	NEPA	CEQA			
16 Climate Change					
Effect CC-1: Generate greenhouse gas emissions, either directly or indirectly, that may have a significant impact on the environment.	PAA, RTA, RDA = LTS	PAA, RTA, RDA = LTS	No mitigation is required.		
Effect CC-2: Conflict with an applicable plan, policy, or regulation adopted for the purpose of reducing the emissions of greenhouse gases.	PAA, RTA, RDA = LTS	PAA, RTA, RDA = LTS	No mitigation is required.		
Effect CC-3: Result in inefficient and wasteful consumption of energy, or require new or expanded energy facilities.	PAA, RTA, RDA = LTS	PAA, RTA, RDA = LTS	No mitigation is required.		
Effect CC-4: Effects of climate change to the action.	PAA = B RTA = LTS RDA = LTS	PAA = B RTA = LTS RDA = LTS	No mitigation is required.		
Cumulative Effects	PAA, RTA, RDA = LTS	PAA, RTA, RDA = LTS			
17 Geology, Soils, and Mineral Resources					
Effect GEO-1: Expose people or structures to substantial adverse effects due to rupture of a known earthquake fault, strong seismic ground shaking, seismic-related ground failure, or landslides.	PAA, RTA, RDA = LTS	PAA, RTA, RDA = LTS	No mitigation is required.		
Effect GEO-2: Result in substantial soil erosion or the loss of topsoil.	PAA, RTA, RDA = LTS	PAA, RTA, RDA = LTS	No mitigation is required.		
Effect GEO-3: Create a substantial risk to life or property by locating structures on expansive soil.	PAA, RTA, RDA = LTS	PAA, RTA, RDA = LTS	No mitigation is required.		
Effect GEO-4: Result in the loss of availability of a known mineral resource.	PAA, RTA, RDA = LTS	PAA, RTA, RDA = LTS	No mitigation is required.		
Cumulative Effects	PAA, RTA, RDA = LTS	PAA, RTA, RDA = LTS			
18 Visual Resources					
Effect VIS-1: Potential for substantial adverse effects on scenic vistas.	PAA = B RTA = LTS RDA = LTS	PAA = B RTA = LTS RDA = LTS	No mitigation is required.		
Effect VIS-2: Potential damage to scenic resources.	PAA, RTA, RDA = LTS	PAA, RTA, RDA = LTS	No mitigation is required.		
Effect VIS-3: Potential degradation of visual character and quality.	PAA = B RTA = LTS RDA = LTS	PAA = B RTA = LTS RDA = LTS	No mitigation is required.		
Proposed Action Alternative = PAA		Reduced Take Alternative = RTA		Reduced Development Alternative = RDA	
B = Beneficial		LTS = Less than significant		PS = Potentially significant	
				S = Significant	
				SU = Significant and unavoidable	

Table ES-2 Summary of Impacts and Mitigation Measures

Impact	Significance before Mitigation		Mitigation Measure
	NEPA	CEQA	
Effect VIS-4: Potential for substantial light or glare.	PAA, RTA, RDA = LTS	PAA, RTA, RDA = LTS	No mitigation is required.
Cumulative Effects	PAA, RTA, RDA = LTS	PAA, RTA, RDA = LTS	
19 Hazardous Materials			
Effect HAZ-1: Create a significant hazard through the routine transport, use, or disposal of hazardous materials, including along existing transportation corridors and in proximity to school sites.	PAA, RTA, RDA = LTS	PAA, RTA, RDA = LTS	No mitigation is required.
Effect HAZ-2: Result in the release of hazardous materials from a site of known or potential contamination.	PAA, RTA, RDA = LTS	PAA, RTA, RDA = LTS	No mitigation is required.
Effect HAZ-3: Result in a safety hazard for people residing or working in the project area because of proximity to public airports or private airstrips.	PAA, RTA, RDA = LTS	PAA, RTA, RDA = LTS	No mitigation is required.
Effect HAZ-4: Impair implementation of, or physically interfere with, an adopted emergency response plan or emergency evacuation plan.	PAA, RTA, RDA = LTS	PAA, RTA, RDA = LTS	No mitigation is required.
Effect HAZ-5: Expose people or structures to a significant risk of loss, injury, or death involving wildland fires.	PAA, RTA, RDA = LTS	PAA, RTA, RDA = LTS	No mitigation is required.
Cumulative Effects	PAA, RTA, RDA = LTS	PAA, RTA, RDA = LTS	

Proposed Action Alternative = PAA		Reduced Take Alternative = RTA		Reduced Development Alternative = RDA	
B = Beneficial	LTS = Less than significant	PS = Potentially significant	S = Significant	SU = Significant and unavoidable	