

# **Appendix B**

---

## **Alternative Evaluation Process**

**Table B-1 Screening of Alternatives to Yolo County Habitat Conservation Plan/Natural Communities Conservation Plan**

List of Potential Alternatives	Objective and Purpose Criteria							Feasibility and Reasonableness Criteria							
	Could the potential alternative provide for long-term conservation of covered species and the conservation and enhancement of natural and seminatural communities within the Plan Area while allowing public and private activities?	Could the potential alternative assemble and maintain a reserve system within the Plan Area that includes preservation, enhancement, monitoring, and management actions that protect and enhance species, natural communities, and ecosystems?	Could the potential alternative provide a reserve system in the Plan Area large enough to maintain in perpetuity each type of natural community included in the reserve system, and maintain in perpetuity or expand the existing distribution of covered species within the Plan Area?	Could the potential alternative rely solely on willing sellers for the purchase of land or easements when establishing habitat reserves and protect the long-term viability of agricultural operations in the Planning Area?	Could the potential alternative provide a less costly, more efficient project review process that results in greater conservation values than the current project-by-project, species-by-species review and regulatory regime?	Could the potential alternative coordinate and standardize mitigation and compensation requirements of FESA, CESA, NEPA, and CEQA and other applicable laws and regulations related to biological and natural resources within the Plan Area?	Score (# of "Possibly")*	Would the costs of the potential alternative, as compared to the cost of implementing the Proposed Action, be so substantial that a reasonably prudent public agency would not proceed with the alternative?	Would the costs of the potential alternative, as compared to the cost of implementing the Proposed Action, be so substantial that it would be impractical to proceed with the alternative?	Would the potential alternative take so long to implement, as compared to the Proposed Action, that it would not meet the project purpose or objectives within an acceptable time frame?	Would the potential alternative require technology or physical components that are technically infeasible based on currently available science and engineering for the scope of the potential alternative?	Would construction, operation, and/or maintenance of the potential alternative violate any federal or state statutes or regulations?	Would the potential alternative involve an outcome that is clearly undesirable from a policy standpoint in that the outcome could not reflect a reasonable balancing of relevant economic, environmental, social, and technological factors?	Score (# of "No or Unknown")*	Carried Forward to Analysis in the EIS/EIR?
<b>Reduced permit term</b>	Not likely because a shorter permit term would not provide sufficient time to fully implement the general plans and other long-range plans in the Plan Area	Not likely because a shorter permit term would not provide sufficient time to assemble a reserve system from willing sellers and partnerships with local agencies and private landowners	Not likely because a shorter permit term would not provide sufficient time to develop an adaptive management program to be implemented in perpetuity	Not likely because a shorter permit term would not provide sufficient time to assemble a reserve system from willing sellers	Possibly	Possibly	2	Yes because total amount of fees collected would be reduced, or per acre fees would be too high to compensate for the reduced time to collect fees.	Yes because total amount of fees collected would be reduced, or per acre fees would be too high to compensate for the reduced time to collect fees.	No	No	No	Yes because total amount of fees collected would be reduced, or per acre fees would be too high to compensate for the reduced time to collect fees.	3	No
<b>Additional Covered Species</b>	Not likely because cost would make plan development and implementation and reserve system management infeasible	Not likely because cost would make development and management of a sufficient reserve system infeasible	Not likely because cost would make development and management of a reserve system that could be maintained in perpetuity infeasible	Not likely because it is unlikely that willing sellers could be found for all preserve habitat types needed for all species.	Possibly	Possibly	2	Yes because addition of covered species would incur costs considered infeasible	Yes because addition of covered species would incur costs considered infeasible	No	No	No	No	4	No
<b>Reduced Plan Area</b>	Not likely because the reserve system would not be sufficient for all covered species	Not likely because the reserve system would not be sufficient for all covered species	Not likely because the reserve system would not be sufficient for all covered species	Not likely because the reserve system would not be sufficient for all covered species	Possibly	Possibly	2	No	No	Yes, it would take substantial time (if it could be done at all) to assemble a sufficient reserve system in the limited area.	No	No	Yes. The extent of the covered activities would likely need to be substantially limited to accommodate the reduced reserve area availability	4	No
<b>Exclusion of Expanded Plan Area</b>	Not likely because the reserve system would not be sufficient for all covered species	Not likely because the reserve system would not be sufficient for all covered species	Not likely because the reserve system would not be sufficient for all covered species	Not likely because the reserve system would not be sufficient for all covered species	Possibly	Possibly	2	No	No	Likely because it would be very difficult to compile sufficient reserve lands for all needed habitat types from willing sellers.	No	No	No	5	No

**Table B-1 Screening of Alternatives to Yolo County Habitat Conservation Plan/Natural Communities Conservation Plan**

List of Potential Alternatives	Objective and Purpose Criteria							Feasibility and Reasonableness Criteria							
	Could the potential alternative provide for long-term conservation of covered species and the conservation and enhancement of natural and seminatural communities within the Plan Area while allowing public and private activities?	Could the potential alternative assemble and maintain a reserve system within the Plan Area that includes preservation, enhancement, monitoring, and management actions that protect and enhance species, natural communities, and ecosystems?	Could the potential alternative provide a reserve system in the Plan Area large enough to maintain in perpetuity each type of natural community included in the reserve system, and maintain in perpetuity or expand the existing distribution of covered species within the Plan Area?	Could the potential alternative rely solely on willing sellers for the purchase of land or easements when establishing habitat reserves and protect the long-term viability of agricultural operations in the Planning Area?	Could the potential alternative provide a less costly, more efficient project review process that results in greater conservation values than the current project-by-project, species-by-species review and regulatory regime?	Could the potential alternative coordinate and standardize mitigation and compensation requirements of FESA, CESA, NEPA, and CEQA and other applicable laws and regulations related to biological and natural resources within the Plan Area?	Score (# of "Possibly")*	Would the costs of the potential alternative, as compared to the cost of implementing the Proposed Action, be so substantial that a reasonably prudent public agency would not proceed with the alternative?	Would the costs of the potential alternative, as compared to the cost of implementing the Proposed Action, be so substantial that it would be impractical to proceed with the alternative?	Would the potential alternative take so long to implement, as compared to the Proposed Action, that it would not meet the project purpose or objectives within an acceptable time frame?	Would the potential alternative require technology or physical components that are technically infeasible based on currently available science and engineering for the scope of the potential alternative?	Would construction, operation, and/or maintenance of the potential alternative violate any federal or state statutes or regulations?	Would the potential alternative involve an outcome that is clearly undesirable from a policy standpoint in that the outcome could not reflect a reasonable balancing of relevant economic, environmental, social, and technological factors?	Score (# of "No or Unknown")*	Carried Forward to Analysis in the EIS/EIR?
<b>Reduced Agricultural Impacts</b>	Not likely because the reserve system would not be sufficient for all covered species	Not likely because the reserve system would not be sufficient for all covered species	Not likely because the reserve system would not be sufficient for all covered species	Not likely because the reserve system would not be sufficient for all covered species	Possibly	Possibly	2	Yes, because it would be substantially more costly to acquire sufficient reserve system lands.	Yes, because it would be substantially more costly to acquire sufficient reserve system lands.	No	No	No	No	6	No
<b>Increase Extent of Covered Activities</b>	Not likely because impacts to natural resource, and therefore the resulting size of the reserve system, would be too great	Not likely because impacts to natural resource, and therefore the resulting size of the reserve system, would be too great	Not likely because impacts to natural resource, and therefore the resulting size of the reserve system, would be too great	Not likely because impacts to natural resource, and therefore the resulting size of the reserve system, would be too great	Possibly	Possibly	2	Unknown	Unknown	No	No	No	Yes, because it is unlikely that the increases in covered activities considered would be authorized by all involved regulatory agencies.	6	No
<b>Reduced Take</b>	Possibly	Possibly	Possibly	Possibly	Possibly	Possibly	6	No	No	No	No	No	No	6	Yes
<b>Reduced Development</b>	Possibly	Possibly	Possibly	Possibly	Possibly	Possibly	6	No	No	No	No	No	No	6	Yes

\* An alternative must score 5 or 6 under both criteria (i.e., most or all of the criteria are met) to be carried forward for further analysis in the EIS/EIR

Notes: MSAA=master streambed alteration agreement, CDFW=California Department of Fish and Wildlife, USACE=U.S. Army Corps of Engineers, CWA=Federal Clean Water Act, RHA=Rivers and Harbors Act

No Action Alternative not considered because it is requirement of NEPA and CEQA that it be included in the EIS/EIR