

Table ES-1. Summary of Environmental Effects and Mitigation – LCCFB Plan

Significant Effects	Mitigation and Best Management Practices	Level of Significance with Mitigation
<i>Social and Economic Resources</i>		
Project-induced flooding on some lands north of the flood barrier would cause a potential decrease in land value.	Agricultural landowners would be compensated for land value effects/takings to the extent required by law.	LTS ¹
One home would be relocated.	Land and home owner would be compensated for land/home value effects/takings.	LTS
<i>Land Use</i>		
The flood barrier footprint would convert 100 acres of row crop, 2 acres of orchard, and 2 acres of agricultural support lands for flood control purposes.	This effect represents an incompatible land use change and is a significant effect that cannot be mitigated.	SU ²
<i>Agriculture, Prime and Unique Farmlands</i>		
The flood barrier would result in a loss of 100 acres of prime farmland and 2 acres of statewide important/locally important farmland.	The conversion of prime farmlands represents an effect that cannot be mitigated.	SU
<i>Transportation</i>		
Temporary direct transportation effects would include lane closure during road repair, roadway safety hazards, and an increase in traffic volume.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Lead agency to provide traffic management plan. • Contractors would use construction easements as much as feasible when hauling materials to the construction site. • Traffic would be rerouted when necessary to avoid construction areas. • Flaggers would be stationed to slow or stop approaching vehicles to avoid conflicts with construction vehicles or equipment. 	LTS
¹ LTS = Less than significant ² SU = Significant unavoidable		

Table ES-1. Summary of Environmental Effects and Mitigation – LCCFB Plan

Significant Effects	Mitigation and Best Management Practices	Level of Significance with Mitigation
<i>Transportation (continued)</i>		
<p>Indirect transportation effects result from the flooding of CR 102 for a greater length of time than under existing conditions. Under existing conditions, a 5' levee perpendicular to CR 102 would cause flooding of the roadway. With project conditions, the levee height would be increased to 18', increasing the depth and duration of flooding at CR 102. This impact would occur for floods that have greater than a 1 in 40 chance of occurring. These road closures could cause lengthened response times for emergency vehicles traveling to residents northeast of the city of Woodland.</p>	<p>The mitigation listed below would reduce the effects, but not to a less-than-significant level.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Detours would be available to circumvent flooded roadways. 	<p align="center">SU</p>
<i>Noise</i>		
<p>Construction of the flood barrier would temporarily produce decibel levels above the significance threshold for some sensitive receptors during construction.</p>	<p>The mitigation listed below would reduce the effects, but not to a less-than-significant level.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Construction equipment would be outfitted and maintained with noise-reduction devices such as mufflers. • Construction would be limited to daytime hours. 	<p align="center">SU</p>
<i>Air Quality</i>		
<p>NO_x emissions would exceed the significance thresholds established by the Yolo-Solano Air Quality Management District (YSAQMD). The exceedence would be a temporary effect during construction.</p>	<p>The mitigation listed below would reduce NO_x emissions, but not to a less-than-significant level.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Incorporate NO_x mitigation measures into construction plans and specifications. 	<p align="center">SU</p>

Table ES-1. Summary of Environmental Effects and Mitigation – LCCFB Plan

Significant Effects	Mitigation and Best Management Practices	Level of Significance with Mitigation
<i>Air Quality (continued)</i>		
<p>PM₁₀ emissions would exceed the significance thresholds established by the YSAQMD. The exceedence would be a temporary effect during construction. Sensitive receptors would also be exposed to the high levels of fugitive dust emissions.</p>	<p>The mitigation listed below would reduce PM₁₀ emissions, but not to a less-than-significant level. The lead agency would provide a dust suppression plan that would likely include the following measures:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • All construction areas, unpaved access roads, and staging areas would be watered as needed during dry soil conditions, or soil stabilizers would be applied. • All trucks hauling soil or other loose material would be covered or have at least 2 feet of freeboard. Construction vehicles would use paved roads to access the construction site wherever possible. • Vehicle speeds would be limited to 15 mph on unpaved roads and construction areas, or as required to control dust. • Streets would be cleaned daily if visible soil material is carried onto adjacent public streets. • Soil stabilizers would be applied to inactive construction areas on an as-needed basis. • Exposed stockpiles of soil and other excavated materials would be enclosed, covered, watered, or applied with soil binders as needed. • Vegetation would be replanted in disturbed areas as quickly as possible following the completion of construction. 	<p align="center">SU</p>
<i>Settling Basin</i>		
<p>The removal of the training levee could alter the distribution of sedimentation in the settling basin.</p>	<p>Design of the LCCFB Plan would incorporate the function of the settling basin.</p>	<p align="center">LTS</p>

Table ES-1. Summary of Environmental Effects and Mitigation – LCCFB Plan

Significant Effects	Mitigation and Best Management Practices	Level of Significance with Mitigation
<i>Water Quality</i>		
Pollutants from construction equipment and erosion at the construction site could temporarily degrade the water quality of local runoff during construction.	The proper permitting procedures would be adhered to. In addition, appropriate best management practices and monitoring would be implemented to preserve the quality of surface runoff.	LTS
<i>Vegetation and Wildlife</i>		
Project-related effects, as determined by the USFWS in its draft CAR would include the loss of 122 acres of agricultural habitat, 100 native and non-native trees, 0.52 acre of upland habitat, and 0.28 acre of scrub shrub.	Mitigation for habitat loss has been outlined by the Fish and Wildlife Service in its Coordination Act Report (Appendix A).	LTS
Construction-related effects would include disturbance from equipment and crews and potential disturbance of species.	Mitigation measures include: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Restricting construction crews to the right-of-way and confinement of disturbance to as small an area as possible; • Requiring construction crews to maintain a 15 m.p.h. speed limit on all unpaved roads to reduce the chance of wildlife being mortally wounded if struck by construction equipment; and • Conducting of nest surveys prior to the removal of any trees or scrub shrub to ensure migratory birds would not be lost during construction, pursuant to the Migratory Bird Treaty Act. 	LTS

Table ES-1. Summary of Environmental Effects and Mitigation – LCCFB Plan

Significant Effects	Mitigation and Best Management Practices	Level of Significance with Mitigation
<i>Special-Status Species</i>		
Project-related effects to special-status species (Swainson’s hawk, giant garter snake, northwestern pond turtle, chinook salmon, steelhead) would include temporary and permanent loss of habitat.	Incidental Take Conditions for effects to special-status species would be determined through formal consultation with the Fish and Wildlife Service and National Marine Fisheries Service and outlined in their Biological Opinion. Proposed conservation measures are outlined in Section 5.7.	LTS
Construction-related effects would include disturbance from equipment and crews and potential take of species.	Incidental Take Conditions for effects to special-status species would be determined through formal consultation with the Fish and Wildlife Service and National Marine Fisheries Service and outlined in their Biological Opinion. Incidental Take Conditions for effects to State special-status species would also be determined through formal consultation with the California Department of Fish and Game. Proposed conservation measures are outlined in Section 5.7.	LTS
<i>Cultural Resources</i>		
Increased flooding may occur at sites between the creek and barrier.	Mitigation measures would be developed in consultation with the State Historic Preservation Office and could include flood proofing some structures.	LTS
<i>Esthetic and Visual Resources</i>		
The flood barrier would create a new linear feature and a view block to residents.	The LCCFB would be reseeded with grasses and forbs; however, this would not reduce the overall effect to less-than-significant.	SU