

Executive Summary

ES-1 Introduction

This *Draft Environmental Impact Report/Environmental Impact Statement for the Revised Natomas Basin Habitat Conservation Plan* (EIR/EIS) presents the environmental impacts that have the potential to occur as a result of implementing the Proposed Action described in Chapter 1 of this EIR/EIS. The Proposed Action comprises the conservation measures of the revised *Draft Natomas Basin Habitat Conservation Plan, Sacramento and Sutter Counties, California*¹ (HCP), incidental take permits (ITPs) for covered activities included in the HCP, and an implementing agreement or agreements (IA[s]) to secure participation and compliance of the permittees. The permittees (see Section 2.1) are the City of Sacramento, Sutter County, and the Natomas Basin Conservancy. The City and Sutter County are lead agencies under the California Environmental Quality Act (CEQA), and the U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service (USFWS) is the lead agency under the National Environmental Policy Act (NEPA) (see Section 1.3.1). In addition to the City, Sutter County, and the Conservancy, Reclamation District No. 1000 (RD 1000) and the Natomas Central Mutual Water Company (Natomas Mutual) have also participated in the HCP development process, and the impacts of their proposed covered activities are analyzed in this EIR/EIS (see Section 1.2.1 for a discussion of RD 1000's and Natomas Mutual's history and status of participation in the development of the HCP evaluated in this EIR/EIS).²

Each of the permittees has a specific designated permit area for its covered activities. The permittees, their permit areas and covered activities, and the conservation measures for which each permittee is responsible are discussed in detail in Chapter 2 of this EIR/EIS.

The HCP has been developed to provide and implement a multispecies conservation program to minimize and mitigate impacts of planned urban development and management activities of the Natomas Basin Conservancy (see Section 2.3 for a discussion of the HCP's underlying covered activities associated with the Proposed Action). The HCP also has been prepared to meet the requirements of the California Department of Fish and Game (CDFG) in support of planned applications, or revisions to current applications, to receive incidental take authorization for state-listed species under Section 2081 of the California Fish and Game Code (see Section 1.3.2 for additional discussion of CDFG participation).

The conservation measures in the HCP apply to 22 special-status species (the "covered species"). A list of the covered species is presented in Section 2.4.3 of this EIR/EIS. Sections I and II of the HCP also include a discussion of the covered species.

¹ City of Sacramento, Sutter County, Natomas Basin Conservancy, July 2002.

² On the basis of ongoing discussions with USFWS on whether the water agencies (RD 1000 and Natomas Mutual) can obtain incidental take coverage for pesticide use, the water agencies have decided not to file applications for permits at this time. They have, however, identified proposed conservation measures (see Section 2.4.6.3 of this EIR/EIS) for their covered activities that exclude pesticide use, and these measures are incorporated in the HCP evaluated in this EIR/EIS (see Section 2.3.3 of this EIR/EIS). The water agencies could elect to apply for an ITP at a future date and would be required at that time to execute an IA that demonstrates implementation and compliance with the HCP. A summary of the water agencies' participation in the HCP is in Section 1.2.1.

The HCP evaluated in this EIR/EIS supercedes the prior HCP for the Natomas Basin that was prepared and approved in 1997 (see Section 1.2).

This Executive Summary includes the following sections:

- Purpose and Need/Objectives (ES-2)
- Study Area (ES-3)
- Proposed Action and Alternatives (ES-4)
- Areas of Controversy (ES-5)
- Issues to be Resolved (ES-6)
- Summary of Impacts (ES-7)

A summary of the alternatives is in Table ES-1, and a comparative summary of the impacts of the Proposed Action and the alternatives to the Proposed Action is provided in Table ES-2.

ES-2 Purpose and Need/Objectives

The USFWS's purpose (in accordance with NEPA requirements) in issuing ITPs, entering into an IA(s), and approving the HCP is to authorize the incidental take of the covered species resulting from the covered activities in the Natomas Basin. As stated in the USFWS's *Habitat Conservation Planning Handbook* (USFWS and National Marine Fisheries Service, 1996), a key facet of the HCP program is to reduce conflicts between listed species and economic development activities, and create a framework that would encourage "creative partnerships" among the public and private sectors and state, municipal, and federal agencies in the interests of endangered and threatened species and habitat conservation. The need for the action is based on the potential that activities proposed by the permittees could result in the take of federally listed species and other unlisted species that could become listed in the future. The USFWS must respond to the ITP application related to activities that have the potential to result in the take of covered species within each permittee's permit area.

The primary objectives under CEQA for the City and Sutter County are to implement their respective general plans and other planning documents (see Section 2.2 and Chapter 4, Environmental Consequences) for lands within the Natomas Basin. These plans represent a foreseeable urban development scenario evaluated for the HCP. The Proposed Action addresses incidental take of the covered species resulting from 17,500 acres of planned development in the Natomas Basin (this also includes the 1,983-acre Metro Air Park project in unincorporated Sacramento County, which is covered by a separate ITP, as described in Section 1.2.1). These development activities have the potential to result in the take of listed species and permanent disturbance to their habitats within the 53,537-acre Natomas Basin.

The objective for the Conservancy is to implement the provisions of the HCP on lands acquired for management by the Conservancy in a way that promotes biological conservation and provides incidental take coverage.

ES-3 Study Area

The study area for this EIR/EIS is primarily the Natomas Basin. The study area also includes Area B, which is the out-of-basin mitigation area in which habitat reserve lands could be acquired (see Section 2.4.5.6). (The EIR/EIS study area includes the HCP Plan Area.) The individual permit areas for each of the permittees are discussed in Section 2.2.

ES-4 Proposed Action and Alternatives

The alternatives evaluated in this EIR/EIS are summarized in Table ES-1.

TABLE ES-1
EIR/EIS Alternatives

Title	Brief Description
Revised Natomas Basin HCP (Proposed Action)	<p>Provide incidental take coverage for the following covered activities:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Urban development of 17,500 acres in the City of Sacramento, Sutter County, and Metro Air Park (see Section 2.3.1) • Development, operations, and maintenance of the system of habitat reserves envisioned under the HCP <p>Implement conservation measures for 22 special-status species. See Table 2-1 for a listing of these species; Section 2.4.6 for conservation measures to be implemented by the City of Sacramento, Sutter County, Metro Air Park; RD 1000, and Natomas Mutual.</p> <p>Establish a system of habitat reserves based on a ratio of one-half acre of land to be acquired for each acre of land developed (8,750 acres total, based on 17,500 acres to be developed). See Section 2.4.5 for a description of the acquisition, management, and funding program for the habitat reserves.</p>
Increased Mitigation (Alternative 1)	Same as the Proposed Action, but acquisition of habitat reserves would be based on a 1:1 ratio (17,500 acres of reserves with 17,500 acres of land development).
Habitat-Based Mitigation (Alternative 2)	Same as the Proposed Action, but acquisition of habitat reserves would be based on habitat value of the lands subject to urban development. Based on the methodology described in Section 2.6.2, this would result in the need to acquire 17,569 acres of lands to be managed as habitat reserves.
Reserve Zones (Alternative 3)	Same as the Proposed Action, but the acquisition criteria for habitat reserves would be geographically focused based on the habitat needs of the giant garter snake and Swainson's hawk. For a description of the five reserve zones, see Section 2.6.3.
Reduced Potential for Incidental Take (Alternative 4)	Same as the Proposed Action, but the land development area covered under the ITPs would be reduced from 17,500 acres to 12,000 acres.
No Action Alternative (Alternative 5)	Incidental take permits would not be issued and the HCP would not be implemented. Land development would occur, but would develop mitigation measures for the covered species on a case-by-case basis.

ES-4.1 Independent Implementation

As discussed in Section I.A of the HCP (and in Section 2.3 of this EIR/EIS), the individual permittees (i.e., the City, Sutter County, Conservancy, RD 1000, and Natomas Mutual) would obtain individual ITPs from the USFWS for activities within each permittee's respective permit area. Similarly, each of these permittees also would obtain individual Section 2081 permits (or amendments to existing 2081 permits) from the CDFG for activities conducted within each permittee's respective permit area. Each permittee would be required to mitigate independently the impacts of its covered activities (i.e., if any one of the permits was revoked, the other permits would remain in effect). The conservation strategy in the HCP, as it pertains to specific permittees, can be used by the various applicants to obtain the necessary take permits needed to conduct otherwise lawful activities within each permittee's respective permit area. Because of the potential for independent implementation of the HCP by permittees, this EIR/EIS assesses impacts from individual permittees as well as overall impacts of the Proposed Action and alternatives (see Chapter 4, Environmental Consequences).

ES-5 Areas of Controversy

Areas of controversy known to the lead agencies, including issues raised by agencies and the public, must be identified in the Executive Summary of an EIR. (California Code of Regulations, Section 15123). The scoping phase of the EIR/EIS, conducted between December 18, 2000 and January 16, 2001, identified the following key areas of concern for consideration in the EIR/EIS:

- Nuisance effects of habitat reserves on adjacent land uses
- Potential for the habitat reserves to increase conflicts between waterfowl and aircraft from Sacramento International Airport
- Need to provide increased mitigation (e.g., a higher ratio for reserve acquisition) or protect key existing habitat areas
- Consideration of future development beyond the 17,500 acres considered in the HCP

ES-6 Issues To Be Resolved

Issues to be resolved, including the choice among alternatives and whether or how to mitigate significant effects, must be identified in the Executive Summary of an EIR (California Code of Regulations, Section 15123). The choice among the alternatives evaluated in the EIR/EIS is the primary issue to be resolved as part of the EIR/EIS process.

ES-7 Summary of Impacts and Mitigation Measures

This section presents a summary of the impacts of implementing the Proposed Action (i.e., the proposed Natomas Basin HCP) or alternatives. The proposed conservation strategy (see Section 2.1.3) is designed to: (1) avoid the environmental effects that could cause take; and (2) minimize and mitigate the impacts of take that could occur. The potential direct, indirect,

and cumulative effects of the Proposed Action and alternatives are described and evaluated in Chapter 4, Environmental Consequences, for the resource areas listed below. (The affected environment for each of these resource areas is presented in Chapter 3, Affected Environment.)

- Geology and Soils (Section 4.2)
- Water Resources (Section 4.3)
- Biological Resources (Section 4.4)
- Cultural Resources (Section 4.5)
- Land Use/Consistency with Adopted Plans and Policies (Section 4.6)
- Social and Economic Conditions (Section 4.7)
- Traffic (Section 4.8)
- Noise (Section 4.9)
- Air Quality (Section 4.10)
- Public Health and Safety (Section 4.11)

Table ES-2, at the end of this Executive Summary, provides a comparative overview of the impacts of the Proposed Action and the alternatives for each of the resource areas assessed in this EIR/EIS. The table is focused on the impacts of developing the habitat reserves (see Section 4.1.3 for a discussion of prior environmental analyses). Detailed analysis of impacts is contained in Chapter 4, Environmental Consequences.

ES-7.2 Summary of Impacts

Overall, the critical resources assessed in this EIR/EIS are the species covered by the ITPs. On the basis of the assessment of direct, indirect, and cumulative impacts presented in Section 4.4, implementing the HCP or the other alternatives would not result in significant environmental impacts. The impacts to species resulting from implementation of the HCP would be less than significant, because of either the conservation measures in the HCP or additional mitigation measures prescribed in Section 4.4.

Implementing the HCP could result in the potential for impacts to occur to other resources. Potentially significant impacts are identified relating to water quality, cultural resources, agricultural lands, traffic, noise, and air quality. Impacts associated with land development have been addressed in prior environmental documents as referenced in Section 4.1 and in Appendix C. Where new significant impacts are identified, mitigation measures are proposed to reduce the extent of the impacts to a less-than-significant level. With the exception of the loss of farmland resulting from creating the habitat reserves, all new impacts are expected to be reduced to a less-than-significant level with the mitigation measures proposed. Impacts attributable to loss of farmland in the Natomas Basin from creation of habitat reserves are not likely to be mitigated to a less-than-significant level and, therefore, represent an unavoidable adverse consequence of the Proposed Action.

TABLE ES-2
Summary of Potential Environmental Impacts Associated with Proposed Action and Alternatives

Proposed Action	Alternative 1: Increased Mitigation	Alternative 2: Habitat-Based Mitigation	Alternative 3: Reserve Zones	Alternative 4: Reduced Potential for Incidental Take	Alternative 5: No Action
4.2 Geology and Soils					
<u>Impact:</u> Less-than-significant increases in erosion resulting from development of habitat reserves.	<u>Impact:</u> Greater impacts than the Proposed Action, but less than significant.	<u>Impact:</u> Greater impacts than the Proposed Action, but less than significant.	<u>Impact:</u> Same as Proposed Action.	<u>Impact:</u> Same as Proposed Action.	<u>Impact:</u> Similar effects are expected with case-by-case mitigation.
4.3 Water Resources					
<u>Impact:</u> Less-than-significant increases in flood potential resulting from management of habitat reserves.	<u>Impact:</u> Same as Proposed Action.	<u>Impact:</u> Same as Proposed Action.	<u>Impact:</u> Same as Proposed Action.	<u>Impact:</u> Same as Proposed Action.	<u>Impact:</u> Similar effects are expected with case-by-case mitigation.
<u>Impact:</u> Potentially significant decreases in stormwater quality resulting from development of habitat reserves. Can be mitigated to a less-than-significant level with mitigation.	<u>Impact:</u> Greater impacts than the Proposed Action. Can be mitigated to a less-than-significant level with mitigation.	<u>Impact:</u> Greater impacts than the Proposed Action. Can be mitigated to a less-than-significant level with mitigation.	<u>Impact:</u> Same as Proposed Action.	<u>Impact:</u> Similar to Proposed Action.	<u>Impact:</u> Similar effects are expected with case-by-case mitigation.
<u>EIR/EIS Mitigation Measure:</u> Construction of habitat reserves shall adhere to the requirements of the State Water Resources Control Board’s General Permit for Stormwater Discharges Associated with Construction Activity, as amended from time to time, by filing an NOI with the Central Valley Regional Water Quality Control Board. For development activities on each reserve site, the Conservancy shall prepare a Stormwater Pollution Prevention Plan that includes best management practices consistent with the City’s Administrative and Technical Procedures for Grading and Erosion and Sediment Control and Sacramento County’s Erosion and Sediment Control Standards and Specifications, regardless of whether the reserves are located in Sacramento or Sutter County. Best management practices shall focus on the control of	<u>EIR/EIS Mitigation Measure:</u> Same as Proposed Action.	<u>EIR/EIS Mitigation Measure:</u> Same as Proposed Action.	<u>EIR/EIS Mitigation Measure:</u> Same as Proposed Action.	<u>EIR/EIS Mitigation Measure:</u> Same as Proposed Action.	

TABLE ES-2

Summary of Potential Environmental Impacts Associated with Proposed Action and Alternatives

Proposed Action	Alternative 1: Increased Mitigation	Alternative 2: Habitat-Based Mitigation	Alternative 3: Reserve Zones	Alternative 4: Reduced Potential for Incidental Take	Alternative 5: No Action
sediment discharge into local drains (e.g., through installation of barriers such as silt fences and through tracking controls) and the release of hazardous materials from construction operations (e.g., through the use of designated staging areas with onsite controls).					
<u>Impact:</u> Less-than-significant impacts associated with future water availability in the Natomas Basin.	<u>Impact:</u> Same as Proposed Action.	<u>Impact:</u> Same as Proposed Action.	<u>Impact:</u> Same as Proposed Action.	<u>Impact:</u> Same as Proposed Action.	<u>Impact:</u> Similar effects are expected with case-by-case mitigation.
4.4 Biological Resources					
<u>Impact:</u> Marsh habitat as measured by rice fields, canals and drains, and ponds and seasonally wet areas would decline in the Natomas Basin by 8,087 acres (35 percent), 404 acres (23 percent), and 21 acres (22 percent), respectively because of authorized development. Permanent reserves would be established, including 2,187.5 acres of managed marsh and 4,350 acres of rice. <u>EIR/EIS Mitigation Measure:</u> As part of the process for development review, the City and Sutter County will include a provision that public or private development projects that could support jurisdictional wetlands will result in no net loss of wetlands and will ensure that that wetlands functions and values will be maintained.	<u>Impact:</u> Impacts to marsh habitat associated with authorized development would be the same as under the Proposed Action. Permanent reserves would be established, including 4,350 acres of managed marsh and 8,750 acres of rice. <u>EIR/EIS Mitigation Measure:</u> Same as Proposed Action.	<u>Impact:</u> Impacts to marsh habitat associated with authorized development would be the same as under the Proposed Action. Permanent reserves would be established, including a combined rice/managed marsh reserve acreage of 9,687 acres. <u>EIR/EIS Mitigation Measure:</u> Same as Proposed Action	<u>Impact:</u> Same as Proposed Action. <u>EIR/EIS Mitigation Measure:</u> Same as Proposed Action.	<u>Impact:</u> Marsh habitat as measured by rice fields, canals and drains, and ponds and seasonally wet areas would decline in the Natomas Basin by 5,752 acres (25 percent), 277 acres (16 percent), and 15 acres (15 percent), respectively because of authorized development. Permanent reserves would be established, including 1,500 acres of managed marsh and 3,000 acres of rice. <u>EIR/EIS Mitigation Measure:</u> Same as Proposed Action.	<u>Impact:</u> Marsh habitat is expected to decrease by approximately the same acreage as under the Proposed Action because of urban development. Unknown benefits associated with habitat creation.

TABLE ES-2

Summary of Potential Environmental Impacts Associated with Proposed Action and Alternatives

Proposed Action	Alternative 1: Increased Mitigation	Alternative 2: Habitat-Based Mitigation	Alternative 3: Reserve Zones	Alternative 4: Reduced Potential for Incidental Take	Alternative 5: No Action
<u>Impact:</u> Upland habitat in the Natomas Basin would decrease by 9,188 acres (42 percent) because of authorized development. Permanent reserves would be established, including 2,187.5 acres of uplands.	<u>Impact:</u> Impacts to upland habitat associated with authorized development would be the same as under the Proposed Action. Permanent reserves would be established, including 4,350 acres of uplands.	<u>Impact:</u> Impacts to upland habitat associated with authorized development would be the same as under the Proposed Action. Permanent reserves would be established, including 8,074 acres of uplands.	<u>Impact:</u> Same as Proposed Action.	<u>Impact:</u> Upland habitat in the Natomas Basin would decrease by 6,063 acres (28 percent) because of authorized development. Permanent reserves would be established, including 1,500 acres of uplands.	<u>Impact:</u> Upland habitat is expected to decrease by approximately the same acreage as under the Proposed Action because of urban development. Unknown benefits associated with habitat creation.
<u>Impact:</u> Loss of riparian habitat in the Natomas Basin generally would not occur.	<u>Impact:</u> Same as Proposed Action.	<u>Impact:</u> Same as Proposed Action.	<u>Impact:</u> Same as Proposed Action.	<u>Impact:</u> Same as Proposed Action.	<u>Impact:</u> Same as Proposed Action.
<u>Impact:</u> Up to 8 acres (8 percent) of oak groves in the Natomas Basin would potentially be removed because of urban development.	<u>Impact:</u> Same as Proposed Action.	<u>Impact:</u> Same as Proposed Action.	<u>Impact:</u> Same as Proposed Action.	<u>Impact:</u> Expected to be approximately the same as Proposed Action.	<u>Impact:</u> Expected to be approximately the same as Proposed Action.
<u>Impact:</u> Vernal pools could be affected in North Natomas and potentially in other areas of the Natomas Basin.	<u>Impact:</u> Same as Proposed Action.	<u>Impact:</u> Same as Proposed Action.	<u>Impact:</u> Same as Proposed Action.	<u>Impact:</u> Expected to be approximately the same as Proposed Action.	<u>Impact:</u> Expected to be approximately the same as Proposed Action.
<u>Impact:</u> Approximately 8,512 acres of potential habitat for the giant garter snake would be affected by authorized development in the Natomas Basin. Preservation of wetland habitat and creation and management of reserves that support 6,562 acres of giant garter snake habitat mitigates the impacts of the covered activities on giant garter snakes to a less-than-significant level.	<u>Impact:</u> Impacts to giant garter snake habitat would be the same as under the Proposed Action. Approximately 13,125 acres of giant garter snake habitat would be supported by the system of habitat reserves.	<u>Impact:</u> Impacts to giant garter snake habitat would be the same as under the Proposed Action. Approximately 9,687 acres of giant garter snake habitat would be supported by the system of habitat reserves.	<u>Impact:</u> Same as Proposed Action.	<u>Impact:</u> Approximately 6,044 acres of potential habitat for the giant garter snake would be affected by authorized development in the Natomas Basin. Approximately 4,500 acres of giant garter snake habitat would be supported by the system of habitat reserves.	<u>Impact:</u> Giant garter snake habitat is expected to decrease by approximately the same acreage as under the Proposed Action because of urban development. Unknown benefits associated with habitat creation.

TABLE ES-2

Summary of Potential Environmental Impacts Associated with Proposed Action and Alternatives

Proposed Action	Alternative 1: Increased Mitigation	Alternative 2: Habitat-Based Mitigation	Alternative 3: Reserve Zones	Alternative 4: Reduced Potential for Incidental Take	Alternative 5: No Action
<u>Impact:</u> Two Swainson's hawk nesting territories with remaining nest trees (NB-3 and NB-6) have the potential to be abandoned because of authorized development.	<u>Impact:</u> Same as the Proposed Action.	<u>Impact:</u> Same as the Proposed Action.	<u>Impact:</u> Same as the Proposed Action.	<u>Impact:</u> Expected to be approximately the same as the Proposed Action.	<u>Impact:</u> Expected to be approximately the same as the Proposed Action.
<u>Impact:</u> Swainson's hawk foraging habitat in the Natomas Basin would decrease by 9,188 acres (42 percent) because of authorized development. Permanent reserves would be established including 2,187.5 acres of uplands that would be managed for Swainson's hawk foraging habitat value.	<u>Impact:</u> Impacts to Swainson's hawk foraging habitat associated with authorized development would be the same as under the Proposed Action. Permanent reserves would be established, including 4,350 acres of uplands.	<u>Impact:</u> Impacts to Swainson's hawk foraging habitat associated with authorized development would be the same as under the Proposed Action. Permanent reserves would be established, including 8,074 acres of uplands.	<u>Impact:</u> Same as Proposed Action.	<u>Impact:</u> Swainson's hawk foraging habitat in the Natomas Basin would decrease by 6,063 acres (28 percent) because of authorized development. Permanent reserves would be established including 1,500 acres of uplands.	<u>Impact:</u> Swainson's hawk foraging habitat is expected to decrease by approximately the same acreage as under the Proposed Action because of urban development. Unknown benefits associated with habitat creation.
<u>Impact:</u> Overall effects to other covered species associated with habitat loss and creation would be less than significant.	<u>Impact:</u> Similar to Proposed Action.	<u>Impact:</u> Similar to Proposed Action.	<u>Impact:</u> Same as Proposed Action.	<u>Impact:</u> Expected to be approximately the same as Proposed Action.	<u>Impact:</u> Expected to be approximately the same as Proposed Action.
<u>Impact:</u> Potentially significant effects to some other special-status species (e.g., dwarf downingia, rose mallow, Cooper's hawk, American bittern, black tern, lark sparrow, white-tailed kite, Pacific-slope flycatcher, Bewick's wren) can be mitigated to a less than significant level with mitigation. <u>EIR/EIS Mitigation Measure:</u> Preconstruction surveys required pursuant to Section V.A.1 of the HCP shall encompass the habitat areas that could support dwarf downingia or rose mallow. If dwarf downingia or rose mallow are found during the habitat surveys, mitigation shall conform to the mitigation requirements for Delta tule pea and Sanford's arrowhead as described in the HCP and in	<u>Impact:</u> Same as Proposed Action. <u>EIR/EIS Mitigation Measure:</u> Same as Proposed Action.	<u>Impact:</u> Same as Proposed Action. <u>EIR/EIS Mitigation Measure:</u> Same as Proposed Action.	<u>Impact:</u> Same as Proposed Action. <u>EIR/EIS Mitigation Measure:</u> Same as Proposed Action.	<u>Impact:</u> Expected to be approximately the same as Proposed Action. <u>EIR/EIS Mitigation Measure:</u> Same as Proposed Action.	<u>Impact:</u> Expected to be approximately the same as Proposed Action.

TABLE ES-2
Summary of Potential Environmental Impacts Associated with Proposed Action and Alternatives

Proposed Action	Alternative 1: Increased Mitigation	Alternative 2: Habitat-Based Mitigation	Alternative 3: Reserve Zones	Alternative 4: Reduced Potential for Incidental Take	Alternative 5: No Action
<p>accordance with the California Native Plant Protection Act.</p> <p>Preconstruction surveys required pursuant to Section V.A.1 of the HCP shall encompass the habitat areas where nesting birds could occur. In accordance with the requirements of the Migratory Bird Treaty Act, vegetation containing an occupied nest and an appropriate-sized buffer around the nests of Cooper's hawks, American bitterns, black terns, lark sparrows, white-tailed kites, Pacific-slope flycatchers, and Bewick's wrens shall not be removed until the nest has been abandoned by the nesting pair or the young have fledged.</p>	<p><u>Impact:</u> Same as Proposed Action.</p>	<p><u>Impact:</u> Same as Proposed Action.</p>	<p><u>Impact:</u> Same as Proposed Action.</p>	<p><u>Impact:</u> Same as Proposed Action.</p>	<p><u>Impact:</u> Same as Proposed Action.</p>
<p><u>Impact:</u> No impact to fish species of concern would occur.</p>	<p><u>Impact:</u> Net reduction in waterfowl habitat would be less than significant.</p>	<p><u>Impact:</u> Similar to the Proposed Action.</p>	<p><u>Impact:</u> Similar to the Proposed Action.</p>	<p><u>Impact:</u> Similar to the Proposed Action.</p>	<p><u>Impact:</u> Similar to the Proposed Action.</p>
4.5 Cultural Resources					
<p><u>Impact:</u> Potentially significant increase in the potential to disturb unknown, subsurface cultural resources resulting from development of habitat reserves. Can be mitigated to a less-than-significant level with mitigation. <u>EIR/EIS Mitigation Measure:</u> Parcels being considered for habitat reserves shall undergo preconstruction literature review and/or field surveys, based on the discretion of a qualified archaeologist. Based on the findings of the cultural resource review and the potential for land disturbance to occur on the reserve, the</p>	<p><u>Impact:</u> Greater impacts than the Proposed Action. Can be mitigated to a less-than-significant level with mitigation. <u>EIR/EIS Mitigation Measure:</u> Same as Proposed Action.</p>	<p><u>Impact:</u> Greater impacts than the Proposed Action. Can be mitigated to a less-than-significant level with mitigation. <u>EIR/EIS Mitigation Measure:</u> Same as Proposed Action.</p>	<p><u>Impact:</u> Same as Proposed Action. <u>EIR/EIS Mitigation Measure:</u> Same as Proposed Action.</p>	<p><u>Impact:</u> Similar to Proposed Action. <u>EIR/EIS Mitigation Measure:</u> Same as Proposed Action.</p>	<p><u>Impact:</u> Similar effects are expected with case-by-case mitigation.</p>

TABLE ES-2

Summary of Potential Environmental Impacts Associated with Proposed Action and Alternatives

Proposed Action	Alternative 1: Increased Mitigation	Alternative 2: Habitat-Based Mitigation	Alternative 3: Reserve Zones	Alternative 4: Reduced Potential for Incidental Take	Alternative 5: No Action
<p>Natomas Basin Conservancy could be required to complete an archaeological report and implement site-specific mitigation measures as a condition for restoration.</p> <p>and</p> <p>In the event that any historic or archaeological features (surface or subsurface) or deposits, including locally darkened soil ("midden") that could conceal cultural deposits, animal bone, shell, obsidian, mortars, or human remains, are uncovered during construction, work within 100 feet of the find shall cease and a qualified archaeologist and a representative of the Native American Heritage Commission shall be consulted to develop, if necessary, further mitigation measures to reduce any archaeological impacts to a less-than-significant level before construction continues.</p> <p>and</p> <p>When Native American archaeological, ethnographic, or spiritual resources are involved, all identification and treatment shall be conducted by qualified archaeologists who are either certified by the Society of Professional Archaeologists (SOPA) or who meet the federal standards as stated in the <i>Code of Federal Regulations</i> (36 CFR 61), and Native American Representatives who are approved by the local Native American community as scholars of their cultural traditions. In the event that no such Native American is available, persons who represent tribal governments and/or organizations in the locale in which</p>					

TABLE ES-2
Summary of Potential Environmental Impacts Associated with Proposed Action and Alternatives

Proposed Action	Alternative 1: Increased Mitigation	Alternative 2: Habitat-Based Mitigation	Alternative 3: Reserve Zones	Alternative 4: Reduced Potential for Incidental Take	Alternative 5: No Action
<p>resources could be affected shall be consulted. When historic archaeological sites or historic architectural features are involved, all identification and treatment is to be carried out by historical archaeologists or architectural historians. These individuals shall meet either SOPA or 36 <i>CFR</i> 61 requirements.</p>					
<p>and</p>					
<p>If human bone of unknown origin is found during construction, all work shall stop in the vicinity of the find and the County Coroner shall be contacted immediately. If the remains are determined to be Native American, the Coroner shall notify the Native American Heritage Commission who shall notify the person it believes to be the most likely descendant. The most likely descendant shall work with the contractor to develop a program for reinterment of the human remains and any associated artifacts. No additional work is to take place within the immediate vicinity of the find until the identified appropriate actions have been carried out.</p>					
<p>4.6 Land Use/Consistency With Adopted Plans and Policies</p>					
<p><u>Impact:</u> Less-than-significant land use compatibility/plan inconsistency impacts.</p>	<p><u>Impact:</u> Same as Proposed Action.</p>	<p><u>Impact:</u> Same as Proposed Action.</p>	<p><u>Impact:</u> Same as Proposed Action.</p>	<p><u>Impact:</u> Same as Proposed Action.</p>	<p><u>Impact:</u> Similar effects are expected with case-by-case mitigation.</p>

TABLE ES-2

Summary of Potential Environmental Impacts Associated with Proposed Action and Alternatives

Proposed Action	Alternative 1: Increased Mitigation	Alternative 2: Habitat-Based Mitigation	Alternative 3: Reserve Zones	Alternative 4: Reduced Potential for Incidental Take	Alternative 5: No Action
<p><u>Impact:</u> Significant loss of farmland. Not likely to be mitigated to a less-than-significant level.</p> <p><u>EIR/EIS Mitigation Measure:</u> To the extent practicable (and to the extent that biological goals are not compromised), development of site-specific management plans will incorporate provisions that consider farmlands and agricultural use.</p>	<p><u>Impact:</u> Greater impacts than the Proposed Action.</p> <p><u>EIR/EIS Mitigation Measure:</u> Same as Proposed Action.</p>	<p><u>Impact:</u> Greater impacts than the Proposed Action.</p> <p><u>EIR/EIS Mitigation Measure:</u> Same as Proposed Action.</p>	<p><u>Impact:</u> Same as Proposed Action.</p> <p><u>EIR/EIS Mitigation Measure:</u> Same as Proposed Action.</p>	<p><u>Impact:</u> Similar to the Proposed Action.</p> <p><u>EIR/EIS Mitigation Measure:</u> Same as Proposed Action.</p>	<p><u>Impact:</u> Similar effects are expected with case-by-case mitigation.</p>
4.7 Social and Economic Conditions					
<p><u>Impact:</u> Less-than-significant changes in local employment and tax revenues to Sacramento and Sutter counties.</p>	<p><u>Impact:</u> Greater impacts than the Proposed Action, but less than significant.</p>	<p><u>Impact:</u> Greater impacts than the Proposed Action, but less than significant.</p>	<p><u>Impact:</u> Same as Proposed Action.</p>	<p><u>Impact:</u> Same as Proposed Action.</p>	<p><u>Impact:</u> Similar effects are expected with case-by-case mitigation.</p>
4.8 Traffic					
<p><u>Impact:</u> Potentially significant increase in the potential for traffic safety conflicts resulting from development of habitat reserves. Can be mitigated to a less-than-significant level with mitigation.</p> <p><u>EIR/EIS Mitigation Measure:</u> Prior to commencing substantial habitat reserve development activities, the Conservancy shall evaluate traffic levels on any adjacent rural roadways that would provide construction access. Where potential traffic-safety impacts are identified, the Conservancy and/or its contractor shall prepare a Traffic Control Plan that addresses potential impacts to public safety and other construction-related nuisances. The Traffic Control Plan shall be reviewed and approved by the City of Sacramento and/or Sutter County, and should be submitted for review by Sacramento County for projects</p>	<p><u>Impact:</u> Greater impacts than the Proposed Action. Can be mitigated to a less-than-significant level with mitigation.</p> <p><u>EIR/EIS Mitigation Measure:</u> Same as Proposed Action.</p>	<p><u>Impact:</u> Greater impacts than the Proposed Action. Can be mitigated to a less-than-significant level with mitigation.</p> <p><u>EIR/EIS Mitigation Measure:</u> Same as Proposed Action.</p>	<p><u>Impact:</u> Same as Proposed Action.</p> <p><u>EIR/EIS Mitigation Measure:</u> Same as Proposed Action.</p>	<p><u>Impact:</u> Similar to Proposed Action.</p> <p><u>EIR/EIS Mitigation Measure:</u> Same as Proposed Action.</p>	<p><u>Impact:</u> Similar effects are expected with case-by-case mitigation.</p>

TABLE ES-2
 Summary of Potential Environmental Impacts Associated with Proposed Action and Alternatives

Proposed Action	Alternative 1: Increased Mitigation	Alternative 2: Habitat-Based Mitigation	Alternative 3: Reserve Zones	Alternative 4: Reduced Potential for Incidental Take	Alternative 5: No Action
<p>located within the unincorporated portion of Sacramento County. Traffic management measures to be included in the Traffic Control Plan include, but are not limited to, the following:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Provide adequate warning to users of the roadway in the vicinity of the construction, through signs or other means visible from the roadway • Provide adequate assistance to the public in navigating the construction site through the use of flagmen • Install adequate signage for construction zones and detours • If traffic and circulation would be interrupted for an extended period of time, provide for the opportunity for public input from affected residents 					

TABLE ES-2

Summary of Potential Environmental Impacts Associated with Proposed Action and Alternatives

Proposed Action	Alternative 1: Increased Mitigation	Alternative 2: Habitat-Based Mitigation	Alternative 3: Reserve Zones	Alternative 4: Reduced Potential for Incidental Take	Alternative 5: No Action
<p>4.9 Noise</p> <p><u>Impact:</u> Potentially significant increase in noise-related nuisances resulting from development of habitat reserves. Can be mitigated to a less-than-significant level with mitigation.</p> <p><u>EIR/EIS Mitigation Measure:</u> Prior to commencing substantial habitat reserve development activities, the Conservancy shall determine if residences or other sensitive receptors are located within 1000 feet of the construction site. If sensitive receptors are located within 1000 feet of the construction site, operation of construction equipment and vehicles would occur between the hours of 7:00 am and 6:00 pm, Monday through Saturday, and between 9:00 am and 6:00 pm on Sunday.</p>	<p><u>Impact:</u> Greater impacts than the Proposed Action. Can be mitigated to a less-than-significant level with mitigation.</p> <p><u>EIR/EIS Mitigation Measure:</u> Same as Proposed Action.</p>	<p><u>Impact:</u> Greater impacts than the Proposed Action. Can be mitigated to a less-than-significant level with mitigation.</p> <p><u>EIR/EIS Mitigation Measure:</u> Same as Proposed Action.</p>	<p><u>Impact:</u> Same as Proposed Action.</p> <p><u>EIR/EIS Mitigation Measure:</u> Same as Proposed Action.</p>	<p><u>Impact:</u> Similar to Proposed Action.</p> <p><u>EIR/EIS Mitigation Measure:</u> Same as Proposed Action.</p>	<p><u>Impact:</u> Similar effects are expected with case-by-case mitigation.</p>

TABLE ES-2
Summary of Potential Environmental Impacts Associated with Proposed Action and Alternatives

Proposed Action	Alternative 1: Increased Mitigation	Alternative 2: Habitat-Based Mitigation	Alternative 3: Reserve Zones	Alternative 4: Reduced Potential for Incidental Take	Alternative 5: No Action
4.10 Air Quality					
<p><u>Impact:</u> Potentially significant increase in NO_x and PM₁₀ resulting from development of habitat reserves. Can be mitigated to a less-than-significant level with mitigation.</p> <p><u>EIR/EIS Mitigation Measure:</u> The following measures shall be implemented to reduce emissions of ozone precursors during construction activities on the habitat reserves.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ● To the extent feasible, the Natomas Basin Conservancy shall work with contractors who include low-NO_x, heavy-duty construction vehicles. ● Construction activities shall be phased to reduce the simultaneous operation of construction equipment. ● The contractor shall perform routine tuning and maintenance of construction equipment. ● The contractor shall use existing on-site electric power sources in place of diesel generators to the extent that these sources are available. <p style="text-align: center;">and</p> <p>The following measures shall be implemented to reduce construction-related emissions of fugitive dust (PM₁₀).</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ● The contractor shall reduce or suspend grading and excavation activity during windy periods (i.e., winds in excess of 15 miles per hour). 	<p><u>Impact:</u> Greater impacts than the Proposed Action. Can be mitigated to a less-than-significant level with mitigation.</p> <p><u>EIR/EIS Mitigation Measure:</u> Same as Proposed Action.</p>	<p><u>Impact:</u> Greater impacts than the Proposed Action. Can be mitigated to a less-than-significant level with mitigation.</p> <p><u>EIR/EIS Mitigation Measure:</u> Same as Proposed Action.</p>	<p><u>Impact:</u> Same as Proposed Action.</p> <p><u>EIR/EIS Mitigation Measure:</u> Same as Proposed Action.</p>	<p><u>Impact:</u> Similar to Proposed Action.</p> <p><u>EIR/EIS Mitigation Measure:</u> Same as Proposed Action.</p>	<p><u>Impact:</u> Similar effects are expected with case-by-case mitigation.</p>

TABLE ES-2

Summary of Potential Environmental Impacts Associated with Proposed Action and Alternatives

Proposed Action	Alternative 1: Increased Mitigation	Alternative 2: Habitat-Based Mitigation	Alternative 3: Reserve Zones	Alternative 4: Reduced Potential for Incidental Take	Alternative 5: No Action
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The contractor shall post and enforce speed limits on unpaved driving areas. • The contractor shall apply water twice daily to disturbed areas and active construction sites. • The contractor shall treat completed sites with soil binders or vegetation. <p>Dirt shall be washed off trucks and other equipment before leaving the construction site.</p>					
4.11 Public Health and Safety					
<u>Impact:</u> Less-than-significant public health and safety impacts resulting from the creation of habitat reserves within the bird-strike zones of Sacramento International Airport.	<u>Impact:</u> Greater impacts than the Proposed Action, but less than significant.	<u>Impact:</u> Greater impacts than the Proposed Action, but less than significant.	<u>Impact:</u> Same as Proposed Action.	<u>Impact:</u> Similar to Proposed Action.	<u>Impact:</u> Similar effects are expected with case-by-case mitigation.