

Executive Summary

This document is the Final Environmental Impact Statement (EIS)/Environmental Impact Report (EIR) for the East Contra Costa County (ECCC) Habitat Conservation Plan (HCP)/Natural Community Conservation Plan (NCCP). The executive summary provides a brief overview of the HCP/NCCP purpose and need; compliance requirements of the National Environmental Policy Act (NEPA) and the California Environmental Quality Act (CEQA); alternatives considered in the EIS/EIR; environmental consequences of the alternatives; and areas of controversy and issues to be addressed or resolved.

Project Overview

Purpose and Need

Contra Costa County (County), the Cities of Brentwood, Clayton, Oakley, and Pittsburg, the Contra Costa County Flood Control and Water Conservation District, the East Bay Regional Park District (EBRPD), and the HCP/NCCP Implementing Entity are applying for incidental take permits (ITPs) from the U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service (USFWS), pursuant to Section 10(a)(1)(B) of the Endangered Species Act (ESA) of 1973, as amended; and from the California Department of Fish and Game (DFG), pursuant to Section 2835 of the Fish and Game Code. The permits would authorize take of certain state- and federally listed species during the course of otherwise lawful activities. As a required component of the application for these permits, the applicants have prepared a HCP/NCCP for ECCC. The area covered by the proposed HCP/NCCP (or Plan) encompasses approximately 174,018 acres in eastern Contra Costa County, California.

This Final EIS/EIR evaluates the potential impacts of approval of the ECCC HCP/NCCP, including issuance of ITPs by USFWS and DFG, and adoption of an implementing agreement (IA) for the proposed HCP/NCCP and other alternatives, including the no-action alternative. The EIS/EIR has been prepared pursuant to the National Environmental Policy Act (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; the California Environmental Quality Act (CEQA) (Pub. Res. Code Secs. 21000-21178.1); and the State CEQA Guidelines.

The purpose of this EIS/EIR is to inform agency decision makers and the public regarding the anticipated significant environmental effects of the proposed

project, potential measures to mitigate these significant effects, and reasonable alternatives that could reduce the significant environmental impacts of the proposed project to a less-than-significant level.

National Environmental Policy Act Compliance

NEPA provides a framework for federal agencies to prevent environmental damage and contains procedures requiring action; this ensures that federal agency decision makers take environmental factors into account for all alternatives. NEPA applies to all federal agencies (in this instance, the USFWS) and to most of the activities they manage, regulate, or fund that affect the human environment. It requires all agencies to consider and to publicly disclose the environmental implications of their proposed actions through the preparation of appropriate documents. CEQ has adopted regulations and other guidance that provides detailed procedures that federal agencies must follow to implement NEPA.

NEPA requires that every federal agency prepare an EIS for proposed legislation or other major federal actions “significantly affecting the quality of the human environment” (42 USC 4332; 40 C.F.R. 1501). Because USFWS, as the Lead Agency under NEPA, has determined that the issuance of ITPs to the Permittees under Section 10 of the ESA constitutes a major federal action, an EIS must be prepared.

California Environmental Quality Act Compliance

CEQA requires state and local agencies to estimate and evaluate the environmental implications of their actions and aims, in order to prevent adverse environmental impacts of those actions. Those agencies, when feasible, are thus required to avoid or reduce significant environmental impacts. The State CEQA Guidelines are the primary source of rules and interpretation of CEQA.

CEQA requires that the lead agency prepare an EIR when the lead agency determines that a project may have a significant effect on the environment. CEQA applies to all California projects, and NCCPs are required to comply with CEQA. The ECCC Habitat Conservation Plan Association (HCPA), a joint powers authority, 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.

Joint CEQA/NEPA 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. USFWS is the federal Lead Agency responsible for compliance under NEPA, and HCPA is the local Lead Agency with responsibility for compliance under CEQA.

Several other agencies have responsibility for implementing or approving the proposed HCP/NCCP and are considered Responsible Agencies under CEQA. DFG is the Responsible Agency with responsibility for approving the NCCP portion of the HCP/NCCP and issuing take permits for state-listed species. The local members of HCPA, including Contra Costa County; EBRPD; CCWD; and the Cities of Brentwood, Clayton, Oakley, and Pittsburg, are also Responsible Agencies with responsibility for approving and implementing the proposed HCP/NCCP. All lead and responsible agencies have independently reviewed and directed the preparation of this document. The EIS/EIR has been prepared pursuant to NEPA and CEQA and fulfills the procedural and content requirements of each law.

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 Plan* 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.

Alternatives Considered

Project alternatives are described briefly below. For a detailed discussion of the four alternatives, see Chapter 2, *Proposed Project and Alternatives*. As the lead agencies, the East Contra Costa County Habitat Conservation Plan Association and USFWS have developed the following alternatives for consideration:

- Alternative 1: Proposed Plan (Conservation Strategy A)
- Alternative 2: Conservation Strategy B
- Alternative 3: Reduced Development Area.
- Alternative 4: No Action/No Project.

Alternative 1: Proposed Plan (Conservation Strategy A)

The proposed HCP/NCCP plan, Alternative 1 (also known as Conservation Strategy A) offers the best combination of project benefits, including factors related to both the project's purpose and need and its impacts, and contains the elements described below.

Permit Areas

Two permit areas which reflect the range of expected growth in the area would be established under Alternative 1.

- An initial urban development area (which would authorize 9,796 acres of ground-disturbing urban development activities).

- A maximum urban development area (which would authorize up to 13,029 acres of ground-disturbing urban development activities).

Covered Activities

Covered activities (i.e., specific activities or projects) in the proposed HCP/NCCP which would be permitted by DFG and USFWS include the following three distinct categories.

- Activities and projects associated with urban growth, in accord with local general plans.
- Specific infrastructure projects outside the Urban Limit Line (ULL). The proposed plan would allow up to 1,126 acres of impact from rural infrastructure projects for either the initial or maximum urban development area.
- The following activities inside the proposed HCP/NCCP preserves:
 - construction and maintenance of recreational or management facilities,
 - habitat enhancement, restoration, and creation,
 - management activities necessary to achieve the HCP/NCCP's biological goals,
 - surveys for covered species, vegetation communities, and other resources,
 - agricultural activities on adjoining land within one mile of the preserve boundary,
 - low-intensity recreational use, and
 - construction and maintenance of utility infrastructure.

Other activities or projects not specifically described above may be evaluated for coverage under the proposed HCP/NCCP on a case-by-case basis.

Preserve System

The main element of the proposed HCP/NCCP conservation strategy is the creation of a Preserve System that would preserve approximately 23,800 acres of land with the initial urban development area, or approximately 30,300 acres of land under the maximum urban development area. Likely locations for land acquisition have been divided into Acquisition Analysis Zones, and are under study as detailed in Chapter 2.

Conservation Measures

The proposed HCP/NCCP conservation measures address the landscape-level, community-level (or habitat), and species-level impacts, and includes measures to address the following objectives.

- Design of covered activities to avoid or minimize impacts on covered species and covered vegetation communities.
- Preservation of covered vegetation communities.
- Preservation of covered species populations and habitats.
- Restoration of covered species habitat and vegetation communities to compensate for direct and indirect impacts on specific species and vegetation communities.
- Restoration of species habitat to contribute to the recovery of listed covered species and help prevent the listing of non-listed covered species.
- Management of preserves to maximize the functions of habitats for covered species.

Alternative 2. Conservation Strategy B

Alternative 2 (Conservation Strategy B) was developed as part of the November 2003 preliminary working draft HCP/NCCP. This draft was distributed to stakeholders, regulatory agency staff, and others for review and comment. Alternative was developed in response to comments from the Science Advisory Panel on the January 2003 draft of the conservation strategy. Alternative 2 is similar to the Proposed HCP/NCCP, Alternative 1 (Conservation Strategy A).

The amount and location of land acquisition and habitat restoration proposed under the HCP/NCCP is the sole difference between Alternatives 1 and 2. Under Alternative 1, 15,600 acres total would be acquired for preservation within the Initial Urban Development Area. Within the Maximum Urban Development Area, Alternative 1 would require acquisition of 19,600 acres for preservation.

Alternative 2 (Conservation Strategy B) would require that 9,997 acres be acquired for preservation within the Initial Urban Development Area; within the Maximum Urban Development Area, 13,455 acres would be acquired.

Conservation measures related to land management, principles of habitat restoration, and impact avoidance and minimization are the same between the two alternatives.

Alternative 3. Reduced Development Area

The Reduced Development Area alternative would designate a single, smaller permit area, rather than the initial and maximum urban development areas designated in alternatives 1 and 2. Under this alternative, covered activities and projects within the urban development area would be limited to lands inside city limits that are designated for development and lands in unincorporated areas with a development land use designation in the Contra Costa County General Plan. Rural infrastructure projects and activities within the preserves, as described for the proposed HCP/NCCP, would also be covered under this alternative.

Under this alternative, the permit area would be 6,991 acres, approximately 1,958 acres less than the initial urban development area and 6,225 acres less than the maximum urban development area.

Land acquisition priorities identified for the initial urban development area would remain the same as alternatives 1 and 2. Requirements for land acquisition and restoration would be reduced under Alternative 3 because these requirements are scaled according to the level of development. All other elements of the proposed HCP/NCCP would be identical to alternatives 1 and 2 under the Reduced Development Area alternative

Alternative 4. No Action/No Project

Under the No-Action/No-Project alternative, the proposed HCP/NCCP, including implementation of conservation measures and creation of a Preserve System, would not be adopted, and the relevant permits required by the federal Endangered Species Act (ESA) and the California Natural Community Conservation Planning Act of 2002 (NCCPA) would not be issued.

Under the No-Action/No-Project alternative, compliance with both the federal ESA and the California ESA (CESA) would continue to be evaluated on a case-by-case basis. No comprehensive strategies to avoid, minimize, or mitigate effects on sensitive species would be implemented under the No-Action/No-Project alternative. No measures that provide for species recovery, as required under NCCPA, would be implemented.

Impacts and Mitigation Measures

A list of specific resource topics was developed to focus on and compare environmental impacts of the various alternatives. The list was drafted based on applicable laws, regulations and policies, as well as comments from agency staff and the interested public. Chapter 3 of the EIS/EIR describes, for each resource topic, the existing environment that could be affected by the proposed actions. These existing conditions establish the baseline for the analysis of effects. Chapter 4 provides a detailed analysis and discussion of the probable environmental consequences, or impacts, of implementing the alternatives.

The HCP/NCCP would provide incidental take authorization for the participating local jurisdictions and agencies. Project approvals by these entities within the permit area are part of the covered activities proposed under the HCP/NCCP to be authorized for incidental take. Covered activities are detailed in Section 2.2 Proposed Project and Alternatives.

No specific development or other ground-disturbing activity is approved or authorized as part of the proposed HCP/NCCP approval. Unless it is otherwise exempt, all future development projects and activities, including those undertaken by the Implementing Entity within proposed HCP/NCCP preserves, would proceed through the normal project review and approval process of the local land use agencies (e.g., grading permit issuance, EIR certification). Urban

development within the HCP/NCCP urban development area, which is a general covered activity under the proposed HCP/NCCP, is development and growth that is planned under the general plans of the County and incorporated cities. The environmental impacts from this urban growth and transportation improvement projects in the region have been evaluated in prior CEQA documents for each of the local general plans. These documents are incorporated by reference into this EIS/EIR. These prior analyses considered the effects of planned development, including cumulative effects, within each land use agency's jurisdiction. The analyses in the prior environmental documents, therefore, disclose the impacts and provide the programmatic mitigation measures required for this development.

Table ES-1 summarizes the environmental impacts (including cumulative impacts) of the HCP/NCCP alternatives, any mitigations to reduce significant impacts, and their level of significance after mitigation. Impacts are summarized for each alternative by resource topic. Impacts are classified as beneficial or adverse; and as significant, less than significant, or less than significant with mitigation. It should be noted that the analysis of biological resources impacts takes into account the full effect of HCP/NCCP implementation prior to making conclusions regarding significance including the effect of preserve establishment, habitat restoration, as well as the conditions on development found in Chapter 5 and 6 of the HCP/NCCP.

Impacts associated with the HCP/NCCP were found to be primarily less than significant or less than significant with mitigation, or in some instances beneficial. Through the analysis in this EIS/EIR, it was determined that no significant and unavoidable impacts would result from the project alternatives. This is due in great part to the fundamental premise that the HCP/NCCP does not specifically authorize or approve a majority of the covered activities. These activities will be required to undergo separate environmental review and permit approval independent of the HCP/NCCP, relying on the HCP/NCCP for ESA and CESA compliance.

Cumulative Impacts

The proposed HCP/NCCP assesses potential cumulative impacts to covered species in the development of its conservation strategy. As a regional plan, the proposed HCP/NCCP considers cumulative impacts to covered species from buildout and development in accordance with the local general plans. Chapter 5 (*Other Required CEQA and NEPA Analyses*) of this EIS/EIR incorporates this analysis into the evaluation of potential cumulative impacts on covered species.

The proposed EIS/EIR also evaluates several specific projects that may, in combination with the HCP/NCCP, result in cumulative impacts to covered species. These include:

- **City of Antioch Development.** The City of Antioch is not a participating member of the HCP/NCCP; therefore, urban development within the City

would result in a wide range of environmental impacts that could contribute to cumulative conditions in the region.

- **Los Vaqueros Reservoir Expansion.** The Los Vaqueros Reservoir expansion would involve restoration and enhancement efforts on lands owned by other agencies, and acquisition of additional land for protection or restoration.
- **Ongoing or Expanded Agricultural Practices.** Agricultural uses are currently a dominant land use in the HCP/NCCP inventory area. The County has continued to see a trend toward conversion of agricultural lands to other uses; thus it is unlikely that agriculture in the County will substantially expand in the future. However, agriculture in the region has continued to shift to more high-value crops such as vineyards. Changes in crop type or other agricultural practices may result in varying cumulative impacts.
- **Ongoing and Future Mineral Extraction.** There is likely to be an increase in quarrying in areas with mineral resources as regional development continues and the demand for aggregate for construction grows.
- **Wind Turbine Operation and Expansion.** The Altamont Pass Wind Resources Area, located in eastern Alameda and the Byron Hills area of Contra Costa County, covers approximately 50,000 acres and contains approximately 5,000 windmills. Expansion of wind turbines, or replacement of existing turbines with newer technology, is likely to continue on a limited scale in the future.

Areas of Controversy/Issues

Based on input during the public scoping and comment periods for the draft EIS/EIR, several issue areas of public concern have been identified regarding the HCP/NCCP Plan. Some of the issues raised might be considered controversial. The issues of apparent greatest concern raised in comment to date are highlighted below. These issue areas and their resolution as it relates to the HCP/NCCP are discussed in the responses to comments in Volume II, Chapter 2 of this Final EIS/EIR.

- HCP/NCCP Inventory, Habitat Modeling, and Impact Methodology.
- Site-Specific Concerns
- Impact on Covered Species.
- Impact on non-Covered Special-Status Species.
- Impact on Designated Critical Habitat.
- Impact on Swainson's Hawk and San Joaquin Kit Fox.
- Exclusion of fish species as covered species.
- Consistency with Long-Term Land Use Planning.
- Consistency with Newly Adopted Urban Limit Lines in Pittsburg and Antioch.

- Consistency with Antioch's Sand Creek Focus Area.
- Impact of Land Acquisition on Housing Availability.
- Affordable Housing and Environmental Justice.
- Economic Impact of HCP/NCCP Fees and Program and Property Rights.
- Impact on Water Quality.
- Impact on Farmland.
- City of Antioch Participation.
- HCP/NCCP Funding Mechanisms and Fee Determination.
- HCP/NCCP Implementation Specifics.
- Integration of Regional Permitting.

Table ES-1. Summary of Impacts

Impact	Impact Level (after Mitigation)				Mitigation Measure
	Alternative 1	Alternative 2	Alternative 3	Alternative 4	
Section 4.2 Biological Resources Impacts					
NOTE: The analysis of biological resources impacts takes into account the full effect of HCP/NCCP implementation prior to making conclusions regarding significance including the effect of preserve establishment, habitat restoration, as well as the conditions on development found in Chapter 5 and 6 of the HCP/NCCP.					
Impact BIO-1: Loss of up to 4,152 Acres of Annual Grassland Habitat.	Less Than Significant	Less Than Significant	Less Than Significant	N/A—No Action Alternative	None Required
Impact BIO-2: Loss of up to 115 acres of alkali grassland habitat.	Less Than Significant	Less Than Significant		N/A—No Action Alternative	None Required
Impact BIO-3: Loss of up to 238 acres of oak woodland and oak savanna habitat.	Less Than Significant	Less Than Significant		N/A—No Action Alternative	None Required
Impact BIO-4: Loss of up to 2 Acres of chaparral/scrub habitat.	Less Than Significant	Less Than Significant		N/A—No Action Alternative	None Required
Impact BIO-5: Loss of up to 35 acres of riparian woodland/scrub habitat.	Less Than Significant	Less Than Significant		N/A—No Action Alternative	None Required
Impact BIO-6: Loss of up to 255 acres of wetlands, ponds, and sloughs, and 0.8 miles of stream.	Less Than Significant	Less Than Significant		N/A—No Action Alternative	None Required
Impact BIO-7: Loss of up to 5,011 acres of cropland or pasture.	Less Than Significant	Less Than Significant		N/A—No Action Alternative	None Required
Impact BIO-8: Potential disturbance or loss of covered special-status plant and wildlife species and their habitat associated with proposed plan.	Less Than Significant	Less Than Significant	Less Than Significant	N/A—No Action Alternative	None Required
Impact BIO-9: Potential disturbance or loss of valley elderberry longhorn beetle and their habitat associated with the proposed plan.	Less Than Significant with Mitigation	Less Than Significant with Mitigation	Less Than Significant with Mitigation	N/A—No Action Alternative	Mitigation Measure BIO-1: Conduct surveys for elderberry shrubs..

Impact	Impact Level (after Mitigation)				Mitigation Measure
	Alternative 1	Alternative 2	Alternative 3	Alternative 4	
Impact BIO-10. Temporary disturbance to nesting habitat for special-status bird species during restoration activities.	Less Than Significant with Mitigation	Less Than Significant with Mitigation	Less Than Significant with Mitigation	N/A—No Action Alternative	Mitigation Measure BIO-2: Conduct preconstruction surveys to locate special-status bird species' nest sites or rookeries before construction is initiated and avoid breeding sites.
Impact BIO-11. Potential disturbance or loss of non-covered special-status plant species and their habitat associated with the proposed Plan.	Less Than Significant with Mitigation	Less Than Significant with Mitigation	Less Than Significant with Mitigation	N/A—No Action Alternative	Mitigation Measure BIO-3. Document special status plant populations and avoid or minimize impacts.
Impact BIO-12: Potential Disturbance or Loss of Common Wildlife Species and Their Habitat Associated with Proposed Plan.	Less Than Significant	Less Than Significant	Less Than Significant	N/A—No Action Alternative	None Required
Section 4.3 Land Use and Housing Impacts					
Impact LU-1: Physically divide an established community through acquisition and preservation of lands.	Less Than Significant	Less Than Significant	Less Than Significant	N/A—No Action Alternative	None Required
Impact LU-2: Incompatibility of preserves with existing land uses.	Less Than Significant	Less Than Significant	Less Than Significant	N/A—No Action Alternative	None Required
Impact LU-3: Incompatibility of preserves with adjacent land uses.	Less Than Significant	Less Than Significant	Less Than Significant	N/A—No Action Alternative	None Required
Impact LU-4: Potential inconsistencies between preserve land acquisition and local land use plans and policies.	Less Than Significant	Less Than Significant	Less Than Significant	N/A—No Action Alternative	None Required
Impact LU-5: Potential conflicts of preserves with applicable rural land use designations.	Less Than Significant	Less Than Significant	Less Than Significant	N/A—No Action Alternative	None Required
Impact LU-6: Potential conflicts with existing HCPs.	Less Than Significant	Less Than Significant	Less Than Significant	N/A—No Action Alternative	None Required

Impact	Impact Level (after Mitigation)				Mitigation Measure
	Alternative 1	Alternative 2	Alternative 3	Alternative 4	
Impact LU-7: Displace substantial numbers of existing housing, necessitating the construction of replacement housing elsewhere.	Less Than Significant	Less Than Significant	Less Than Significant	N/A—No Action Alternative	None Required
Section 4.4 Agricultural Impacts					
Impact AG-1: Convert Prime Farmland, Unique Farmland, or Farmland of Statewide Importance to nonagricultural use.	Less Than Significant	Less Than Significant	Less Than Significant	N/A—No Action Alternative	None Required
Impact AG-2: Conflict with existing zoning for agricultural use or a Williamson Act contract.	Less Than Significant	Less Than Significant	Less Than Significant	N/A—No Action Alternative	None Required
Section 4.5 Public Services Impacts					
Impact PS-1: Increased demand for fire protection services as a result of increased recreation and use of prescribed burns.	Less Than Significant	Less Than Significant	Beneficial	N/A—No Action Alternative	None Required
Impact PS-2: Increased demand for police protection services due to increased recreational use in the preserves.	Less Than Significant	Less Than Significant	Beneficial	N/A—No Action Alternative	None Required
Impact PS-3: Increase in recreational opportunities and parklands in East Contra Costa County.	Beneficial	Beneficial	Beneficial	N/A—No Action Alternative	None Required
Section 4.6 Hydrology and Water Quality					
Impact WTR-1: Potential for short-term degradation of surface water quality from construction associated with urban growth and infrastructure projects.	Less Than Significant	Less Than Significant	Less Than Significant	N/A—No Action Alternative	None Required
Impact WTR-2: Potential for long-term degradation of surface or groundwater quality, alteration of drainage patterns, increased flooding potential associated with urban growth and infrastructure projects.	Less Than Significant		Less Than Significant	N/A—No Action Alternative	None Required
Impact WTR-3: Potential for short-term degradation of surface water quality from activities in HCP/NCCP preserves.	Less Than Significant with Mitigation		Less Than Significant with Mitigation	N/A—No Action Alternative	Mitigation WTR-1: Implement erosion and sediment control BMPs.

Impact	Impact Level (after Mitigation)				Mitigation Measure
	Alternative 1	Alternative 2	Alternative 3	Alternative 4	
Impact WTR-4: Potential for long-term degradation of surface or groundwater quality, alteration of drainage patterns, increased flooding potential from activities in HCP/NCCP preserves.	Beneficial	Beneficial	Beneficial	N/A—No Action Alternative	None Required
Section 4.7 Socioeconomics and Environmental Justice Impacts					
Impact SOCIO-1: Effects on employment, industry, or commerce, or displacement of businesses or farms from implementation of the proposed Plan.	Less Than Significant	Less Than Significant	Less Than Significant	N/A—No Action Alternative	None Required
Impact SOCIO-2: Potential effects on property values or local tax base from acquisition of land for preserves.	Less Than Significant	Less Than Significant	Less Than Significant	N/A—No Action Alternative	None Required
Impact SOCIO-3: Potential effects on minority, low-income, elderly, disabled, transit-dependent, or other specific interest groups from acquisition of land for preserves.	Less Than Significant	Less Than Significant	Less Than Significant	N/A—No Action Alternative	None Required
Section 4.8 Geology, Soils, and Seismicity Impacts					
Impact GEO-1: Expose people or structures to rupture of a known earthquake fault, strong seismic ground shaking, or seismic-related ground failure.	Less Than Significant	Less Than Significant	Less Than Significant	N/A—No Action Alternative	None Required
Impact GEO-2: Expose people or structures to landslides.	Less Than Significant	Less Than Significant	Less Than Significant	N/A—No Action Alternative	None Required
Impact GEO-3: Result in substantial soil erosion or loss of topsoil.	Less Than Significant	Less Than Significant	Less Than Significant	N/A—No Action Alternative	None Required
Impact GEO-4: Be located on expansive soil.	Less Than Significant	Less Than Significant	Less Than Significant	N/A—No Action Alternative	None Required

Impact	Impact Level (after Mitigation)				Mitigation Measure
	Alternative 1	Alternative 2	Alternative 3	Alternative 4	
Section 4.9 Cultural Resources Impacts					
Impact CR-1: Potential impacts on known or unknown cultural resources, cultural deposits, or human remains.	Less Than Significant with Mitigation	Less Than Significant with Mitigation	Less Than Significant with Mitigation	N/A—No Action Alternative	Mitigation Measure CR-1: Develop HCP/NCCP cultural resources management plan. Mitigation Measure CR-2: Stop work if cultural materials are discovered during ground-disturbing activities.
Section 4.10 Transportation and Circulation Impacts					
Impact TRA-1: Temporary construction-related traffic increases and traffic safety hazards.	Less Than Significant with Mitigation	Less Than Significant with Mitigation	Less Than Significant with Mitigation	N/A—No Action Alternative	Mitigation Measure TR-1: Prepare and implement a traffic control plan.
Impact TRA-2: Potential conflicts with transportation plans, programs, and planned projects.	Less Than Significant with Mitigation	Less Than Significant with Mitigation	Less Than Significant with Mitigation	N/A—No Action Alternative	Mitigation TRA-2: Avoid planned transportation improvement sites.
Impact TRA-3: Potential traffic increases from proposed HCP/NCCP implementation, including operation and maintenance of preserves.	Less Than Significant	Less Than Significant	Less Than Significant	N/A—No Action Alternative	None Required
Section 4.11 Noise Impacts					
Impact NOISE-1: Exposure of noise-sensitive land uses to construction-related noise.	Less Than Significant with Mitigation	Less Than Significant with Mitigation	Less Than Significant with Mitigation	N/A—No Action Alternative	Mitigation Measure NOISE-1: Employ noise-reducing construction practices.
Impact NOISE-2: Potential permanent exposure of noise-sensitive land uses to noise levels in excess of established standards.	Less Than Significant	Less Than Significant	Less Than Significant	N/A—No Action Alternative	None Required

Impact	Impact Level (after Mitigation)				Mitigation Measure
	Alternative 1	Alternative 2	Alternative 3	Alternative 4	
Impact NOISE-3: Potential increases in traffic noise levels.	Less Than Significant	Less Than Significant	Less Than Significant	N/A—No Action Alternative	None Required
Section 4.12 Air Quality Impacts					
Impact AIR-1: Short-term increase in emissions from construction activities.	Less Than Significant with Mitigation	Less Than Significant with Mitigation	Less Than Significant with Mitigation	N/A—No Action Alternative	Mitigation Measure AIR-1: Implement NOx-reducing construction practices. Mitigation Measure AIR-2: Implement PM10-reducing construction practices. Mitigation Measure AIR-3: Comply with California Air Resource Board's (ARB's) Smoke Management Guidelines for Agricultural and Prescribed Burning. Mitigation Measure AIR-4: Comply with BAAQMD Regulation 5 requirements for wildland vegetation management burning.
Impact AIR-2: Short-term increases in CO, ROG, PM10, and NOx from prescribed burning.	Less Than Significant with Mitigation	Less Than Significant with Mitigation	Less Than Significant with Mitigation	N/A—No Action Alternative	
Impact AIR-3: Determination of Conformity with the State Implementation Plan.	Less Than Significant	Less Than Significant	Less Than Significant	N/A—No Action Alternative	None Required
Impact AIR-4: Short-term increase in emissions from construction activities.	Less Than Significant with Mitigation	Less Than Significant with Mitigation	Less Than Significant with Mitigation	N/A—No Action Alternative	Mitigation Measure AIR-5: Implement BAAQMD requirements for the management of PM10.

Impact	Impact Level (after Mitigation)				Mitigation Measure
	Alternative 1	Alternative 2	Alternative 3	Alternative 4	
Impact AIR-5: Short-term increases in CO, ROG, PM10, and NOx from prescribed burning.	Less Than Significant with Mitigation	Less Than Significant with Mitigation	Less Than Significant with Mitigation	N/A—No Action Alternative	Mitigation Measure AIR-3: Comply with California Air Resource Board's (ARB's) Smoke Management Guidelines for Agricultural and Prescribed Burning. Mitigation Measure AIR-4: Comply with BAAQMD Regulation 5 requirements for wildland vegetation management burning.
Section 4.13 Mineral Resources Impacts					
Impact MIN-1: Loss of availability of a known mineral resource that would be a value to the region and the residents of the state, or loss of availability of a locally important mineral resource recovery site.	Less Than Significant with Mitigation	Less Than Significant with Mitigation	Less Than Significant with Mitigation	N/A—No Action Alternative	Mitigation MIN-1: Evaluate mineral resources.