Summary Form for Electronic Document Submittal

Form F

Lead agencies may include 15 hardcopies of this document when submitting electronic copies of Environmental Impact Reports, Negative Declarations, Mitigated Negative Declarations, or Notices of Preparation to the State Clearinghouse (SCH). The SCH also accepts other summaries, such as EIR Executive Summaries prepared pursuant to CEQA Guidelines Section 15123. Please include one copy of the Notice of Completion Form (NOC) with your submission and attach the summary to each electronic copy of the document.

| OOI1#. | 2015102031 |
|--|--|
| Project Title: Yuba River Ecosystem Restoration Feasibility Study | y |
| Lead Agency: US Army Corps of Engineers | · |
| Contact Name: Chelsea Stewart | |
| Email: Chelsea.D.Stewart@usace.army.mil | Phone Number: 916-557-6979 |
| Project Location: Yuba County | |
| City | County |
| Project Decription (Proposed actions, location, and/or consequence | ces). |
| The recommended plan in the Feasibility Report/Environmental A approximately 43 acres of aquatic habitat in the Lower Yuba Rive Marysville. Restoration features include side channels, backwate measures. Engineered log jams, boulders, and large woody mate with high flow velocities. The plan also includes approximately 13 native riparian species. | er corridor, between the Highway 20 bridge and er areas, bank scallops, and channel stabilization erial would be placed at actively eroding banks or sites |
| The restoration feature footprint is 179 acres within the proposed area easements are about 6 acres and permanent road easemen | |

Identify the project's significant or potentially significant effects and briefly describe any proposed mitigation measures that would reduce or avoid that effect.

The recommended plan, while providing long-term benefits to the Yuba River watershed, would also have short-term effects on some resources. The FR/EA evaluated in detail, potential effects to Air Quality, Climate Change, Aesthetics, Hydrology and Hydraulics, Vegetation and Wildlife, Special Status Species, Water Quality, Transportation, Recreation, Cultural Resources, and Noise.

In all cases, the potential adverse environmental effects would be reduced to a less-than-significant level through project design, construction practices, preconstruction surveys and analysis, regulatory requirements, and best management practices. All construction would be implemented in compliance with applicable Federal laws, regulations and executive orders. Best management practices and avoidance and minimization measures as summarized within the FR/EA would be implemented. No compensatory mitigation would be required. A geotechnical analysis of underlying substrates and water quality analysis of construction activities and methods would be conducted during the preconstruction engineering and design phase to further refine potential impact analysis. A National Pollutant Discharge Elimination System general construction permit would be required. A Storm Water Pollution Prevention Plan and Spill Prevention Control and Countermeasures Plan would be developed by the contractor prior to construction.

The likelihood of encountering Hazardous, Toxic, and Radiological Waste during the construction of this project is minimal. Elemental mercury and methylmercury are known contaminants of concern in the Lower Yuba River, however, no concentrations of any material are anticipated at levels that would be classified as Hazardous or acutely Toxic. The potential for release of contaminants would be addressed through characterization, monitoring, and adaptive controls.

| If applicable, describe any of the project's areas of controver agencies and the public. | rsy known to the Lead Agency, including issues raised by |
|--|--|
| In general, the public and resource agencies expressed sup for the proposed actions in the recommended plan, but also especially fish passage and dam removal. | port for ecosystem restoration in the watershed and support a desire for additional ecosystem restoration actions, |
| soposially non-passage and dam remeral. | |
| | |
| | |
| | |
| * | |
| | |
| | |
| | |
| | |
| | |
| | · · |
| | |
| | |
| | |
| | |
| | |
| | |
| | |
| Provide a list of the responsible or trustee agencies for the p | roject. |
| US Army Corps of Engineers, Yuba County Water Agency. | |
| | |
| | |
| | |
| | |
| | |
| | |
| | |
| | |
| | |
| | |
| · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · | |
| | |
| | |
| | |
| | • |
| | |
| | |
| | |
| | |
| · | |
| l e e e e e e e e e e e e e e e e e e e | |