

**APPENDIX A**

---

**East Franklin and Cal-Fed Mitigation Measures**

Final EIR East Franklin  
Specific Plan, February 2000

- Directing urban growth to lower quality soils in order to protect valuable agricultural land.
- Providing open space areas or larger lots adjacent to rural residential or agricultural land uses.
- Protecting other farmland through conservation easements or Williamson Act contracts.
- Establishing buffers such as setbacks, berms, greenbelts and open space areas to separate farmland from urban uses. (Many communities consider 300 feet to be sufficient to buffer impacts such as pesticide spraying, noise and dust).
- Implementing right-to-farm ordinances.
- Adopting a farmland protection program utilizing transfer of development rights, purchase of development rights and conservation easements, and establishment of farmland trusts.

In conclusion, the project's impacts pertaining to loss of productive soils, intensive agricultural operations and general agriculture resources are considered to be **significant and unavoidable**. These impacts are due to direct loss of agriculturally productive land and the potential indirect loss of agricultural land through disruption or curtailing of established agricultural practices due to nuisance concerns.

Consistent with the requirements of CEQA, mitigation measures have been identified that would reduce the project's significant impacts; however, the impacts cannot be reduced to less than significant levels.

**MITIGATION MEASURES:**

- SG-1 Preserve 1,675± acres of permanent agricultural land located within a 3-mile radius of the project site that lies within Sacramento County and outside of the existing Urban Service Boundary. This land shall be protected in perpetuity through a conservation easement to be approved by the Board of Supervisors.
- SG-2 Disclose to all prospective buyers of property within 500 feet of any active farming/dairy operation through notification in the title report, that they could experience inconvenience or discomfort resulting from accepted farming activities pursuant to the provisions of the County Right-to-Farm Ordinance.
- SG-3 Establish a 500-foot wide open space/agricultural buffer zone around the west and north perimeter of the Machado dairy property. The buffer shall remain in place until such time the dairy operations cease.



The Preferred Program Alternative would convert agricultural lands to other uses, including habitat, levee improvements, and water storage. This conversion would add to the existing statewide conversion of substantial amounts of agricultural lands to urban uses and other habitat uses, and would conflict with the adopted plans of many local governments. Increased water demand from the Ecosystem Restoration Program could reduce water supply reliability to some localized areas under specific conditions, but other Program actions would result in an overall increase in water supply reliability to agriculture. The transfer of water from one area to another may result in localized adverse impacts on agriculture in the source water areas and may result in beneficial effects on agriculture in the receiving areas. Mitigation strategies have been developed that could lessen many of the impacts of the Program; however, a significant conversion of agricultural lands could occur.

**Alternatives 1, 2, and 3.** All three Program alternatives would result in impacts on agriculture similar to impacts described for the Preferred Program Alternative. All three alternatives also would provide benefits essentially similar to those of the Preferred Program Alternative. Alternative 1 likely would result in fewer impacts on agriculture because fewer facilities would be constructed. Alternative 3 likely would result in the greatest impacts because construction of an isolated facility could require converting somewhat more agricultural land. The differences are not substantial, however, and an adverse impact that is potentially significant for one alternative would be potentially significant for all alternatives.

The following table presents a summary of the potentially significant adverse impacts and mitigation strategies associated with the Preferred Program Alternative. Mitigation strategies that correlate to each listed impact are noted in parentheses after the impact. (See Chapter 9 for a discussion of mitigation monitoring and implementation.) See the text in this chapter for a more detailed description of impacts and mitigation strategies.

Summary of Potentially Significant Adverse Impacts and Mitigation Strategies Associated with the Preferred Program Alternative

<p><b>Potentially Significant Adverse Impacts</b></p> <p>Conversion of prime, statewide important, and unique farmlands to project uses (1,2,5,6,7,8,9,10, 11,12,13,14,15,16,17,18,20,21,24, 26, 27).</p> <p>Conflicts with local government plans and policies (3,4,25).</p> <p>Conflicts with adjacent land uses (19,22,23).</p>	<p>configurations to achieve the optimal balance between resource impacts and benefits.</p> <p>5. Retaining water allocations from retired drainage-impaired lands within the existing water districts.</p> <p>6. Supporting the testing and application of alternative crops to idled farmland (for example, agroforestry or energy crops).</p> <p>7. Providing water supply reliability benefits to agricultural water users.</p> <p>8. Supporting the California Farmland Conservancy Program in acquiring easements on agricultural land in order to prevent its conversion to urbanized uses and increase farm viability. Focusing on lands in proximity to where any conversion impact takes place.</p> <p>9. Restoring existing degraded habitat as a priority before converting agricultural land.</p>
<p><b>Mitigation Strategies</b></p> <p>1. Siting and aligning Program features to avoid or minimize impacts on agriculture.</p> <p>2. Examining structural and nonstructural alternatives to achieving project goals in order to avoid impacts on agricultural land.</p> <p>3. Implementing features that are consistent with local and regional land use plans.</p> <p>4. Involving all affected parties, especially landowners and local communities, in developing appropriate</p>	



Summary of Potentially Significant Adverse Impacts and Mitigation Strategies Associated with the Preferred Program Alternative (continued)

- 10. Focusing habitat restoration efforts on developing new habitat on public lands before converting agricultural land.
- 11. If public lands are not available for restoration efforts, focusing restoration efforts on acquiring lands that can meet ecosystem restoration goals from willing sellers where at least part of the reason to sell is an economic hardship (for example, lands that flood frequently or where levees are too expensive to maintain).
- 12. Using farmer-initiated and developed restoration and conservation projects as a means of reaching Program goals.
- 13. Where small parcels of land need to be acquired for waterside habitat, seeking out points of land on islands where the ratio of levee miles to acres farmed is high.
- 14. Obtaining easements on existing agricultural land for minor changes in agricultural practices (such as flooding rice fields after harvest) that would increase the value of the agricultural crop(s) to wildlife.
- 15. Including provisions in floodplain restoration efforts for compatible agricultural practices.
- 16. Purchasing water for habitat purposes so that the same locality is not affected over the long term.
- 17. Using a planned or phased habitat development approach in concert with adaptive management.
- 18. Minimizing the amount of water supply required to sustain habitat restoration acreage.
- 19. Developing buffers and other tangible support for remaining agricultural lands. Vegetation planted on these buffers should be compatible with farming and habitat objectives.
- 20. In implementing levee reconstruction measures, working with landowners to establish levee reconstruction methods that avoid or minimize the use of agricultural land.
- 21. Working with landowners to establish levee subsidence BMPs that avoid impacts on land use practices. Through adaptive management, further modify BMPs to reduce impacts on agricultural land.
- 22. Implementing erosion control measures to the extent possible during and after project construction activities. These erosion control measures can include grading the site to avoid acceleration and concentration of overland flows, using silt fences or hay bales to trap sediment, and revegetating areas with native riparian plants and wet meadow grasses.
- 23. Protecting exposed soils with mulches, geotextiles, and vegetative ground covers to the extent possible during and after project construction activities in order to minimize soil loss.
- 24. Using rotational fallowing to reduce selenium drainage.
- 25. Advising the Director of Conservation and the local governing body responsible for the administration of the preserve of a proposal, when it appears that land within an agricultural preserve may be acquired from a willing seller by a state CALFED agency for a public improvement as used in Government Code Section 51920.
- 26. Limiting the number of acres that can be fallowed (in order to produce transferrable water) in a given area (district or county) or the amount of water that can be transferred from a given area.
- 27. Supporting assistance programs to aid local entities in developing and implementing groundwater management programs in water transfer source areas.

**Bold indicates a potentially significant unavoidable impact.**

