ENVIRONMENTAL CHECKLIST FORM / INITIAL STUDY

NOTE: Environmental Compliance will be covered as part of Phase II and Environmental Assessment (NEPA)

- 1. Project Title: Floodplain Reconnection and Restoration on La Barranca and Blackberry Island
- Lead Agency Name and Address: As USFWS properties, environmental compliance will be completed in accordance with NEPA
- 3. Contact Person: Dan Efseaff

Restoration Ecologist Sacramento River Partners 539 Flume Street Chico, CA 95928

(530) 894-5401 ext. 21

- Project Location: The La Barranca (River Mile 237.5-239.5 R) and Blackberry Island (River Mile 239-240 L) Units are located approximately 5 miles southeast of Red Bluff, in Tehama County, California.
- 5. Project Sponsor's Name and Address: The project is still in the proposal stage
- 6. Description of Project:
 - 1. Restore 500 acres (approximately 460 acres on the La Barranca Unit and 40 acres across the river on the Blackberry Island Unit) with native riparian plants,
 - 2. Breech or remove the levee (reconnecting the floodplain to the river),
 - 3. Reduce fish entrapment and provide non-structural floodwater retention.
 - 4. Conduct a hydraulic evaluation,
 - 5. Complete environmental compliance documentation (part of phase II), and
 - 6. Implement weed control and replant with native species in targeted areas of the existing riparian forest and former gravel mining areas (approximately 400 acres).
 - 7. Maintain native habitat community and species diversity and restore and enhance those resources where they are missing.
- 7. Surrounding Land Uses and Setting:
 Most of the lands adjacent to the project are in riparian habitat, with some sites bordered by agricultural land. Neighboring properties are in either private or public ownership.

Environmental Factors Potentially Affected:

involving at least one impact that is a "Potentially Significant Impact", as indicated by the checklist on the following pages. ☐ Public Services X Land Use and Planning ☐ Transportation/Circulation ☐ Population and Housing X Biological Resources ☐ Utilities and Service Systems X Aesthetics ☐ Geological Problems ☐ Energy and Mineral Resources X Water ☐ Hazards ☐ Cultural Resources ☐ Air Quality □ Noise X Recreation **■** Mandatory Findings of Significance The project will have positive potentially significant impacts on the above. **Determination:** (To be completed by the Lead Agency) On the basis of this initial evaluation: I find that the proposed project COULD NOT have a significant effect on the environment, and a **NEGATIVE DECLARATION** will be prepared. I find that although the proposed project could have a significant effect on the environment, there will not be a significant effect in this case because the mitigation measures described on an attached sheet have been added to the project. A NEGATIVE DECLARATION will be prepared. I find that the proposed project MAY have a significant effect on the environment, and an **ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACT REPORT (EIR) is required.** I find that the project MAY have a significant effect(s) on the environment, but at least one effect (1) has been adequately analyzed in an earlier document pursuant to applicable legal standards, and (2) has been addressed by mitigation measures based on the earlier analysis as described on attached sheets, if the effect is a "potentially significant impact" or "potentially significant unless mitigated." An EIR is required, but it must analyze only the effects that remain to be addressed. I find that although the proposed project could have a significant effect on the environment, there WILL NOT be a significant effect in this case because all potentially significant effects (1) have been analyzed adequately in an earlier EIR pursuant to applicable standards, and (2) have been avoided or mitigated pursuant to that earlier EIR, including revisions or mitigation measures that are imposed upon the proposed project. Signature **Date Printed Name** For

The environmental factors checked below would be potentially affected by this project,

	Significant Potentially Unless Less Than No Impa			
Issues	Significant	Mitigation	Significant	or Positive
issues	Impact	Incorporated	Impact	Impact
I. LAND USE AND PLANNING. Would the proposal:				
a. Conflict with general plan designation or zoning				X
b. Conflict with applicable environmental plans or policies adopted by agencies with jurisdiction over the project?				X
c. Be incompatible with existing land use in the vicinity?				X
d. Affect agricultural resources or operations (e.g., impacts to soils or farmlands, or impacts from incompatible land uses)?			X	
e. Disrupt or divide the physical arrangement of an established community (including a low-income or minority community)?				X
II. POPULATION AND HOUSING. Would the proposal:				
a. Cumulatively exceed official regional or local population projections?				X
b. Induce substantial growth in an area either directly or indirectly (e.g., through projects in an undeveloped area or extension of major infrastructure)?				X
c. Displace existing housing, especially affordable housing?				X
III. GEOLOGIC PROBLEMS. Would the proposal result in or expose people to potential impacts involving:	П	п	П	X
a. Fault rupture?	Ц	ш	ш	^
b. Seismic ground shaking?				X
c. Seismic ground failure, including liquefaction?				X
d. Seiche, tsunami, or volcanic hazard?				X
e. Landslides or mudflows?				X
f. Erosion, changes in topography, or unstable soil conditions from excavation, grading, or fill?				X
g. Subsidence of the land?				X
h. Expansive soils?				X

Potentially

		Issues	Potentially Significant Impact	Potentially Significant Unless Mitigation Incorporated	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact or Positive Impact
	I.	Unique geologic or physical features?				X
I۷	/. V	NATER. Would the proposal result in:				
	a.	Changes in absorption rates, drainage patterns, or the rate and amount of surface runoff?				X
	b.	Exposure of people or property to water related hazards, such as flooding?				X
	C.	Discharge into surface waters or other alteration of surface water quality (e.g, temperature, dissolved oxygen, or turbidity)?				X
	d.	Changes in the amount of surface water in any water body?				X
	e.	Changes in currents, or the course or direction of water movements?				X
	f.	Change in the quantity of ground waters, either through direct additions or withdrawals, or through interception of an aquifer by cuts or excavations, or through substantial loss of groundwater recharge capability?				X
	g.	Altered direction or rate of flow of groundwater?				X
	h.	Impacts to groundwater quality?				X
	I.	Substantial reduction in the amount of groundwater otherwise available for public water supplies?				X
V.	All	R QUALITY. Would the proposal:				
	a.	Violate any air quality standard or contribute to an existing or projected air quality violation?				X
	b.	Expose sensitive receptors to pollutants?				X
	c.	Alter air movement, moisture, or temperature, or cause any change in climate?				X
	d.	Create objectionable odors?				X
VI.		RANSPORTATION/CIRCULATION. ould the proposal result in:				
	a.	Increased vehicle trips or traffic congestion?				X
	b.	Hazards to safety from design features (e.g., sharp curves or dangerous intersections) or incompatible uses (e.g., farm equipment)?				X

Issues	Potentially Significant Impact	Potentially Significant Unless Mitigation Incorporated	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact or Positive Impact
c. Inadequate emergency access or access to nearby uses?				Х
d. Insufficient parking capacity on-site or off-site?				X
e. Hazards or barriers for pedestrians or bicyclists?				X
f. Conflicts with adopted policies supporting alternative transportation (e.g., bus turnouts, bicycle racks)?				X
g. Rail, waterborne, or air traffic impacts?				X
VII. BIOLOGICAL RESOURCES. Would the proposal result in impacts to:				
 Endangered, threatened, or rare species or their habitats (including but not limited to plants, fish, insects, animals, and birds)? 				X
b. Locally designated species (e.g., heritage trees)?				X
c. Locally designated natural communities (e.g., oak forest, coastal habitat, etc.)?				X
d. Wetland habitat (e.g., marsh, riparian, and vernal pool)?				X
e. Wildlife dispersal or migration corridors?				X
VIII. ENERGY AND MINERAL RESOURCES. Would the proposal:				
a. Conflict with adopted energy conservation plans?				X
 b. Use non-renewable resources in a wasteful and inefficient manner? 				X
c. Result in the loss of availability of a known mineral resource that would be of true value to the region and the residents of the State?				X
IX. HAZARDS. Would the proposal involve:				
a. A risk of accidental explosion or release of hazardous substances (including but not limited to: oil, pesticides, chemical, or radiation)?				X
 b. Possible interference with an emergency response plan or emergency evacuation plan? 				X
c. The creation of any health hazard or potential health hazard?				X

Issues	Potentially Significant Impact	Significant Unless Mitigation Incorporated	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact or Positive Impact
d. Exposure of people to existing sources of potential health hazards?				Х
e. Increased fire hazard in areas with flammable brush, grass, or trees?				X
X. NOISE. Would the proposal result in:				
a. Increases in existing noise levels?				X
b. Exposure of people to severe noise levels?				X
XI. PUBLIC SERVICES. Would the proposal have an effect upon, or result in a need for new or altered government services in any of the following areas:				
a. Fire protection?				X
b. Police protection?				X
c. Schools?				X
d. Maintenance of public facilities, including roads?				X
e. Other governmental services?				X
XII. UTILITIES AND SERVICE SYSTEMS. Would the proposal result in a need for new systems or supplies, or substantial alterations to the following utilities:				
a. Power or natural gas?				X
b. Communications systems?				X
c. Local or regional water treatment or distribution facilities?				X
d. Sewer or septic tanks?				X
e. Storm water drainage?				X
f. Solid waste disposal?				X
g. Local or regional water supplies?				X
XIII. AESTHETICS. Would the proposal:				
a. Affect a scenic vista or scenic highway?				X
b. Have a demonstrable negative aesthetic effect?				X
c. Create light or glare?				X

XIV. CULTURAL RESOURCES. Would the proposal:

		Potentially	Potentially Significant Unless	Less Than	No Impact
	Issues	Significant Impact	Mitigation Incorporated	Significant Impact	or Positive Impact
	Disturb paleontological resources?				X X
	Disturb archaeological resources? Affect historical resources?				X
d.	Have the potential to cause a physical change which would affect unique ethnic cultural values?				X
e.	Restrict existing religious or sacred uses within the potential impact area?				X
XV. R	ECREATION. Would the proposal:				
a.	Increase the demand for neighborhood or regional parks or other recreational facilities?				X
b.	Affect existing recreational opportunities?				X
XVI. N	MANDATORY FINDINGS OF SIGNIFICANCE.				
a.	Does the project have the potential to degrade the quality of the environment, substantially reduce the habitat of a fish and wildlife species, cause a fish or wildlife population to drop below self-sustaining levels, threaten to eliminate a plant or animal community, reduce the number or restrict the range of a rare or endangered plant or animal, or eliminate important examples of the major periods of California history or prehistory?				X
b.	Does the project have the potential to achieve short- term, to the disadvantage of long-term, environmental goals?				X
c.	Does the project have impacts that are individually limited, but cumulatively considerable?				X
d.	Does the project have environmental effects which will cause substantial adverse effects on human beings either directly or indirectly?				X