

**TABLE 2: SAMPLE TABLE TO REPORT CUMULATIVE IMPACTS BY RESOURCE**

**Route 466 Highway Widening Project (Route, project and species are fictitious)**

<b>Species</b>	<b>Historic Populations/ Habitat</b>	<b>Current Populations/ Habitat</b>	<b>Effect of Proposed Action</b>	<b>Effects from Future Actions</b>	<b>Overall Cumulative Effect from Past, Present, and Reasonably Foreseeable Future Projects</b>
Menzies' vetch	<p>No quantitative estimates of historic population exist.</p> <p>Habitat: The historical range extends along the eastern foothills of the Coast Range from Glenn County to Solano County, and the Sierra foothills from Plumas County to Amador County.</p>	<p>19 populations, with over 3,000 individuals, were identified in the Resource Study Area in 2003.</p> <p>There were an estimated 10,000 to 12,000 individual plants in Glenn County in 2002 (Source HCP.)</p>	<p>Direct and indirect impacts on 18 individuals and 2 populations from each of Alternatives B, C, and D1.</p>	<p>Direct and indirect impacts to 7 populations and approx. 480 individuals from future projects (See Table 1); mitigation measures will be implemented.</p>	<p>Range has been diminished and fragmented. (Source: USFWS.)</p> <p>Because of cumulative impacts from the project and from other reasonably foreseeable future actions in the RSA, cumulative impacts to will be adverse.</p>
Fremont's sparrow hawk	<p>Population and habitat: During the early 1900s, the Fremont's sparrow hawk nested in Sierra and Coastal foothills throughout most of California, maintaining populations as large as 12,000 pairs (Source: CDFG)</p>	<p>Ten years ago, only 340 nesting pairs were found in California and numbers have been slowly declining. There is no evidence of breeding in the Resource Study Area, but they are known to occasionally forage in the region. As of 2004, 0.5% of sparrow hawk's foraging habitat exists within RSA (Source: CDFG.)</p>	<p>No direct impacts. Indirect effects from human proximity and foraging habitat loss.</p>	<p>No direct effects from cumulative projects (See "Table 1: Future Actions and Impacts"). Indirect effects from human proximity and habitat loss due to reasonably foreseeable cumulative land use changes.</p>	<p>Habitat destruction in nesting and foraging areas has significantly reduced numbers Statewide, and the overall condition of the species is declining.</p> <p>However, due to lack of breeding evidence, and relative lack of habitat in RSA, the proposed project and future actions are not expected to have adverse cumulative effects.</p>