Napa County Regional Park and Open Space District
1195 3rd Street, Suite 210
Napa, CA 94559
(707) 259-5933

Initial Study Checklist

1. **Project Title**: Napa River and Bay Trail: Soscol Ferry Road to San Anselmo Court Segment

2. **Property Owner**: A portion of this trail segment is owned by Napa County, a portion is owned by CalTrans, a portion is owned by VCC-Napa LLC, and a portion is owned by Napa Redevelopment Partners LLC.

3. **Contact person and phone number**: John Woodbury, General Manager, (707) 259-5933, jwoodbury@ncrposd.org

4. **Project location and APN:** This trail segment will begin at Soscol Ferry Road, APN 046-400-015, proceed over the right-of-way of the western segment of Soscol Ferry Road which is currently closed to motorized traffic, then over land owned by CalTrans as part of the State Highway 29 corridor, connect to land owned by VCC-Napa LLA, APN 046-630-007, and either terminate at Anselmo Court, a public way, or proceed over land of Napa Redevelopment Partners, LLC, APN 046-630-008, and terminate at land owned by Napa Pipe. This segment of the trail is partially in Napa County and partially in the City of Napa. The project is within AW:AC (Agricultural Watershed:Airport Compatibility Combining District) county zoning for the Soscol Ferry Road segment and RA (resource area) city zoning for the VCC-Napa and Redevelopment Partners parcels.

5. **Project Sponsor's Name and Address**: Napa County Regional Park and Open Space District, 1195 Third Street, Ste 210, Napa, Calif. 94559,

6. **General Plan Description**
   The portion of the trail within the County is in Cities and Public Institutional section of the General Plan. The portion in the City is in the Resource Area section.

   County: Cities and Public Institutional: The Napa County General Plan refers to these parcels as those lands set aside for existing and future uses of a governmental, public use, or public utility nature such as a public hospital, public use airport, sanitation district facilities, government equipment yard, state or federal administrative offices, recycling-composing facilities, or any other facilities for which the determination set forth, pertaining to criteria for eminent domain in the California Civil Code Section 1245.230(c)(1)-(3).

   City: Resource Area: The City of Napa General Plan refers to these parcels as sensitive lands inside the RUL that require special standards due to viewshed, resource, habitat, geotechnical or other considerations that further the conservation and resource protection goals of the General Plan. Limited, very low-density residential use is permitted, with discretionary review of the site development details. Other low intensity uses, such as rural residential or agriculture, may be considered at the discretion of the City on a case by case basis. All uses will be assessed to determine if they will impact or change the underlying character or feature that is intended for preservation by the RA designation.

7. **Current Zoning**
   County: AW:AC (Agricultural Watershed:Airport Compatibility)
   City: AR (Agricultural Resource)

8. **Project Description**: The Napa River and BayTrail Project overall is a proposal to construct a multi-use trail (hiking and bicycling) public trail that will provide the only non-motorized link between the cities of American Canyon and Napa. The trail will provide exceptional bird viewing, as well as interpretation and educational opportunities. The segment which is the subject of this Initial Study stretches from Soscol Ferry Road to San

Anselmo Ct. is .8 miles long and runs along the Napa River to the east of the Southern Pacific Railroad. While it ultimately may be part of the larger Napa River and Bay Trail Project, the subject segment is a viable stand-alone segment, and will be useful regardless of whether the larger trail project is completed. The remaining uncompleted portion of the Napa River and Bay Trail project involves very different environmental, construction and financing issues and will be the subject of a separate review process at a later date.

Access to the Soscol Ferry Road - San Anselmo Ct. segment of the trail will be from Soscol Ferry Road, a public way, and from Anselmo Court, a public way. Parking is available along Soscol Ferry Road . Gates will be constructed at both ends of the trail to allow pedestrians and bicycles while excluding non-authorized motor vehicles. A 6-foot security fence will be installed between the railroad tracks and the trail where the trail parallels the tracks. A 4-foot wildlife fence will be installed to protect wetland areas. The trail alignment runs along Soscol Ferry Road, crosses under Highway 29 on land owned by Caltrans, and proceeds north on land owned by VCC-Napa and Napa Redevelopment Partners, also known as the Napa Valley Corporate Park. The trail will be 8-feet wide and constructed out of stabilized quarry fines which provide a semi-permeable, stable, ADA-compliant surface. See attached map for trail location.

9. **Environmental Setting and Surrounding Land Uses:**
The project encompasses three legal parcels that contain wetlands and grasslands typically found along the Napa River. There is an existing dirt road on one of the parcels and dirt trails on the other two parcels that will be utilized to create this segment of the Napa River and Bay Trail. The public currently uses the western section of Soscol Ferry Road which is closed to vehicular traffic for recreation (primarily fishing) though they are not officially designated as open to the public. On the parcels adjacent to the Napa Valley Corporate Park, some restoration work consisting of plantings of native trees was done. The trail alignment is near the Napa Sanitation District, 1.2 miles from the Napa County Airport, and partially adjacent to the Union Pacific Rail Line which parallels the Napa River.

10. **Other agencies whose approval is required:** The following agencies have review and/or approval authority over the project:

Responsible (R) and Trustee (T) Agencies:

Trustee: California Department of Fish and Game
Bay Area Air Quality Management District
San Francisco Regional Water Quality Control Board
US Fish and Wildlife Service

Responsible: Caltrans (encroachment permit)
City of Napa (use permit)
County of Napa (management agreement for use of road right-of-way)

Other Agencies Contacted:

Napa Sanitation District
Napa County Airport
Napa County Airport Land Use Commission
Napa County Flood Control and Water Conservation District

ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACTS AND BASIS OF CONCLUSIONS:

The conclusions and recommendations contained herein are professional opinions developed in accordance with current standards of professional practice. They are based on a review of the Napa County Environmental Resource Maps, Napa County General Plan, updated 2008, City of Napa General Plan Vision 2020, 2002 Aerial Photography, and a Habitat Survey by Questa Engineering subcontractors Michael Morangio, wildlife biologist and Nick Duffert, environmental

scientist. For further information, please see the permanent record file on this project, available for review at the offices of the Napa County Regional Park and Open Space District, 1195 Third Street, Rm 210 Napa, CA

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 revisions in the project have been made by or agreed to by the project proponent. A MITIGATED NEGATIVE DECLARATION will be prepared.

☐ I find that the proposed project MAY have a significant effect on the environment, and an ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACT REPORT is required.

☐ I find that the proposed project MAY have a "potentially significant impact" or "potentially significant unless mitigated" impact 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. An ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACT REPORT 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, because all potentially significant effects (a) have been analyzed adequately in an earlier EIR or NEGATIVE DECLARATION pursuant to applicable standards, and (b) have been avoided or mitigated pursuant to that earlier EIR or NEGATIVE DECLARATION, including revisions or mitigation measures that are imposed upon the proposed project, nothing further is required.

John Woodbury

BY: John Woodbury
Napa County Regional Park and Open Space District

11/25/2010
Date

Environmental Checklist Form

	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporation	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
I. AESTHETICS. Would the project:				
a) Have a substantial adverse effect on a scenic vista?	☐	☐	☐	☒
b) Substantially damage scenic resources, including, but not limited to, trees, rock outcroppings, and historic buildings within a state scenic highway?	☐	☐	☐	☒
c) Substantially degrade the existing visual character or quality of the site and its surroundings?	☐	☐	☐	☒
d) Create a new source of substantial light or glare which would adversely affect day or nighttime views in the area?	☐	☐	☐	☒

Discussion:

a.-d. The trail is not located near a designated scenic byway. The trail will afford unimpeded visual access by the public to the Napa River that currently does not exist. No construction is proposed other than minor informational and directional signage, installation of gates for controlling access and a security fence along the railroad tracks that will not impede the view of the Napa River. No trees, rock outcropping, historic buildings, or other visually attractive features will be adversely affected. No lighting will be installed on the trails.

Mitigation Measures: None are required.

	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporation	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
II. AGRICULTURE RESOURCES. Would the project:				
a) Convert Prime Farmland, Unique Farmland, or Farmland of Statewide Important (Farmland) as shown on the maps prepared pursuant to the Farmland Mapping and Monitoring Program of the California Resources Agency, to non-agricultural use?	☐	☐	☐	☒
b) Conflict with existing zoning for agricultural use, or a Williamson Act contract?	☐	☐	☐	☒
c) Involve other changes in the existing environment which, due to their location or nature, could result in conversion of Farmland to non-agricultural use?	☐	☐	☐	☒

Discussion:

a-c. None of the property is currently used or appropriate for agricultural purposes. The trail is located along an existing levee/service road and under a highway in part and along the Napa River in part. Both locations are inappropriate for future agricultural use, thus the trail is not likely to result in any farmland conversion. There is no Williamson Act contract on any of the parcels.

Mitigation Measures: None are required.

	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporation	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
III. AIR QUALITY. Where available, the significance criteria established by the applicable air quality management or air pollution control district may be relied upon to make the following determinations. Would the project:				
a) Conflict with or obstruct implementation of the applicable air quality plan?	☐	☐	☐	☒
b) Violate any air quality standard or contribute substantially to an existing or projected air quality violation?	☐	☐	☐	☒
c) Result in a cumulatively considerable net increase of any criteria pollutant for which the project region is non-attainment under an applicable federal or state ambient air quality standard (including releasing emissions which exceed quantitative thresholds for ozone precursors)?	☐	☐	☐	☒
d) Expose sensitive receptors to substantial pollutant concentrations?	☐	☐	☐	☒
e) Create objectionable odors affecting a substantial number of people?	☐	☐	☐	☒

Discussion:

a.-e. Only an insignificant amount of earthmoving is proposed as part of the project to flatten the trail surface prior to applying stabilized quarry fines, so no measurable airborne dust will be caused by construction activities. The surface of the trail will be constructed with stabilized quarry fines, so that public use will not produce any dust.. The two adjacent land users, Napa Sanitation District and the Napa Valley Corporate Park, are not considered sensitive receptors. No pollutants or odors will be generated by the project.

Mitigation Measure(s): None are required.

	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporation	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact

	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporation	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
IV. BIOLOGICAL RESOURCES. Would the project:				
a) Have a substantial adverse effect, either directly or through habitat modifications, on any species identified as a candidate, sensitive, or special status species in local or regional plans, policies, or regulations, or by the California Department of Fish and Game or U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service?	☐	☐	☒	☐
b) Have a substantial adverse effect on any riparian habitat or other sensitive natural community identified in local or regional plans, policies, regulations, or by the California Department of Fish and Game or US Fish and Wildlife Service?	☐	☐	☒	☐
c) Have a substantial adverse effect on federally protected wetlands as defined by Section 404 of the Clean Water Act (including, but not limited to, marsh, vernal pool, Coastal, etc.) through direct removal, filling, hydrological interruption, or other means?	☐	☐	☒	☐
d) Interfere substantially with the movement of any native resident or migratory fish or wildlife species or with established native resident or migratory wildlife corridors, or impede the use of native wildlife nursery sites?	☐	☐	☒	☐
e) Conflict with any local policies or ordinances protecting biological resources, such as a tree preservation policy or ordinance?	☐	☐	☐	☒
f) Conflict with the provisions of an adopted Habitat Conservation Plan, Natural Community Conservation Plan, or other approved local, regional, or state habitat conservation plan?	☐	☐	☐	☒

Discussion:

a.-b The general project area consists of a mixture of upland areas having a cover mainly of introduced annual grasses, and ruderal (disturbed) areas. Coyote bush has colonized a portion of the disturbed upland area through which the trail alignment would pass.

There are several isolated patches of wetland adjacent to or near the proposed trail alignment. This includes wetlands along the edge of the Napa River, and along the perimeter of the proposed trail alignment in two adjacent created wetland areas. The created wetlands consist of 1) a tidal lagoon connected to the Napa River via tide gates under the riverside railroad embankment levee, and 2) a small freshwater pond receiving local runoff. These lagoons were created as part of a mitigation project for an adjacent business park (Napa Valley Corporate Park) approximately 15 years ago.

The small tidal lagoon is primarily deep water, but is ringed by a 2-3 foot wide pickleweed/saltgrass zone, while the freshwater lagoon is ringed by a wider zone of tules, cattails, and some willows. A service road located on top

of a berm or levee separates the tidal lagoon from the freshwater pond. The proposed trail would follow the service road in this area. A number of native oaks, buckeyes, and other trees have been planted on upland areas within the mitigation parcel. Most are relatively small (less than 15-feet tall) and several of the planted trees have died.

There is also a small isolated depression immediately north of the Hwy 29 overpass that may meet wetland criteria. The proposed alignment would entirely avoid all of these wetland areas.

As stated above, upland vegetation along most of the trail is dominated by non-native ruderal species. Dominant upland species include soft brome (*Bromus hordeaceus*), bird's-foot trefoil (*Lotus cornicalutas*), coyote bush (*Baccharis pilularis*), Italian ryegrass (*Lolium multiflorum*), spear saltbrush (*Atriplex patula*), black mustard (*Brassica negra*), and seaside barley (*Hordeum marinum*). Wetland species include Baltic rush (*Juncus balticus*), pickleweed (*Salicornia virginica*), gumweed (*Grindelia sp.*), curly dock (*Rumex crispus*), cattail (*Typha latifolia*), saltgrass (*Distichlis spicata*) and salt-marsh bulrush (*Scirpus robustus*).

No special status plant or animal species have been observed in the vicinity of the proposed alignment during several reconnaissance site visits. However, review of California Natural Diversity Database records (CNDDB 2009) and other sources identified a number of potential special status species and several confirmed in the general vicinity of the proposed trail. These include 11 plant species, 1 reptile, 9 birds, and 2 mammals (see **Table 1,**below).

Table 1: Special Status Species with Potential to Occur in the Vicinity of the Napa River Trail

Scientific Name	Common Name	Fed/State/CNPS Status	Preferred Habitat	Likelihood of Occurrence in the Project Area
PLANTS				
Astragalus tener var. tener	Alkali milk-vetch	SC/--/1B.2	Playas, valley and foothill grassland and vernal pools; often on alkaline soils; blooms Mar-June; elevation range 1 - 60 m.	Not likely to occur within immediate project impact area. The project vicinity may contain suitable habitat. Soil salinity/alkalinity conditions do not appear suitable, and the dense emergent marsh vegetation would likely crowd out this species. However, the nearest occurrence, located 0.6 mi. NE of the project, has been extirpated in the constructed mitigation freshwater wetlands.
Atriplex joaquiniana	San Joaquin spearscale (=saltbush)	SC/--/1B.2	Chenopod scrub, meadows and seeps, playas and valley and foothill grassland; typically with alkaline soils; blooms Apr-Oct; elevation range 1 - 835 m.	Low potential to occur within the project impact area. The project vicinity may contain some suitable habitat, however conditions in the mitigation wetlands are marginal. A known population is located 1.9 mi N of the project site
Cordylanthus mollis	Soft bird's beak	E/R/1B.2	Coastal saltmarsh, riparian wetlands	Very low potential to occur in adjacent tidal lagoon, but not in immediate project impact area. Thin bank of pickleweed provides marginal habitat conditions. Natural recruitment of this species into mitigation wetlands is very problematic. Known from about 1.8 mi S.
Downingia pusilla	Dwarf downingia	--/--2.2	Valley and foothill mesic grassland, vernal pools; blooms Mar-May; elevation range 1 - 445 m.	Not likely to occur in immediate project area. Grasslands in vicinity disturbed during mitigation site construction and not reported in Napa Valley Corp. Park environmental documents. The project vicinity may support some suitable habitat. Although the nearest occurrence is located about 0.4 miles NE of the project site, it is apparently extirpated.
Lasthenia conjugens	Contra Costa Goldfields	--/--/1B.1	Valley vernal pools and other wetlands	Not likely to occur in immediate project area. No vernal pools in project vicinity, although vernal pools to the south and east on Napa Sanitation District property. Known from 0.7 mi E of the project site.

Scientific Name	Common Name	Fed/State/CNPS Status	Preferred Habitat	Likelihood of Occurrence in the Project Area
Lathyrus jepsonii var. jepsonii	Delta tule-pea	SC/--/1B.2	Marshes and swamps (freshwater and brackish); blooms May-Sep; elevation range 0 - 4 m.	Not likely to occur within the immediate project impact area. Low to moderate potential to occur in adjacent mitigation ponds, although dense cattails/tules would likely crowd out and prevent recruitment Occurrences known within the project vicinity along the Napa River.
Legenere limosa	False Venus' looking glass	--/--/1B.1	Vernal pools	Not likely to occur in immediate project area. No vernal pools in project vicinity, although vernal pools to the south and east on Napa Sanitation District property. Recorded observations 1 mi E.
Lilaeopsis masonii	Mason's lilaeopsis	SC/R/1B	Marshes and swamps (brackish or freshwater), riparian scrub; blooms Apr-Nov; elevation range 0 - 10 m.	Not likely to occur in immediate project impact area, low potential to occur in adjacent wetlands. The project area may contain potentially suitable habitat. The species is known to occur in remnant wetlands along the Napa River in the project vicinity, but recruitment to mitigation wetlands through tide gate is very problematic.
Polygonum marinense	Marin knotweed	SLC/--/3	Marshes and swamps (coastal salt or brackish); blooms Apr-Oct; elevation range 0 - 10 m.	Not likely to occur in immediate project impact area, low potential to occur in adjacent mitigation wetlands. The project area contains some potentially suitable habitat but recruitment to mitigation wetlands is problematic. The nearest occurrences are 1.7 mi SW
Symphotrichum lentus	Suisun Marsh aster	SC/--/1B	Marshes and swamps (brackish and freshwater); blooms May-Nov; elevation range 0 - 3 m.	Not likely to occur in immediate project impact area. The project vicinity has suitable high marsh habitat in several areas. The project area contains some potentially suitable habitat but recruitment to mitigation wetlands is problematic. The nearest occurrence is located 1.mi N
Trifolium depauperatum var. hydrophilum	saline clover	SC/--/1B	Marshes and swamps, valley and foothill grassland (mesic, alkaline), vernal pools; blooms Apr-Jun; elevation range 0 - 300 m.	Low potential to occur. The general project area previously contained a population which is now extirpated.
AMPHIBIANS AND REPTILES				

Scientific Name	Common Name	Fed/State/CNPS Status	Preferred Habitat	Likelihood of Occurrence in the Project Area
Actinemys marmorata marmorata	Northwestern pond turtle	SC/SSC/--	Inhabits a variety of aquatic habitats with permanent or nearly permanent water. Requires basking sites.	Moderate to high potential to occur. Known to occur in the Napa River. Not observed during several site reconnaissance visits.
Birds				
Agelaius tricolor	Tricolor blackbird	--/SC/--	Colonial nesting in lowland wetlands	High potential to occur. Known to have nested on the project site. Not observed during several site reconnaissance visits.
Aquila chryaetos	Golden eagle	--/--/-- (federally protected under the Bald Eagle Protection Act of 1962)	Found in open and semi-open habitats from sea level to 3600 m elevation. Inhabit tundra, shrublands, grasslands, woodland-brushlands, and coniferous forests. Most found in mountainous areas, but also nest in wetland, riparian and estuarine habitats.	Potential for foraging but not nesting. Known nest site is 0.9 mi WSW
Athene cunicularia hypugaea	Western burrowing owl	SC/SSC/--	Inhabits open, grasslands and scrublands characterized by low-growing vegetation. Subterranean nester dependent upon burrowing mammals.	Moderate potential to occur. Levees with burrows provide suitable habitat for burrowing owls. The nearest known occurrence is located 1.7 mi. SE of the project site. Not observed during several site reconnaissance visits.
Buteo regalis	Ferruginous hawk	SC/SSC/--	Inhabits open grasslands, low foothills and desert scrub; nests in trees, low cliffs, and other elevated structures. Eats mainly lagomorphs, and other small mammals; also birds, amphibians, and reptiles. No nesting records in California.	Low Potential to occur. Site offers some foraging habitat. There are no known occurrences in the project vicinity.
Buteo swainsoni	Swainson's Hawk	--/--/--	Roosts in open areas, usually in a lone tree or utility pole. Tolerant of heat; nest often unshaded. No breeding records from California. Nests in foothills or prairies; on low cliffs, buttes, cut banks, shrubs, trees, or in other elevated structures, natural or human-made.	Potential nesting in site vicinity. Known nesting 0.9 mi SE
Elanus leucurus	White-tailed (=black shouldered) kite	SC/FP/--	Nests in dense oak, willow, or other tree stands near open grassland meadows, farmlands, and emergent wetlands.	Known to be present. The general project area provides suitable foraging and nesting habitat.
Geothlypis trichas sinuosa	Saltmarsh common yellowthroat (=San Francisco) common yellowthroat	SC/SSC/--	San Francisco Bay region in fresh and saltwater marshes with thick continuous cover to water surface, tall grasses, tule patches and willows for nesting.	Moderate to high potential to occur in adjacent freshwater wetlands. The project area offers some suitable foraging habitat and little nesting habitat. The nearest occurrence is located 1.3 mi N

Scientific Name	Common Name	Fed/State/CNPS Status	Preferred Habitat	Likelihood of Occurrence in the Project Area
Laterallus jamaicensis coturniculus	California black rail	--/T/--	Mainly inhabits salt marshes bordering large bays. It inhabits saltwater, brackish, and freshwater marshes. Nests and forages in dense pickleweed.	Very low Potential to occur in adjacent tidal lagoon. Project area has minimal suitable nesting and foraging areas. Nearest occurrence is about 1.9 mi SSW
Rallus longirostris obsoletus	California clapper rail	E/E/--	Restricted to salt marshes and tidal sloughs; usually associated with heavy growth of pickleweed; feeds on mollusks removed from the mud in sloughs.	Very low potential to occur in adjacent tidal lagoon. Project area has minimal suitable habitat. Nearest occurrences 1.7 mi S
MAMMALS				
Reithrodontomys raviventris	Salt marsh harvest mouse	E/E/--	Salt marshes with a dense plant cover of pickleweed and fat hen adjacent to an upland site.	Very low potential to occur in adjacent tidal lagoon. Project area has minimal suitable habitat. Although they are known from within 0.2 mi of the project site, Minimal habitat requirements are present in salt marsh fringe.
Taxidea taxus	Badger	--/SSC/--	Sandy uplands with supply of rodents	Unlikely to be present. Old record known from about 1.8 mi W

E – Endangered under the Federal or State Endangered Species Act
T – Threatened under the Federal or State Endangered Species Act
SC – Federal species of concern
SLC – Federal species of local concern
R – California rare species
California Native Plant Society (CNPS)
1B – Plant species that are rare, threatened, or endangered in California and elsewhere
2 – Plant species that are rare, threatened, or endangered in California but more common elsewhere
3 – Plant species about which we need more information (a review list)
E – Endangered under the Federal or State Endangered Species Act
T – Threatened under the Federal or State Endangered Species Act
P – Proposed for federal listing status under the Federal Endangered Species Act
C – Candidate for listing status
SC – Federal species of concern
SSC – California species of special concern

Special Status Plant Species

Of the plants listed in **Table 1**, at least 7 have some potential to be present within the general project area, but are very unlikely to be present within the immediate impact area of the trail alignment. These include alkali milk-vetch (*Astragalus tener var. tener)*, San Joaquin spearscale (*Atriplex joaquiniana)*, Soft bird's beak (*Cordylanthus mollis)*, Contra Costa goldfields (*Lasthenia conjugens)*, Delta tule-pea (*Lathyrus jepsonii var. jepsonii)*, Mason's lilaeopsis (*Lilaeopsis masonii)*, and Suisun Marsh aster (*Symphotrichum lentus)*. According to CNDDB GIS data, Delta tule-pea and Mason's Lilaeopsis are mapped as occurring within the project vicinity (**Table 1, Special Status Species**). Known populations of this species are present along the edge of the Napa River within small brackish wetlands, although no individuals of these species have been observed within the immediate impact area during several reconnaissance visits.

Vegetation at the project site was inventoried as part of a Preliminary Wetland Delineation completed for the Napa River/San Francisco Bay Trail Feasibility Study (Questa, December 2006). No special status or rare plants were observed during this survey, or during subsequent biological reconnaissance site visits, although no detailed floristic surveys during plant specific flowering periods have been completed. There are no historic observations of these species within the immediate trail impact area (CNDDB, 2009).

The sensitive plant species listed above have exacting ponding, soil moisture and salinity requirements that do not appear to be fully met within the immediate project vicinity. Some potentially suitable habitat may be present for several sensitive plant species in the adjacent tidal lagoon and freshwater mitigation wetland, but their natural dispersal mechanics generally preclude recruitment into newly established habitat and mitigation areas. Several of the plants in Table 1 occur in native grasslands and associated vernal pools. These were not identified as being present in the Napa Valley Corporate Park environmental document, and nearly all of the adjacent upland grasslands have been highly disturbed during construction of the Business Park, the mitigation wetlands, and the earlier construction of the Highway 29 over-pass. Given these plants strict habitat requirements, disturbance history, a lack of historic and recent observations, and problematic dispersal into created habitat, it is highly unlikely that these species inhabit the immediate project vicinity. Regardless of habitat suitability, any potential impacts have been avoided by positioning the trail alignment outside of suitable habitat. Accordingly, no impacts to special status plant species are anticipated, and no focused floristic surveys are recommended to address their potential presence. Nonetheless, project implementation will include adherence to Environmental Commitment-1, which includes a generalized preconstruction survey for obvious special status plant and animal species (described at the end of this section). Additional Environmental Commitment 2 through 8 will further reduce potential impacts to sensitive plant species through training of all construction personnel in sensitive species habitat avoidance, use of exclusion fencing along adjacent wetlands during construction and replacement with permanent field fencing, and the presence of a qualified Biological Monitor during all work near sensitive habitat.

Special Status Amphibians

The Northwestern pond turtle, a state species of special concern, inhabits a variety of habitats, preferring riparian areas such as slow-moving streams, ponded areas, large rivers, and sloughs. This species requires deep waters, good vegetation cover, and basking sites. While no individuals of this species were observed during numerous biological reconnaissance visits, they are known to inhabit the Napa River and could potentially occur in wetland or ponded areas in the project vicinity.

If present, the turtle would utilize wetted areas outside of the proposed alignment. No long-term impacts are anticipated as a result of project construction, as the trail would not encroach upon potential turtle habitat. Any potential impacts to this species as a result of project implementation would be entirely limited to potential habitat damage during the construction phase.

If improperly managed, construction activities could adversely impact this species or their nesting sites (if present). Potential direct impacts include running over/stepping on turtles or their nests. Indirect impacts would be those associated with habitat degradation as a result of construction. Construction activities could also potentially expose soils, create erosion, and otherwise contribute sediment to waterways and wetlands. Contaminants, including gasoline, lubricants, and others associated with heavy equipment could potentially leak or be spilled. These potential impacts will be avoided through implementation of Environmental Commitment 1 through 8, outlined at the end of this section which include preconstruction surveys, worker education, exclusion fencing, employment of appropriate construction techniques, and presence of a Biological Monitor during work in sensitive areas.

Although not listed in Table 1., California Red Legged Frog (CRLF), a fully state and federally protected endangered species deserves mention in this assessment, as the freshwater mitigation pond provides potentially suitable habitat. In general, CRLF has not been observed in this area, and no populations of CRLF have been previously determined to be present west of HWY 29. In addition, there are no streams that drain into the pond (originating east of HWY 29) that could potentially allow CRLF to disperse into this area. As with the Northwestern pond turtle, Environmental Commitment 1 through 8 would provide protection, if for some unknown reason, they were present.

Special Status Bird Species

Two special status birds are known to inhabit the project site in the vicinity of the created wetland ponds, the tricolor blackbird (*Agelaius tricolor)* and white-tailed kite (*Elanus leucurus)* (**Table 1, Special Status Species**). There

is a high potential for these species to nest within the vicinity of the proposed trail alignment. Habitat is also suitable for the Swainson's hawk (*Buteo swainsoni)* and saltmarsh common yellowthroat (*Geothlypis trichas sinuosa)*. These species have been observed less than two miles from the project site, though not in the vicinity of the proposed trail alignment. The Western burrowing owl (*Athene cunicularia hypugaea)* has also been observed nearby, but no burrows suggesting their presence were observed during several site reconnaissance visits.
Construction of the trail adjacent to nesting birds, including birds of prey, other special status species, and most migratory bird species could result in disturbance of nesting birds which would violate the Migratory Bird Treaty Act. Potential impacts to these species would be those associated with noise and intrusion, with destruction or degradation of habitat, or associated with direct take (i.e., stepping on or otherwise destroying individuals or their nests). Nesting habitat for these species is limited to areas with dense wetland vegetation, and in riparian trees. As stated, the proposed alignment would entirely avoid these areas, and would be located on existing service roads, and in a few areas on introduced grassland and disturbed ruderal areas. In addition, construction activities will only be allowed to take place outside of the known nesting periods of these birds (excluded March 1st through July 30th). No tree removal is proposed. Any potential impacts to these species would be limited to disturbance during construction phase.

If improperly managed, construction activities could adversely impact these species or their nesting sites (if present) including both direct and indirect impacts. Potential direct impacts include running over/stepping on birds and/or nests. Indirect impacts would be those associated with habitat degradation as a result of construction (inputs of sediment or contaminants to the waterway). These potential impacts will be avoided through implementation of Environmental Commitment 1 through 8, outlined at the end of this section.

Special Status Rodent Species

An endangered rodent, the salt marsh harvest mouse (SMHM), is known to inhabit salt marsh habitat within 0.2 mi of the project trail. Protected habitat is known near the project area. This includes coastal brackish marsh remnants along the Napa River (**Table 1, Special Status Species**).

The proposed alignment would be set back over 100-feet from the Napa River, and avoids adjacent wetland areas. Only the trail alignment near the created tidal wetland would border very marginal SMHM habitat (i.e., pickleweed dominated tidal wetlands). As indicated previously, only a narrow band of pickleweed surrounds the tidal lagoon.

The remnant salt marsh along the Napa River where SMHM is known to occur is separated from the tidal mitigation pond by a railroad levee and a series of tide gates, making the movement and relocation of SMHM to the tidal lagoon mitigation area very problematic. In addition, since the tidal wetland only has a 1 to 2 foot wide fringe of pickleweed and salt grass', suitable habitat is very marginal. It is therefore highly unlikely that this species inhabits the project vicinity. Nonetheless, Environmental Commitments (avoidance and minimization) including preconstruction surveys, worker education, exclusion fencing, and construction of open space fencing adjacent to sensitive habitat, appropriate construction techniques, and presence of a biological monitor during work in sensitive areas will be employed to further minimize potential impacts to this species. These measures are outlined at the end of this section (Env. Comm. 1-8).

c. Natural wetlands and waters under the jurisdiction of the Army Corps of Engineers exist along the Napa River and at the two created mitigation water bodies in the project vicinity. In addition, a low wetland area draining west beneath railroad tracks and near the HWY 29 overpass is located just south of the western water body. Fill of this area could potentially constitute loss of wetlands. The final trail alignment entirely avoids these wetland areas.

Only a small area of ruderal and non-native grassland would be disturbed as a result of trail construction. The trail project does not propose any significant new facilities or uses, nor does it increase the potential for new facilities or uses which could impact biological resources.

No permanent impacts to Waters or Wetlands are anticipated as a result of the project, as the proposed alignment would entirely avoid such areas within the vicinity of the trail. If improperly managed, construction activities (i.e. equipment and materials staging) could adversely impact neighboring Waters/Wetlands in the vicinity of the created mitigation water bodies. Construction activities could potentially expose soils, create erosion, and otherwise contribute sediment to waterways and wetlands. Contaminants, including gasoline, lubricants, and others associated with heavy equipment could potentially leak or be spilled. These potential impacts would be minimized through implementation of Environmental Commitments 2. -3, -4, and -8 which include suitable construction techniques for working near wetlands sensitive habitats.

d. There are existing fences along the border of adjacent properties erected by CalTrans and Napa Sanitation District. Additional fencing adjacent to sensitive habitat areas has been designed so that they do not adversely interfere with wildlife movement.

e-f. There are no Habitat Conservation Plans, Natural Community Conservation Plans or other approved local, regional, or state habitat conservation plans applicable to this segment of the trail.

Reference Sources: Habitat Survey by Michael Morangio, wildlife biologist and Nick Duffert, environmental scientist
Project Feasibility Study by Questa Engineering Corporation

Environmental Commitments

The District pledges that the project implementation shall include the following environmental commitments. A biologist report confirming that the following actions were taken will be completed at the end of construction.

1. Preconstruction surveys, relocation, and avoidance*. Provision will include, but is not limited, to the following:*

- *As close to the beginning of construction as possible, but not more than 14 days prior to construction, a qualified biologist shall conduct a final pre-activity survey of the construction zone to ensure that no special-status wildlife and/or plant species have recently occupied the site, including at a minimum those species described herein as potentially occurring (**Table 1).***

- *If any disturbance might occur (field topographic surveys, geotechnical investigations, etc.) during the nesting season (generally between March 1st and July 31st), a nesting survey will be performed by a qualified biologist and nesting sites avoided or work delayed until fledging.*

- *If any special-status species are found, exclusion zones shall be established and maintained until all construction activities are completed. In some rare cases it may be preferable to remove and/or relocate the individual plant or animal (to be determined by qualified services-approved biologist in consultation with appropriate agency).*

- *If special-status species are found during the pre-construction survey, the biologist will be present immediately prior to construction activities that have the potential to impact special-status species to identify and protect potentially sensitive resources.*

2: Construction staging and vehicle maintenance*. The construction staging area and material storage shall be located a minimum of 50 feet away from wetland and sensitive habitat areas. A fueling and vehicle maintenance area shall be designated outside of wetland areas and at least 100-feet away from sensitive biological resources.*

3: Project construction schedule. *Construction activities shall be limited to the low-precipitation period to reduce the potential for impacts on sensitive, aquatic and wetlands habitat species and water quality. After construction is complete,*

areas disturbed by construction activities will be stabilized as needed to avoid increased erosion during subsequent storms and runoff.

4: Worker education. *A construction worker education program shall be implemented that includes an explanation of all special-status animal species, identification, avoidance measures, and federal and state laws that protect the species. This shall include at a minimum those species described herein as potentially occurring in* ***Table 1****.*

5: Temporary Rodent Exclusion. *Herpetological and rodent exclusion fencing shall be erected around the perimeter of work areas adjacent to sensitive habitat and wetlands prior to construction initiation. Fencing shall remain until work in sensitive areas is complete.*

6: Permanent Open Space Area Fencing*. In areas where the trial alignment abuts wetlands and sensitive habitat, a four strand t-post wire fence will be permanently erected to preclude entrance into adjacent sensitive habitat.*

7: Presence of Biological Monitor*. A qualified Biological Monitor shall be present to oversee all work conducted adjacent to sensitive habitats and wetlands.*

8: Development and Implementation of Stormwater Pollution Prevention Plan (SWPPP) and Spill Control and Counter Measures Plan (SCCP). *A SWPPP and SCCP shall be developed as part of the final Construction Documents for implementation by the construction contractor. They will address site disturbance, vehicle deployment and fueling maintenance, hazardous materials handling, and erosion and stormwater management control. The following Best Management Practices (BMPs) will be employed as appropriate to prevent direct and indirect impacts to sensitive species and habitats. Each of these BMPs seeks to minimize the project construction impacts on aquatic and terrestrial environments.*

Table 2. Project Best Management Practices

Potential Impact	BMP to Employ	Description of BMP
Discharge of pollutants associated with maintenance of construction equipment.	SC (Source Control)-20, 21,22 Equipment and Vehicle Maintenance	Methods to prevent or reduce the discharge of pollutants to stormwater from vehicle and equipment maintenance by conducting these activities off-site or in a designated area designed to contain spills and prevent runoff
Discharge of pollutants associated with cleaning of construction equipment.	SC-20, 21, 22 Equipment and Vehicle Cleaning	Practices to prevent or reduce the discharge of pollutants to stormwater from vehicle and equipment cleaning by using off-site facilities whenever possible, or by conducting these operations in designated, protected area.
Potential degradation of habitat quality to wildlife dependent on riparian areas.	SC-40 Biotechnical bank stabilization.	Use of "soft" bank repair/stabilization methods incorporating biological materials (seeds, plants, root wads) rather than or along with hard armoring. Employ the services of qualified staff (engineer, planner) or biotechnical specialist.
Increased hazard of erosion and adverse effects to special-status species through project scheduling.	SC-40 Project Planning/ Scheduling	Plan channel maintenance projects to minimize potential for erosion and to protect special-status species.
Potential entry of sediment into the creek during dewatering.	SC-10, SC-44 Brush or Rock Filter	A temporary erosion and sediment control method used to slow runoff (coffer dam return flow) that allows sediments to settle out before the water leaves the site.
Runoff and sediment entering the creek from bare/smooth banks.	SC-44 Slope Roughening or Terracing	Used to create unevenness on bare soil to reduce runoff velocity, to trap sediment, and to increase water infiltration into the soil. Likely to be done over small areas using hand tools prior to seeding.
Release of sediment along the perimeter of the channel during construction.	SC-11, SC-33 Straw or Sandbag Barriers	Temporary devices consisting of straw, bio-degradable fiber, or sandbags that are placed to direct flow so as to intercept sheet flow runoff and settle sediment through the barriers while slowly allowing water through.
Increased erosion and airborne pollutants due to airborne dust particles released during construction.	SC-32 Dust Control	Dust control measures used to keep the amount of airborne dust particles to a minimum to reduce erosion and airborne pollutants during the time between site disturbance and paving or revegetation. Dust control measures may include chemical or other measures (e.g. vegetation, mulch, stone, gravel).
Tracking of sediment from construction site onto roadways.	SC-32, 33, 44 Construction Road Entrance Stabilization	Measures to prevent construction equipment or vehicles from tracking sediments out of a work site onto paved roadways.
Potential entry of sediment into the creek during dewatering.	SC-44 Brush or Rock Filter	A temporary erosion and sediment control method used to slow runoff (coffer dam return flow) that allows sediments to settle out before the water leaves the site.
Potential contamination of water by construction equipment operating in the channel.	SC-44 Check Dams	A small dam (sandbag cofferdam) placed across swales or drainage channels to slow concentrated stormwater flows.
Water entering a work area interfering with work and contaminants being discharged downstream.	SC-10, 11 In Channel Flow Diversion System	Methods and measures for implementing/installing flow diversion systems, designed to prevent flow from entering the work site that could result in interfering work or the transport of contaminants downstream.
Erosion and surface runoff from disturbed soils, especially on slopes.	SC-40 Erosion Control Blankets, Mats, and Geotextiles	Use of erosion control blankets and similar devises to stabilize disturbed soils, especially on slopes, and protect soil from rain, surface runoff, and wind cause erosion while enhancing infiltration, decreasing soil compaction, and increasing protection of seeds from predators.
Bank erosion after site disturbance.	SC-40, 44 Revegetation After Soil Disturbance	Methods to properly revegetate sites after site disturbance to reduce bank erosion potential.

Note: BMP #s and descriptions from The California Stormwater Quality Association Construction BMP handbook (http://www.cabmphandbooks.com/industrial.asp).

	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporation	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
V. CULTURAL RESOURCES. Would the project:				
a) Cause a substantial adverse change in the significance of a historical resource as defined in CEQA Guidelines §15064.5?	☐	☐	☐	☒

	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporation	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
b) Cause a substantial adverse change in the significance of an archaeological resource pursuant to CEQA Guidelines§15064.5?	☐	☐	☐	☒
c) Directly or indirectly destroy a unique paleontological resource or site or unique geological feature?	☐	☐	☐	☒
d) Disturb any human remains, including those interred outside of formal cemeteries?	☐	☐	☐	☒

Discussion:

a.-d. This project does not include any earth disturbing activity or any other specific development. There are no known historic buildings or sites, archaeological resources, paleontological resources, unique geological features, nor human remains on the project site. All of the proposed trail alignment is in areas which have been extensively altered by construction activities over the past several decades.

Mitigation Measure(s): None are required.

	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporation	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
VI. GEOLOGY and SOILS. Would the project:				
a) Expose people or structures to potential substantial adverse effects, including the risk of loss, injury, or death involving:				
i) Rupture of a known earthquake fault, as delineated on the most recent Alquist-Priolo Earthquake Fault Zoning Map issued by the State Geologist for the area or based on other substantial evidence of a known fault? Refer to Division of Mines and Geology Special Publication 42.	☐	☐	☐	☒
ii) Strong seismic ground shaking?	☐	☐	☐	☒
iii) Seismic-related ground failure, including liquefaction?	☐	☐	☐	☒
iv) Landslides?	☐	☐	☐	☒
b) Result in substantial soil erosion or the loss of topsoil?	☐	☐	☐	☒
c) Be located on a geologic unit or soil that is unstable, or that would become unstable as a result of the project, and potentially result in on- or off-site landslide, lateral spreading, subsidence, liquefaction or collapse?	☐	☐	☐	☒

	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporation	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
d) Be located on expansive soil, as defined in Table 18-1-B of the Uniform Building Code (1997), creating substantial risks to life or property?	☐	☐	☐	☒
e) Have soils incapable of adequately supporting the use of septic tanks or alternative waste water disposal systems where sewers are not available for the disposal of waste water?	☐	☐	☐	☒

Discussion:

a. The project does not include the construction of any buildings that would be subject to seismic forces. People using the trail will be out-of-doors and dispersed along the trail. There is no potential for the proposed project to expose people to substantial adverse effects, including the risk of loss, injury, or death involving fault rupture, ground shaking, liquefaction, or landslides.
b. Due to the use of existing levees/service roads, no significant soil erosion is expected.
c. There is little likelihood of an on or off-site landslide given the levelness of the Napa River floodplain of the project area.
d. No structures are proposed, so the issue of expansive soils is irrelevant
e. No septic or wastewater systems are included in the project.

Mitigation Measure(s): None are required.

	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporation	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
VII. HAZARDS AND HAZARDOUS MATERIALS. Would the project:				
a) Create a significant hazard to the public or the environment through the routine transport, use, or disposal of hazardous materials?	☐	☐	☐	☒
b) Create a significant hazard to the public or the environment through reasonable foreseeable upset and accident conditions involving the release of hazardous materials into the environment?	☐	☐	☐	☒
c) Emit hazardous emissions or handle hazardous or acutely hazardous materials, substances, or waste within one-quarter mile of an existing or proposed school?	☐	☐	☐	☒

	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporation	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
d) Be located on a site which is included on a list of hazardous materials sites compiled pursuant to Government Code Section 65962.5 and, as a result, would it create a significant hazard to the public or the environment?	☐	☐	☐	☒
e) For a project located within an airport land use plan or, where such a plan has not been adopted, within two miles of a public airport or public use airport, would the project result in a safety hazard for people residing or working in the project area?	☐	☐	☒	☐
f) For a project within the vicinity of a private airstrip, or, where such a plan has not been adopted, within two miles of a public airport or public use airport, would the project result in a safety hazard for people residing or working in the project area?	☐	☐	☒	☐
g) Impair implementation of or physically interfere with an adopted emergency response plan or emergency evacuation plan?	☐	☐	☐	☒
h) Expose people or structures to a significant risk of loss, injury or death involving wild-land fires, including where wild-lands are adjacent to urbanized areas or where residences are intermixed with wild-lands?	☐	☐	☐	☒

Discussion:

a-c. The project does not use any hazardous materials.

d. The project is not on any of the lists of hazardous waste sites enumerated under Government Code Section 65962.5.

e-f. This segment of the trail is within two miles of the Napa County Airport, however no safety hazard will result to trail users or workers constructing the trail because the trail is not near a flight path where planes take off and land. The trail is within Zone D of the Airport Compatibility Zones which means residential uses are prohibited as are uses that would hazardous to flight. A recreational trail is permitted.

g. The project will not interfere with any adopted emergency response plan or emergency evacuation plan.

h. No structures are proposed as part of the project. This trail segment is not located near residences or an urban area. Risk of harm from fire is reduced by the proximity of the trail to the Napa River.

Mitigation Measure(s): None are required.

		Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporation	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
VIII.	**HYDROLOGY AND WATER QUALITY. Would the project:**				
a)	**Violate any water quality standards or waste discharge requirements?**	☐	☐	☐	☒
b)	**Substantially deplete groundwater supplies or interfere substantially with groundwater recharge such that there would be a net deficit in aquifer volume or a lowering of the local groundwater table level (e.g., the production rate of pre-existing nearby wells would drop to a level which would not support existing land uses or planned uses for which permits have been granted)?**	☐	☐	☐	☒
c)	**Substantially alter the existing drainage pattern of the site or area, including through the alteration of the course of a stream or river, in a manner which would result in substantial erosion or siltation on- or off-site?**	☐	☐	☐	☒
d)	**Substantially alter the existing drainage pattern of the site or area, including through the alteration of the course of a stream or river, or substantially increase the rate or amount of surface runoff in a manner which would result in flooding on- or off-site?**	☐	☐	☐	☒
e)	**Create or contribute runoff water which would exceed the capacity of existing or planned stormwater drainage systems or provide substantial additional sources of polluted runoff?**	☐	☐	☐	☒
f)	**Otherwise substantially degrade water quality?**	☐	☐	☐	☒
g)	**Place housing within a 100-year flood hazard area as mapped on a federal Flood Hazard Boundary or Flood Insurance Rate Map or other flood hazard delineation map?**	☐	☐	☐	☒
h)	**Place within a 100-year flood hazard area structures which would impede or redirect flood flows?**	☐	☐	☐	☒
i)	**Expose people or structures to a significant risk of loss, injury or death involving flooding, including flooding as a result of the failure of a levee or dam?**	☐	☐	☒	☐
j)	**Inundation by seiche, tsunami, or mudflow?**	☐	☐	☐	☒

Discussion:

a.-f. The proposed project will not involve any pollutants that could enter adjacent wetlands. Nor will it change runoff rates, direction of water flow, water temperature, or sediment loading as the trail is utilizing an existing levee/service road. Surfacing of the trail with stabilized quarry fines, a semi-permeable surface, would slightly improve water quality by stabilizing the surface of what is now a dirt service road, thereby preventing any existing minor flow into the adjacent wetlands of dirt road soil loosened by occasional service vehicles.

g-h. No housing or structures will be constructed as part of the project.

i-j. The trail is located on a levee so there is some risk of flooding in the event the levee fails. The risk is less than significant because there are no permanent structures or residences and the trail will be closed to hikers in the event of a flood.

Mitigation Measures: None are required.

	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporation	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
IX. LAND USE AND PLANNING. Would the project:				
a) Physically divide an established community?	☐	☐	☐	☒
b) Conflict with any applicable land use plan, policy, or regulation of an agency with jurisdiction over the project (including, but not limited to the general plan, specific plan, local coastal program, or zoning ordinance) adopted for the purpose of avoiding or mitigating an environmental effect?	☐	☐	☐	☒
c) Conflict with any applicable habitat conservation plan or natural community conservation plan?	☐	☐	☐	☒

Discussion:

a. The proposed project does not divide any established community.

b. The Agricultural Watershed, Airport Compatibility, and Agricultural Resource zones within which the project is located allows rural recreational uses upon the grant of a use permit. Although the project is not subject to a County Use Permit (since it is located on a County public road and is thus considered a non-motorized road), it is nonetheless consistent with the general standards (Section 18.104.340) as well as the environmental performance standards for outdoor recreation (Section 18.104.350).

c. There are no habitat conservation plans or natural community conservation plans applicable to the project site.

Mitigation Measures: None are required.

	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporation	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
X. MINERAL RESOURCES. Would the project:				
a) Result in the loss of availability of a known mineral resource that would be of value to the region and the residents of the state?	☐	☐	☐	☒
b) Result in the loss of availability of a locally-important mineral resource recovery site delineated on a local general plan, specific plan or other land use plan?	☐	☐	☐	☒

Discussion:

a.-b. There are no known mineral rights on the property and the subject parcel is not in an area of a known mineral resource of value to the region or state, or within a known mineral resource recovery site.

Mitigation Measures: None are required.

	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporation	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
XI. NOISE. Would the project result in:				
a) Exposure of persons to or generation of noise levels in excess of standards established in the local general plan or noise ordinance, or applicable standards of other agencies?	☐	☐	☐	☒
b) Exposure of persons to or generation of excessive ground-borne vibration or ground-borne noise levels?	☐	☐	☐	☒
c) A substantial permanent increase in ambient noise levels in the project vicinity above levels existing without the project?	☐	☐	☐	☒
d) A substantial temporary or periodic increase in ambient noise levels in the project vicinity above levels existing without the project?	☐	☐	☐	☒
e) For a project located within an airport land use plan or, where such a plan has not been adopted, within two miles of a public airport or public use airport, would the project expose people residing or working in the project area to excessive noise levels?	☐	☐	☐	☒
f) For a project within the vicinity of a private airstrip, would the project expose people residing or working in the project area to excessive noise levels?	☐	☐	☐	☒

Discussion:

a-d. No significant construction or any other noise-generating development is proposed as part of this project and none is foreseeable. The only noise generated by the project will come from human voices. There will be no ground-borne vibrations and no increase in the ambient noise levels either permanently or temporarily. Presently, ambient noise from Highway 29, Napa Sanitation, and the Corporate Park exceed any noise generated by trail users.

e.-f. The proposed trail is within 2 miles of the Napa County Airport, however the airport does not service large planes, The project is not within designated flight paths, planes which use the airport are not close to the ground in the vicinity of the trail, and ambient noise from the adjacent roadways is greater than what is likely from aircraft. Trail users and trail construction workers will not be subject to harmful noise levels.

Mitigation Measures: None are required.

	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporation	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
XII. POPULATION and HOUSING. Would the project:				
a) Induce substantial population growth in an area, either directly (for example, by proposing new homes and businesses) or indirectly (for example, through extension of roads or other infrastructure)?	☐	☐	☐	☒
b) Displace substantial numbers of existing housing, necessitating the construction of replacement housing elsewhere?	☐	☐	☐	☒
c) Displace substantial numbers of people, necessitating the construction of replacement housing elsewhere?	☐	☐	☐	☒

Discussion:

a.-c The project will not have a significant effect on population growth in the area, will not displace any existing housing, and will not displace any people. It will have a small beneficial impact on improving the quality of life of residents on Napa County by providing a public access trail along the Napa River.

Mitigation Measures: None are required.

	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporation	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
XIII. PUBLIC SERVICES. Would the project result in:				

	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporation	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
a) Substantial adverse physical impacts associated with the provision of new or physically altered governmental facilities, need for new or physically altered governmental facilities, the construction of which could cause significant environmental impacts, in order to maintain acceptable service ratios, response times or other performance objectives for any of the public services:				
Fire protection?	☐	☐	☐	☒
Police protection?	☐	☐	☐	☒
Schools?	☐	☐	☐	☒
Parks?	☐	☐	☐	☒
Other public facilities?	☐	☐	☐	☒

Discussion:

a. This project includes no development and will not result in any increased demand for public services or any change to government facilities. The project will improve the availability of outdoor recreation opportunities. The District will maintain the trail and monitor its use.

Mitigation Measures: None are required.

	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporation	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
XIV. RECREATION. Would the project:				
a) Increase the use of existing neighborhood and regional parks or other recreational facilities such that substantial physical deterioration of the facility would occur or be accelerated?	☐	☐	☐	☒
b) Does the project include recreational facilities or require the construction or expansion of recreational facilities which might have an adverse physical effect on the environment?	☐	☐	☐	☒

Discussion:

a.-b. This project includes no development and will not, in and of itself, result in any increased demand for recreation facilities.

Mitigation Measures: None are required.

	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporation	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
XV. TRANSPORTATION/TRAFFIC. Would the project:				
a) Cause an increase in traffic which is substantial in relation to the existing traffic load and capacity of the street system (i.e., result in a substantial increase in either the number of vehicle trips, the volume to capacity ratio on roads, or congestion at intersections)?	☐	☐	☒	☐
b) Exceed, either individually or cumulatively, a level of service standard established by the county congestion management agency for designated roads or highways?	☐	☐	☒	☐
c) Result in a change in air traffic patterns, including either an increase in traffic levels or a change in location that result in substantial safety risks?	☐	☐	☐	☒
d) Substantially increase hazards due to a design feature, (e.g., sharp curves or dangerous intersections) or incompatible uses (e.g., farm equipment)?	☐	☐	☐	☒
e) Result in inadequate emergency access?	☐	☐	☒	☐
f) Result in inadequate parking capacity?	☐	☐	☒	☐
g) Conflict with adopted policies, plans, or programs supporting alternative transportation (e.g., bus turnouts, bicycle racks)?	☐	☐	☐	☒

Discussion:

a.-b. Automobile traffic from people using the trail will be insignificant. The public roads provide vehicular access to both ends of the trail. There is more than enough parking capacity available along the wide shoulders of Soscol Ferry Road.

c. The project would not affect existing air traffic and thus no impacts on either air traffic patterns and/or air traffic safety are anticipated.

d. There will be no change to design features and no change of use for the roads that provide access to the trail.

e. There will be no change to emergency access.

f. There is ample parking available along the public roads that provide access to the trail.

g. The proposed project does not conflict with but instead supports adopted alternative transportation policies. Once the entire Napa River and Bay Trail is completed, there will be a safe bicycle and pedestrian route between American Canyon and Napa, so the project encourages alternative transportation.

Mitigation Measures: None are required.

	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporation	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
XVI. UTILITIES AND SERVICE SYSTEMS. Would the project:				
a) Exceed wastewater treatment requirements of the applicable Regional Water Quality Control Board?	☐	☐	☐	☒
b) Require or result in the construction of a new water or wastewater treatment facilities or expansion of existing facilities, the construction of which could cause significant environmental effects?	☐	☐	☐	☒
c) Require or result in the construction of a new storm water drainage facilities or expansion of existing facilities, the construction of which could cause significant environmental effects?	☐	☐	☐	☒
d) Have sufficient water supplies available to serve the project from existing entitlements and resources, or are new or expanded entitlements needed?	☐	☐	☐	☒
e) Result in a determination by the wastewater treatment provider which serves or may serve the project that it has adequate capacity to serve the project's projected demand in addition to the provider's existing commitments?	☐	☐	☐	☒
f) Be served by a landfill with sufficient permitted capacity to accommodate the project's solid waste disposal needs?	☐	☐	☐	☒
g) Comply with federal, state, and local statutes and regulations related to solid waste?	☐	☐	☐	☒

Discussion:

a-b. The project will not generate wastewater and therefore will not exceed wastewater treatment standards as established by the Regional Water Quality Control Board and will not result in any wastewater discharge.

c. The project will not require or result in the construction of new storm water drainage facilities or an expansion of existing facilities which would cause a significant impact to the environment.

d-e. The project does not require any water and will not generate any wastewater.

f. The project proposes no development and will not result in any increase in waste generation.

g. Trail users will be expected to carry out their trash. The project will not generate any solid wastes.

Mitigation Measure(s): None are required.

	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporation	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
XVII. 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 or 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?	☐	☐	☒	☐
b) Does the project have impacts that are individually limited, but cumulatively considerable? ("Cumulatively considerable" means that the incremental effects of a project are considerable when viewed in connection with the effects of past projects, the effects of other current projects, and the effects of probable future projects)?	☐	☐	☒	☐
c) Does the project have environmental effects that will cause substantial adverse effects on human beings, either directly or indirectly?	☐	☐	☒	☐

Discussion:

a. See Commitments for Section IV Biological Resources (above).

b. As discussed above, the proposed project does not have impacts that are individually limited, but cumulatively considerable.

c. There are no environmental effects caused by this project that would result in substantial adverse effects on human beings, whether directly or indirectly. No hazardous conditions resulting from this project have been identified. The project would not have any environmental effects that would result in significant impacts.

Mitigation Measure(s): None required.

NAPA COUNTY REGIONAL PARK AND OPEN SPACE DISTRICT
1195 3rd Street, Suite 210
Napa, CA 94559
(707) 259-5933

Notice of Intent to Adopt a Negative Declaration

1. **Project Title**: Napa River and Bay Trail: Soscol Ferry Road to San Anselmo Court Segment

2. **Property Owner**: A portion of this trail segment is owned by Napa County, a portion is owned by CalTrans, a portion is owned by VCC-Napa LLC, and a portion is owned by Napa Redevelopment Partners LLC.

3. **Contact person and phone number**: John Woodbury, General Manager, (707) 259-5933, jwoodbury@ncrposd.org

4. **Project location and APN:** This trail segment will begin at Soscol Ferry Road, APN 046-400-015, proceed over land owned by CalTrans as part of the State Highway 29 corridor, connect to land owned by VCC-Napa LLA, APN 046-630-007, and either terminate at Anselmo Court, a public way, or proceed over land of Napa Redevelopment Partners, LLC, APN 046-630-008, and terminate at land owned by Napa Pipe. This segment of the trail is partially within Napa County and partially within the City of Napa. The project is within AW (Agricultural Watershed) and AC (Airport Compatibility) Napa County zoning, and AR(Agricultural Resource) City of Napa zoning.

5. **Project Sponsor's Name and Address**: Napa County Regional Park and Open Space District, 1195 Third Street, Ste 210, Napa, Calif. 94559

6. **Hazardous Waste Sites:** This segment of the Napa River and Bay Trail is not on any of the lists of hazardous waste sites enumerated under Government Code §65962.5.

7. **Project Description**: The Napa River and Bay Trail Project is a proposal to construct a multi-use trail (hiking and bicycling) public trail that will provide the only trail link between the cities of American Canyon and Napa. The trail will provide exceptional bird viewing, as well as interpretation and educational opportunities. The segment that stretches from Soscol Ferry Road to San Anselmo Ct is .8 miles long and runs along the Napa River to the east of the Southern Pacific Railroad. Access to this segment of the trail will be from Soscol Ferry Road, a public way, and from Anselmo Court, a public way. Parking is available on Soscol Ferry Road. A pedestrian gate will be constructed at Soscol Ferry Road to get around a border fence on the property of Napa Sanitation District. A 6-foot security fence will be installed where the trail is adjacent to the railroad tracks. A 4-strand wire wildlife fence will be installed to protect wetland areas. The trail alignment runs along Soscol Ferry Road, crosses under Highway 29 on land owned by Caltrans, and proceeds north on land owned by VCC-Napa, also known as the Napa Valley Corporate Park, and Napa Redevelopment Partners. The trail will be 8-feet wide and constructed out of stabilized quarry which is a semi-permeable, stable surface.

PRELIMINARY DETERMINATION:

The Napa County Regional Park and Open Space District has tentatively determined that the Napa River Trail: Soscol Ferry Road to Napa Pipe Segment would have a less than significant effect on the environment and the District intends to adopt a **negative declaration**. Documentation supporting this determination is contained in or referenced by the attached Initial Study Checklist and is available for inspection at the Napa County Regional Park and Open Space District office, 1195 Third St., Suite 210, Napa, California 94559 between the hours of 9:00 AM and 4:45 PM Monday through Friday (except holidays).

1/25/10
DATE:

John Woodbury
BY: John Woodbury

WRITTEN COMMENT PERIOD: March 3, 2010

Please send written comments to the attention of John Woodbury at 1195 Third St., Suite 210, Napa, Calif. 94559, or via e-mail to jwoodbury@ncrposd.org.

March 8, 2010

RE: Memo to File
Comments and Responses to Notice of Intent to Adopt a Negative Declaration

From: John Woodbury

Comments from Roger Hartwell, Friends of the Napa River

Corrections to Table 1 (species table)

--add peregrine falcon (PEFA) to the species list as a California fully-protected species. PEFA is known to hunt in the project area, successfully nests downstream at the railroad bridge, and has been observed during nesting season (nesting not confirmed)

--note that Swainson's hawk does breed in California, albeit in the Central Valley, not the project area.

--note that as of November 2009 the Sacramento Field Office of the USFWS no longer recognizes the Federal Species of Concern category shown in Table 1.

Comments from Caltrans

At the request of Caltrans, a memo was prepared by Rick Marshall, county Traffic Engineer, substantiating that the project will not have a significant effect on traffic. Caltrans had no other comments, other to note that an Encroachment Permit will be required and the District will be required to maintain the proposed improvements.

Comments from Intelsat—Napa Teleport

At the request of Charles Clifton of this company, the District will include 4-strand wire (open space) fencing along the edge of the trail where it abuts the Intelsat property.

Napa County Regional Park and Open Space District

Harold Kelly
Director Ward One

Tony Norris
Director Ward Two

Guy Kay
Director Ward Three

Dave Finigan
Director Ward Four

Myrna Abramowicz
Director Ward Five

MINUTES

BOARD OF DIRECTORS SPECIAL MEETING

Monday March 8, 2010 2:00 P.M.
1195 Third Street, Third Floor, Napa, CA 94559

1. Call to Order and Roll Call
   Meeting was called to order by President Myrna Abramowicz.
   Directors Harold Kelly, Tony Norris, Guy Kay, and Dave Finigan also present.

2. Public Comment
   None.

3. Set Matters
   None.

4. Administrative Items

   A. Consideration of and potential approval of Minutes of Board of Directors' meeting of February 8, 2010.
   Minutes were approved as corrected.
   GK-TN-HK-DF-MA

   B. Consideration and potential adoption of a Categorical Exemption under the California Environmental Quality Act and authorization for the Lake Berryessa Estates Resort Improvement District to deposit fill material on District property at Lake Berryessa Estates (APN#016-221-001).
   Directors voted to:
   (1) Adopt a Categorical Exemption under the California Environmental Quality Act for the proposed project (Exemption Class 4--Section 15304: Minor Alterations to Land).
   (2) Authorize the placement of fill material on District property at Lake Berryessa Estates (APN#016-221-001), subject to those conditions which the General Manager determines to be appropriate.
   TN-GK-HK-DF-MA

   C. Consideration and potential approval of Operation and Management Plan for the Ahmann easement on the Berryessa Peak Trail.

Directors voted to Authorize the General Manager to execute an Operation and Management Plan.
HK-DF-TN-GK-MA

D. Consideration and potential adoption of a Negative Declaration under the California Environmental Quality Act for Sections 7 and 8 of the Napa River and Bay Trail, authorization for the Board President and/or General Manager to execute those documents and take those actions necessary to complete construction and begin operation of the trail, and approval of related budget amendments for FY 2009-10.
Directors voted to:
(1) Adopt a Negative Declaration under the California Environmental Quality Act for Sections 7 and 8 of the Napa River and Bay Trail.
TN-DF-HK-GK-MA

(2) Authorize the Board President and/or General Manager to (a) apply to the City of Napa for a Use Permit for the trail, (b) accept trail easements where the trail crosses through the Napa Valley Corporate Park, (c) obtain permission from the California Department of Transportation to construct and operate the section of the trail crossing state land, (d) amend Napa County Agreement No 6782 to allow the District to construct and operate the trail where it utilizes the Soscol Ferry Road right-of-way, (e) execute a grant funding agreement to pay for construction of the trail, (f) enter into a professional services contract to prepare construction and bid documents, and (g) take any and all other actions necessary to complete construction and begin operation of the trail.
DF-HK-GK-TN-MA

(3) Amend the FY 2009-10 budget to increase the Napa River and Bay Trail project account by $30,000 and decrease the Contingency/Special Projects account by an equivalent amount.
HK-GK-TN-DF-MA

E. Report on professional services contract for habitat assessment and biological survey work related to the Napa River and Bay Trail, and consideration and potential approval of related budget amendments for FY 2009-10.
Directors voted to:
(1) Cancel the contract with Land Conservation Associates, and unobliate the remaining fund balance in the contract of an estimated $33,960.26.
DF-GK-TN-HK-MA

(2) Amend the District FY 2009-10 District Budget by increasing the budget for the Napa River and Bay Trail project by $21,500 and decreasing the PSS:Other (Professional Services) budget category by an equal amount.
DF-TN-HK-GK-MA

F. Consideration and potential approval of amendment to District By-Laws authorizing General Manager to file Notices of Completion for construction projects pursuant to California Civil Code 3093.
Directors voted to Amend District By-Laws to authorize the General Manager to file Notices of Completion for construction projects pursuant to California Civil Code 3093.
GK-TN-HK-DF-MA

G. Review of the District Projects Status Report.
John Woodbury gave the report with discussions on the Napa River and Bay Trail, Berryessa Estates, Blue Ridge Berryessa, Camp Berryessa, Moore Creek, Oat Hill Mine Trail, Napa River Ecological Reserve, Rector Ridge, the Vine Trail, Lake Hennessey, and the South Napa Wetlands.

H. Receipt of report on expenditures, encumbrances, donations and grants approved by the General Manager
John Woodbury gave the report.
Directors received invoices from the State Department of General Services covering their costs for the lot line adjustment and trail easement relocation.

5. Announcements by Board and Staff
- John Woodbury announced that the potential tax default sale at Lake Berryessa did not happen as the owner did pay the back taxes at the last minute.
- John Woodbury announced that Assemblymember Evans introduced a bill to authorize the State to sell Skyline Park to the County at fair market value.
- John Woodbury announced that the Healthy People Healthy Planet Faire will be held this year on May 1, 2010 in American Canyon.
- Dave Finigan announced that he gave a presentation on the Board to SIRS.
- Tony Norris announced that he attended a conference of the Bay Area Early Detection Network and received updates from the National Park Service on weed management, mapping and elimination of exotic weeds.

6. Agenda Planning
- Dave Finigan reminded the Board that the 3 year Status Report will need to be started soon.

7. Adjournment
Meeting was adjourned to the Regular Park & Open Space District Meeting of April 12, 2010.

MYRNA ABRAMOWICZ,
Board President

ATTEST:

MELISSA GRAY
District Secretary

Key
Vote: HK = Harold Kelly; TN = Tony Norris; GK = Guy Kay; DF = David Finigan; MA = Myrna Abramowicz
The maker of the motion and second are reflected respectively in the order of the recorded vote.
Notations under vote: N = No; A = Abstain; X = Excused

NOTICE OF DETERMINATION

NAPA COUNTY REGIONAL PARK AND OPEN SPACE DISTRICT
1195 THIRD STREET SUITE 210 NAPA CA 94559

(Filed in compliance with Section 21108 or 21152 of the Public Resources Code)

To: ☒ Office of Planning and Research
1400 Tenth Street, Room 121
Sacramento, CA 95814

☒ Napa County Clerk
900 Coombs Street
Napa, CA 94559

LEAD AGENCY: Napa County Regional Park and Open Space District

DISTRICT CONTACT PERSON: John Woodbury
AREA CODE/TELEPHONE NUMBER: 707-259-5933

STATE CLEARINGHOUSE NUMBER: 2010012062

PROJECT TITLE: Napa River and Bay Trail –Soscol Ferry Road to Anselmo Court

PROJECT LOCATION: Existing dirt service roads between Soscol Ferry Road and Anselmo Court utilizing portions of APN # 046-400-006 and 046-630-007 and including the County of Napa road right of way for Soscol Ferry Road and the State of California road right of way for Highway 29 (Butler Bridge).

NEAREST CITY: American Canyon **COUNTY:** Napa

GENERAL PROJECT DESCRIPTION: Construction and operation of a non-motorized recreational trail connecting the western end of Soscol Ferry Road with Anselmo Court.

COUNTY PERMIT(S): Management Agreement for use of right of way anticipated.

APPLICANT NAME: Napa County Regional Park and Open Space District
ADDRESS: 1195 Third St Rm 210, CA 94574

This is to advise that the Napa County Regional Park and Open Space District as ☒Lead Agency ☐ Responsible Agency has approved the above-described project on December 14, 2009 and made the following determinations: (Date)

1. The project ☐will ☒will not have a significant effect on the environment.
2. ☐ An Environmental Impact Report was prepared for this project pursuant to the provisions of CEQA.
   ☒ A Negative Declaration was prepared for this project pursuant to the provisions of CEQA.
3. Mitigation measures ☐ were ☒ were not made a condition of the approval of this project.
4. A mitigation reporting or monitoring plan ☐was ☒ was not adopted for this project.
5. A statement of Overriding Considerations ☐was ☒ was not adopted for this project.
6. Findings ☒ were ☐ were not made pursuant to the provisions of CEQA.

This is to certify that the Final EIR with comments and responses and record of project approval, or the Negative Declaration, is available to the General Public at:

Napa County Regional Park and Open Space District
1195 Third Street, Suite 210
Napa, CA 94559

SIGNATURE: John Woodbury DATE: 3/9/10 TITLE: General Manager
John Woodbury

Date received for filing and posting at OPR:

From: Woodbury, John
To: "Ann Buell"
Subject: Neg Dec for Napa River and Bay Trail
Date: Thursday, February 06, 2014 3:45:12 PM

Ann:
Per your request, this email is to confirm that the Negative Declaration for the Napa River and Bay Trail: Socsol Ferry Road to San Anselmo Court Segment consists of the Initial Study Checklist prepared January25, 2010, the Notice of Intent to Adopt a Negative Declaration executed January 25, 2010, plus the two comment letters that were received. The Notice of Determination indicating adoption of the Negative Declaration was filed on March 9, 2010.
--John Woodbury