

INITIAL STUDY

Prepared for the:

Napa County Transportation and Planning Agency

NAPA COUNTYWIDE BICYCLE PLAN UPDATE

Napa County
City of American Canyon
City of Napa
City of Saint Helena

Prepared by:



Jeffrey H. Peters, Principal, Questa Engineering Corporation

City of Calistoga
Town of Yountville

Prepared by:

Napa County Transportation and Planning Agency

January 7, 2012

Napa County Transportation and Planning Agency

30 DAY NOTICE OF AVAILABILITY OF A DRAFT MITIGATED NEGATIVE DECLARATION

NOTICE IS HEREBY GIVEN that the Napa County Transportation and Planning Agency has prepared an Initial Study Checklist for environmental review of the following described project in accordance with the California Environmental Quality Act (CEQA) of 1970, as amended.

Project Title: Napa Countywide Bicycle Plan Update
Project Applicant: Napa County Transportation and Planning Agency (NCTPA)
Project Location: The Bicycle Plan area includes the area within Napa County's jurisdictional boundaries.

Project Description. The proposed project for the purposes of CEQA review consists of the adoption of the NCTPA Countywide Bicycle Plan (Plan), which incorporates four stand-alone Bicycle Plans and associated policies and projects for the cities of American Canyon, Napa, Calistoga, Yountville St. Helena and the County of Napa (unincorporated areas).

NCTPA is the lead agency for the overall planning effort, also providing assistance in programming regional, state, and federal funds, and will lead or support the implementation of programmatic improvements. The Plan and environmental analysis will also be separately adopted and certified by each respective agency prior to project implementation. The Plan will be used by each individual agency to document policy and guide implementation of local projects and programs.

The Plan is intended to guide development and enhancement of bicycle facility infrastructure within the cities and unincorporated areas of Napa County. It provides a description of proposed projects and priorities for implementation; details design standards for bikeways, and programmatic recommendations to meet transportation goals, and improve safety conditions as part of a multi-modal transportation network. The plans are also intended to guide the future development of bicycle infrastructure in the County and Cities, and in doing so will reduce the use of motor vehicles and improve connectivity, including connectivity between neighborhoods and commercial districts, and improve public health by fostering additional outdoor exercise.

In order to provide for a geographically and thematically comprehensive analysis of the Napa County Bicycle Plan, potential environmental impacts associated with the Plan are analyzed at a "program" level within this Initial Study. The agencies responsible for plan implementation, including Napa County, the Cities of American Canyon, Napa, and St. Helena, and the Napa County Regional Parks and Open Space District, will review all projects on a case-by-case basis to determine if any supplemental environmental review under CEQA of potentially adverse project-specific impacts would occur that are not mitigated through the recommended project revisions and mitigations identified in this Initial Study. This analysis uses the established policies in the Napa County General Plan, as well as the General Plans of the Cities within Napa County, and the ordinances and codes of these entities.

The basis for proposing a Mitigated Negative Declaration (MND) is the finding that implementation of the Countywide Bicycle Plan will have a less than significant effect on the environment because the NCTPA has hereby agreed to implement each of the identified mitigation measures, which would be adopted as part of the Mitigation Monitoring and Reporting Program associated with this CEQA document.

Review and Comment Period: Comments on the Draft MND must be received by *5:00 PM, March 15, 2011*, at the following address:

Eliot Hurwitz
Program Manager for Planning
Napa County Transportation and Planning Agency
707 Randolph St, Napa CA 94559

Report Availability: A copy of the Draft MND and IS are available for review online at <http://www.nctpa.net>. Copies are also available at the following locations:

Napa County Transportation and Planning Agency
707 Randolph Street, Ste. 100
Napa, CA 94558
Napa County Planning Department, Front Counter
1195 Third Street, Suite 210
Napa, CA 94559

Napa City-County Public Library
580 Coombs St.
Napa, CA 94559

City of American Canyon, City Clerk
4381 Broadway Street, Ste. 201
American Canyon, CA 94503

City of St. Helena, Planning Department
1480 Main Street
St. Helena, CA 94574

St. Helena Public Library
1492 Library Lane
St Helena, CA 94574

Start of Public Review: February 15, 2012 **End of Public Review:** March 15, 2012

TABLE OF CONTENTS

INITIAL STUDY/MITIGATED NEGATIVE DECLARATION.....	1
A) BACKGROUND AND PURPOSE	2
B) SETTING.....	2
C) PLAN ELEMENTS.....	3
D) CONSTRUCTION ELEMENTS.....	4
Projects.....	4
Napa County Unincorporated Projects	5
City of American Canyon Projects	5
City of Napa Projects	5
City of Saint Helena Projects	6
City of Calistoga Projects.....	6
Town of Yountville Projects	6
E) ENVIRONMENTAL ANALYSIS.....	7
CEQA Categorically Exempt Projects (CE/CEX).....	7
Mitigated Negative Declaration/Projects Evaluated as part of this Initial Study (MND)	8
Projects Needing Further Study (FSN)	8
Projects Subject to NEPA	8
Surrounding Land Uses and Setting.....	8
Other Public Agencies Whose Approval is Required:	8
ENVIRONMENTAL FACTORS POTENTIALLY AFFECTED.....	9
ENVIRONMENTAL CHECKLIST	10
I. AESTHETICS.....	10
II. AGRICULTURE AND FORESTRY RESOURCES	11
III. AIR QUALITY	13
IV. BIOLOGICAL RESOURCES	15
V. CULTURAL RESOURCES	21
VI. GEOLOGY AND SOILS	22
VII. GREENHOUSE GAS EMISSIONS.....	25
VIII. HAZARDS & HAZARDOUS MATERIALS	25
IX. HYDROLOGY AND WATER QUALITY	27
X. LAND USE	30
XI. MINERAL RESOURCES	31
XII. NOISE	31
XIII. POPULATION AND HOUSING	32
XIV. PUBLIC SERVICES.....	33
XV. RECREATION.....	33
XVI. TRANSPORTATION/TRAFFIC.....	34
XVII. UTILITIES & SERVICE SYSTEMS.....	37
XVIII. MANDATORY FINDINGS OF SIGNIFICANCE	39
SOURCE REFERENCES	40

APPENDIX A: PROJECT MAPS

Study Area and Vicinity
Overview of Countywide Bicycle Facilities
Planning Area - North Valley
Planning Area - Mid Valley
Planning Area - City of Napa
Planning Area - South Valley
Existing and Proposed Bicycle Network, City of American Canyon
Existing and Proposed Bicycle Network, City of Napa
Existing and Proposed Bicycle Network, City of Saint Helena
Existing and Proposed Bicycle Network, Napa County

APPENDIX B: PROJECT LIST

Proposed Bicycle Network, American Canyon
Proposed Bicycle Network, City of Napa
Proposed Bicycle Network, Saint Helena
Proposed Bicycle Network, Napa County Unincorporated
Proposed Bicycle Network Calistoga
Proposed Bicycle Network Yountville

APPENDIX C: MITIGATION MONITORING AND REPORTING PROGRAM

NAPA COUNTYWIDE BICYCLE PLAN UPDATE INITIAL STUDY/MITIGATED NEGATIVE DECLARATION

1. **Project Title:** **Napa Countywide Bicycle Plan Update**
2. **Lead Agency Name and Address:** **Napa County Transportation Planning Agency**
3. **Contact Person and Phone Number:** Eliot Hurwitz
Program Manager for Planning
Napa County Transportation and Planning Agency
707 Randolph St, Napa CA 94559
707-259-8782
4. **Project Location:** Unincorporated Napa County and the Cities of Napa,
St. Helena and American Canyon
Town of Yountville
City of Calistoga
5. **Project Sponsor's Name and Address:** **Napa County Transportation Planning Agency**
6. **General Plan Land Use Designation:** Varies
7. **Zoning:** Varies
8. **Description of Project:**

The proposed project for the purposes of CEQA review consists of the adoption of the NCTPA Countywide Bicycle Plan Update (Plan), which incorporates four stand-alone Bicycle Plans and associated policies and projects for the cities of American Canyon, Napa, Calistoga, Yountville, St. Helena and the County of Napa (unincorporated areas).

The NCTPA Bicycle Plan Update addresses bicycle facility needs over a 25-year planning horizon and consists of several parts. The stand-alone Bicycle Plans for the cities of American Canyon, Napa, Calistoga, Yountville, St. Helena and the County of Napa, will be used by the individual agencies to document policy and compliance with CEQA requirements, and guide implementation of local projects and programs, with a countywide overview that addresses countywide issues. The Plan is intended to address the local context of each community, coordinate bicycle access between jurisdictions, and comply with the requirements of the State-mandated Bicycle Transportation Act. This Plan includes a vision statement, goals, policies, and objectives; and documents existing conditions and proposed projects in text, tables, and Bike Plan Maps (the Plan and background information are available for review online at <http://www.nctpa.net/pro-pro/pla-stu/bicycle.html>). The Bike Plan includes a collision analysis, and documents past expenditures and future funding needs. The Bike Plan: 1) provides a description of proposed projects and priorities for implementation; 2) details design standards for bikeways, and includes a series of programmatic recommendations intended to help mainstream bicycling; 3) helps achieve larger community livability and transportation goals; and 4) includes programs to improve safety conditions for bicyclists and motorists.

NCTPA is the lead agency for the overall planning effort, also providing assistance in programming regional, state, and federal funds, and will lead or support the implementation of programmatic improvements. The Plan and environmental analysis will also be separately adopted and certified by each respective agency prior to project implementation.

In order to provide for a geographically and thematically comprehensive analysis of the Napa County Bicycle Plan, potential environmental impacts associated with the Plan are analyzed at a “program” level within this Initial Study. The agencies responsible for plan implementation, including Napa County, the Cities of American Canyon, Napa, Calistoga, Yountville, St. Helena, and the Napa County Regional Parks and Open Space District, will review all projects on a case-by-case basis to determine if any supplemental environmental review under CEQA of potentially adverse project-specific impacts would occur that are not mitigated through the recommended project revisions and mitigations identified in this Initial Study. This analysis uses the established policies in the Napa County General Plan, as well as the General Plans of the Cities, and the ordinances and codes of these entities.

A) BACKGROUND AND PURPOSE

The Plan is an update of the *2003 Napa Countywide Bicycle Master Plan*, and addresses bicycle facility needs over a 25-year planning horizon. The Plan includes a Vision Statement, Goals, Objectives, Policies and Programs to guide bicycle access within Napa County. The Plans for each community address the local context of each area, including specific projects, programs and implementation actions to comply with the requirements of the State-mandated Bicycle Transportation Act. The Plan documents existing conditions, proposed projects, contains a collision analysis, and an analysis of past expenditures and future funding needs.

The Plan is intended to guide development and enhancement of bicycle facility infrastructure within the cities and unincorporated areas of Napa County. It provides a description of proposed projects and priorities for implementation; details design standards for bikeways, and programmatic recommendations to meet transportation goals, and improve safety conditions as part of a multi-modal transportation network.

The Plan focuses on facilities that provide direct, convenient connections to desired destinations, including employment centers, commercial areas, parks, schools, tourist destinations, and transit. This coordinated effort will help with the inter-jurisdictional planning of bikeways that cross boundaries and affect more than one city or one planning agency (primary routes). The Plan will also be used to obtain regional, state, and federal funding for bicycle projects and programs. Project proposals will be incorporated into the Napa County Transportation and Planning Agency (NCTPA) Strategic Transportation Plan, the Regional Bicycle Plan for the San Francisco Bay Area, and the Metropolitan Transportation Commission’s (MTC) Regional Transportation Improvement Program (RTIP).

B) SETTING

Napa County is located in the North Bay, within the nine-county San Francisco Bay Area Metropolitan Statistical Area. With a County population of approximately 139,000 housed within 754 square miles, it is a primarily rural area, with urban uses concentrated in a valley along a north-south axis roughly paralleling the Napa River. The area is primarily agricultural, and bordered on the west by the Mayacamas Mountains and Sonoma County, on the east by the Howell Range and Solano and Yolo Counties, on the north by Lake County, and on the south by San Pablo Bay. The County is home to the cities of American Canyon, Calistoga, Napa, St. Helena, and Yountville. Napa County is sparsely settled outside of the incorporated and urbanized areas, but the transportation system is affected by tourism, which influences vehicular as well as bicycle use.

C) PLAN ELEMENTS

The Plan has two components, including both programmatic and physical elements: 1) programs, safety enhancements and bicycle support facilities to improve safety and encourage bicycling, which will be implemented countywide and by each City, and 2) a network of proposed bikeway improvements including Class I multi-use paths, Class II bike lanes, and Class III bike route projects in American Canyon, Napa, Calistoga, Yountville, Saint Helena and unincorporated Napa County. Many of the Class I multi-use paths will implement portions of larger trail networks within the County, including the San Francisco Bay Trail, the Napa Vine Trail, Napa River Trail, as well as the Bay Area Ridge Trail. These regional trails are symbolically designated as such on the Bike Plan map sheets.

1) Countywide and Community Programs. Recommended bicycle support facilities and programs include:

- Increasing short- and long-term bicycle parking supplies;
- Improving multi-modal integration; maintenance and monitoring programs;
- Strategies to develop a bicycle counting program;
- Safe routes to school programs;
- Public education;
- Signing and marking enhancements;
- A communitywide traffic safety education campaign.

In general, these activities are Categorically Exempt, as described in Sections 15305-15322 of CEQA. Proposed programs and activities include:

- Bicycle education and awareness program, including developing program webpage;
- Traffic safety multimedia campaign, including public service announcements, educational materials, campaign posters and neighborhood outreach;
- Bicycle safety multimedia campaign, including public service announcements, educational materials, campaign posters and neighborhood outreach;
- Share the Road sign and decal program;
- Bicycle Ambassador/outreach program;
- Bicycle sharing and bicycle fleets;
- Sign Program, including:
 - Caltrans/custom bike route signs
 - Wayfinding signs
 - Warning and advisory signs
 - Pavement markings, lanes, lines, sharrows, etc.
- Bicycle parking and support facilities, which may include racks, lockers, lighting and/or shower facilities;
- Bicycle facility maintenance and monitoring.

2) Bikeway Network Projects. The Bikeway Network consists of the physical projects, including delineation of a Primary Bikeway Network – a continuous countywide network of on- and off-street bikeways that extend between and through communities. The Primary Bikeway Network consists of a combination of existing and proposed Class I, Class II, and Class III bikeways. The proposed bikeway network is organized by geographic planning areas including South Valley, Mid-Valley and North Valley, and by jurisdiction.

Class I Multi Use Path. Class I facilities, typically known as bike paths, are multi-use facilities that provide a completely separated right-of-way for the exclusive use of bicycles and pedestrians, with cross flows of motorized traffic minimized.

Class II Bike Lane. Class II facilities, known as bike lanes; provide a striped and signed lane designated for one-way bicycle travel on a street or highway. The minimum width for bike lanes ranges between four and five feet depending upon the edge of roadway conditions (curbs). Bike lanes are demarcated by a six-inch white stripe, signage and pavement legends.

Class III Bike Route. Class III facilities, known as bike routes, provide signs for shared use with motor vehicles within the same travel lane on a street or highway. Bike routes may be enhanced with warning or guide signs and shared lane marking pavement stencils. Class III Bike Route enhancements, such as bicycle boulevards, may include traffic calming features that reduce the total number of vehicles that use the roadway to make the roadway more bicycle-friendly.

D) CONSTRUCTION ELEMENTS

Depending on the project, construction elements could include the following:

- Signage and striping
- Signal modification
- Street lane width modification (road diet)
- Shoulder widening and improvement
- Off-street trail on existing road (such as a flood control levee, fire or service road)
- Off-street trail through undeveloped area
- Vehicle bridge—modifications to existing bridge, or new bridge with bicycle facilities
- Bicycle/pedestrian bridge
- Boardwalk
- Curb modifications, such as bulb-outs
- Overpass or underpass
- Retaining wall
- Earthwork/grading
- Traffic lane removal/modification
- Parking space removal/modification

Projects

There are approximately 443 miles of bicycle projects that are proposed within Napa County, including the cities of American Canyon, Napa, Saint Helena, Calistoga, Yountville, as well as unincorporated areas. This includes:

Class I = 78 miles
Class II = 104 miles
Class III = 260 miles

Napa County Unincorporated Projects

Approximately 320 miles of bikeway improvements are proposed in unincorporated Napa County. This includes:

- 42 miles of Class I pathways connecting the cities including the Napa Vine Trail (north-south), the Bay Trail, and the Bay Area Ridge Trail.
- 66 miles of Class II bike lanes including Tubbs Lane, Dunaweal Lane, Zinfandel Lane, SR 29, Conn Creek Road, Rutherford Road, and SR's 12, 29, 121, and 221 bike lane improvements.
- 215 miles of Class III bike routes including rural highway segments on SR's 29, 121, 128; Petrified Forest Road, Franz Valley School Road, Larkmead Lane, Bale Lane, Chaix Lane, Howell Mountain Road, Pope Valley Road, Chiles-Pope Valley Road, Sage Canyon Road, Redwood Road, Mount Veeder Road, Atlas Peak Road, Monticello Road, Wooden Valley Road, and others.

City of American Canyon Projects

Approximately 24 miles of bikeway improvements are proposed in American Canyon. This includes:

- 8.5 miles of Class I pathways including the Napa Valley Vine Trail (north-south), San Francisco Bay Trail, Commerce Blvd. extension, Broadway/Veteran's Park, Newell Drive, Napa Junction, Jameson Canyon, and the Eucalyptus Road River to Ridge Trail (east-west).
- 14 miles of Class II bike lanes including Donaldson Way from Newell Drive to Andrew Road; Elliott Drive, Eucalyptus Drive from Rio Del Mar to Wetlands Edge Road; Rio Del Mar from Broadway to Wetlands Road; Silver Oaks, James Road, and Kimberly Drive from Elliott Drive to Meadow Bay Drive.
- 1.5 miles of Class III bike routes including a north-south route that utilizes Melvin Road, James Road, and Danrose Drive, along with an east-west connection along American Canyon between Broadway and the eastern city limit.

City of Napa Projects

Approximately 60 miles of bikeway improvements are proposed in the City of Napa:

- 12 miles of Class I pathways , including:
 - Bay Trail, east side of the Napa River from Kennedy Park to Tulucay Creek
 - Napa River Trail,
 - Napa Valley Vine Trail
- 15 miles of Class II bike lanes:
 - Redwood Road from Trancas Street to Browns Valley Road,
 - West Imola Avenue,
 - Old Sonoma Road,
 - Silverado Trail from Trancas Street to Soscol Avenue
 - Trower Avenue,
 - SR 221 south to Kaiser Road
 - 1st Street /Browns Valley Road west of SR 29
 - Soscol Avenue,
 - Solano Avenue,
 - California Boulevard,
 - Big Ranch Road,
 - Orchard Avenue between Solano Avenue and Dry Creek Road, and

- Golden Gate Drive from West Imola Avenue south to the City Limits.
- 32.5 miles of Class III bike routes

City of Saint Helena Projects

Approximately 36 miles of bikeways are proposed in St. Helena:

- 15 miles of Class I pathways
 - Napa Vine Trail (north-south),
 - Sulphur Creek Path (east-west),
 - Napa River Trail (north-south)
 - Lower Reservoir Park to Spring Mountain Road
 - Crane Park to Grayson Avenue.
- 9 miles of Class II bike lanes
 - Madrona Avenue between Main Street and Sylvaner Avenue
 - Spring Street between Oak Avenue and Sulphur Creek
 - Pope Street between Main Street and Silverado Trail
 - Grayson Avenue and Sulphur Springs Avenue, between Main Street and Crane Avenue.
 - Mountain Road
 - Valley View Street
 - Crane Avenue
 - SR 29 between Deer Park Road and Pratt Aven
- 11 miles of Class III bike routes
- Sign placement and community programs

City of Calistoga Projects

- 5 miles of Class I pathways
 - Napa River Path (east-west),
 - Fair Way Extension Path (east-west),
 - Southern Crossing (north-south)
 - Money Lane extention (east-west)
 - Oak St. connector (north-south)
 - Eastern connection (north-south)
- 5 miles of Class II bike lanes
 - Lake St cross town (north-south)
 - Foothill Blvd (east-west)
 - Lincoln Ave (north-south)
- 4 miles of Class III bike routes
- Sign placement and community programs

Town of Yountville Projects

- 1 mile of Class I pathways
 - Solano Ave Vine Trail (north-south)
 - SR 29 west Vine Trail alignment (north-south)
 - Oak Circle path connector (north-south)
- .3 miles of Class II bike lanes
 - Finnell St (east-west)
- 1.5 miles of Class III bike routes
- Sign placement and community programs

E) ENVIRONMENTAL ANALYSIS

This Initial Study (IS) analyzes the Plan's potential environmental impacts at a *program* level, and at a *project* level where sufficient information about the project is known and available. The IS also identifies those projects where additional information is needed prior to project approval. These designated projects will be subject to supplemental environmental review to determine if potentially adverse project-specific impacts could occur that would not be mitigated to a less than significant level through the mitigation measures and project modifications contained in this IS, and/or where additional site-specific/project-specific measures are needed.

The Project Table (**Appendix B**) describes all proposed Class I (off-street) and Class II facilities and contains a screening and evaluation of potential project impacts and the recommended environmental determination.

Screening was based on review of information contained in the sources listed in this initial Study, including an examination of digital aerial photography and GIS information obtained from the Napa County Baseline Data Report (BDR) that documents countywide environmental features and land use information, to determine if there were significant environmental issues that could be mitigated through the implementation of standard Countywide mitigation measures contained in General Plan policies, ordinances, or development requirements, additional mitigation measures contained in this document, or if the environmental issues were potentially more significant, requiring a more specific and detailed level of analysis. The Napa BDR information was supplemented for geology/soils and hydrology/water quality analysis through the use of Bay Area Association of Governments hazards information (landslides, faults, liquefaction, erosive soils, and tsunami). The California Toxic Substances Control (DTSC) on-line hazardous waste database *Envirostor*, and the State Water Resources Control Board on-line data base *Geotracker* was used to assess Hazards and Hazardous Materials. Based on evaluation and GIS-assisted screening of environmental characteristics, each project's recommended environmental determination was assigned (**Appendix B**):

- CEQA Categorically Exempt (CE) and/or NEPA Categorical Exclusion (CEX). This includes all Class III facilities and many Class II bike lanes that do not require roadway reconfiguration.
- Mitigated Negative Declaration (MND, incorporating Mitigation Measures as outlined in this Initial Study and MMRP). This includes most Class II bike lanes with incorporation of mitigation measures included herein, and some Class I facilities that are located in areas with few potential impacts, or where supplemental environmental analysis has been completed.
- Projects requiring further study (FSN) prior to environmental determination. This includes most Class I facilities where the exact alignment has not been determined, or are not located on existing roads, and may traverse agricultural lands, geologically hazardous areas, creeks, riparian areas, sensitive habitat, flood areas, or require bridges or special crossings as part of the project. In some cases, a focused study regarding a potential impact area such as traffic, flooding or biology might be needed prior to project implementation, rather than a full EIR/EIS.

CEQA Categorically Exempt Projects (CE/CEX)

The creation of bicycle lanes on existing rights of way is Categorically Exempt as indicated in Article 19, Sections 15301(c) (Existing Facilities) and 15304H (h) (Bicycle Lanes) of the California Environmental Quality Act. This applies to all Class III facilities (bicycle routes), as well as most Class II (bicycle lanes) projects, provided that the project is not subject to exceptions such as location, cumulative impact, Scenic Highways (Napa County does not have any designated Scenic Highways, although Hwy 29 is eligible), hazardous wastes, and historic resources. Class I trails and bike projects are also normally categorically excluded (CEX) under NEPA, provided that the project does not affect wetlands, endangered species habitat, protected cultural and historical resources, floodplains and agricultural lands. Focused technical

studies are often required to be completed under NEPA prior to making a Categorically Excluded determination (See NEPA below).

Mitigated Negative Declaration/Projects Evaluated as part of this Initial Study (MND)

This Initial Study / Mitigated Negative Declaration (IS/MND) contains an evaluation of Class I and Class II projects for which sufficient information is known about the project site and existing conditions, and the proposed project's construction elements, to determine the potential level of environmental impact and for which the mitigation measures contained in this document are sufficient to reduce potential impacts to a less than significant level.

Projects Needing Further Study (FSN)

Projects where there is insufficient information known about the site or project, and/or there are potential project-specific impacts that cannot be mitigated by applying the measures contained in this IS/MND and associated MMRP, or where further study is needed to make such a determination, will be subject to subsequent environmental review prior to implementation.

Projects Subject to NEPA

The federal process for environmental review of projects is contained in the National Environmental Policy Act (NEPA). Some, but not all of the projects may also be subject to NEPA review, depending largely on how the project is funded. Bike Plan projects that receive federal funding (including most Caltrans-overseen projects where they act as lead agency for the Federal Highway Administration FHWA) will more than likely be subject to NEPA review. Typical NEPA Technical Studies and potential environmental documentation required for bicycle projects subject to NEPA is contained in the Appendix B. Many NEPA bicycle and trail projects have a Finding of No Significant Impact (FONSI) after an Environmental Assessment with the appropriate Technical Studies completed.

Surrounding Land Uses and Setting

The project location is in the unincorporated areas of Napa County, the Cities of Napa, St. Helena and American Canyon. Land uses and settings in these areas include agricultural land, vineyards, open-space areas, residential, industrial, commercial, institutional uses and park and open space.

Other Public Agencies Whose Approval is Required:

The following public agencies may require approvals for projects which are developed under this Plan, depending on the location of the project and the development activity involved.

- Bay Area Air Quality Management District
- Caltrans
- California Department of Fish and Game
- Regional Water Quality Control Board
- U.S. Army Corps of Engineers
- U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service
- NOAA Fisheries
- Napa County Airport Land Use Commission
- State Lands Commission
- County and local agencies and Special Districts, such as Napa County Park and Open Space District

ENVIRONMENTAL FACTORS POTENTIALLY AFFECTED

The environmental factors checked below would be potentially affected by this project, involving at least one impact that is a Potentially Significant Impact, as indicated by the checklist on the following pages.

- | | | |
|--|--|--|
| <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Aesthetics | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Agriculture & Forestry Resources | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Air Quality |
| <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Biological Resources | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Cultural Resources | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Geology & Soils |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Greenhouse Gas Emissions | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Hazards & Hazardous Materials | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Hydrology & Water Quality |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Land Use | <input type="checkbox"/> Mineral Resources | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Noise |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Population & Housing | <input type="checkbox"/> Public Services | <input type="checkbox"/> Recreation |
| <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Transportation/Traffic | <input type="checkbox"/> Utilities & Service Systems | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Mandatory Findings of Significance |

Determination:

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.

Signature

Date

Printed Name

For

ENVIRONMENTAL CHECKLIST

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

Comment to Questions

- a,c) The proposed Plan would result in the construction of bike lanes, routes and paths including at - grade, surface-level improvements that would not change scenic vistas. Napa County is primarily rural and agricultural, with extensive scenic resources. Urban uses are concentrated in the incorporated valley communities, with low rise buildings with a variety of design elements. Bikeways, bicycle facilities, signage, and other improvements would primarily be located along existing roadways.

Access to scenic vistas and view corridors may be improved by the implementation of bicycle facilities in some areas. All structures, signage, fencing, bridges, and walls would be reviewed to ensure that such features are compatible with the surrounding environment. Trails would generally be located on or next to existing roads, and would generally follow existing contours. Projects that require extensive grading would be subject to further environmental review.

Signage would follow specific County, State and Regional Trail facility design standards and would be placed to avoid obstructing scenic views. **Mitigation Measures AESTH- 1, 2 and 3** would reduce this impact to a less than significant level. **Less-than significant with mitigation incorporated.**

- b) There are no designated State Scenic Highways within Napa County. Many of the Plan's projects would occur within existing right of way and would not affect scenic resources. Some of the Plan's projects however, would require grading that could disturb rock outcroppings, require the removal of trees, or be located near historic buildings or other visual resources. **Mitigation Measures AESTH- 3 and 4** would reduce this impact to a less than significant level. **Less-than significant with mitigation incorporated.**
- d) Street or trail lighting in more urban areas may be included with for some of the proposed bicycle improvements that may introduce a new source of light at those project locations. **Mitigation Measure AESTH -5** would reduce this potentially significant impact to a less than significant level. **Less-than significant impact with mitigation incorporated.**

Mitigation Measures

AESTH -1 All off-street trails and bikeways shall be designed to minimize the amount of cut and fill, conform to existing topography and minimize vertical height of cut/fill slopes to less than 10 feet. All graded areas shall be revegetated with site appropriate native plant species.

- AESTH - 2 Retaining walls shall be limited to three feet, with a maximum slope ratio of 2:1 unless supplemental study is completed.
- AESTH - 3 Structural elements shall be minimized. Bridges, boardwalks, retaining walls, fencing, signage, and other structures shall be compatible with the existing landscape setting and follow approved signage design standards. Avoid placement of bicycle support facilities and/or signage at key areas of scenic viewpoints and trailheads. Signs and service facilities shall be located on the road or interior portion of scenic vista overlooks where feasible.
- AESTH -4 Removal of trees for the purpose of bicycle facilities development shall be minimized to the greatest extent practicable. Any trees that must be removed shall be replaced according to the local jurisdiction's Tree Removal regulations and policies where the bicycle project is located, or, at a minimum, shall be replaced in a 1:1 ratio.
- AESTH -5 Limit use of lighting in rural areas. Lighting of bicycle facilities shall be limited to that required for safety. Lighting shall be directed down onto the facility itself and shall not spill over onto adjacent land uses.

II. AGRICULTURE AND FORESTRY RESOURCES

Would the project:

	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporated	Less Than Significant	No Impact
a) Convert Prime Farmland, Unique Farmland or Farmland of Statewide Importance (Farmland), as shown on the maps prepared pursuant to the Farmland Mapping and Monitoring Program of the California Resources Agency, to non-agricultural use?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
b) Conflict with an existing Williamson Act contract?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
c) Conflict with existing zoning for, or cause rezoning of, forest land (as defined in Public Resources Code section 12220(g)), timberland (as defined by Public Resources Code section 4526), or timberland zoned Timberland Production (as defined by Government Code Section 51104(g))?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
d) Result in the loss of forest land or conversion of forest land to non-forest use?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
e) Involve other changes in the existing environment which, due to their location or nature, could result in conversion of farmland to non-agricultural use or of conversion of forest land to non-forest use?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>

Comment to Questions

- a) Some proposed bicycle improvements may be located adjacent to lands designated as Prime Farmland, Unique Farmland or Farmland of Statewide Importance as shown on the Important Farmland Map prepared by the State Farmland Mapping and Monitoring Program. (Source: 1). In order to mitigate the potential loss of farmland to a less than significant level, **Mitigation Measure AG -1** shall be implemented. **Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporated.**

The County has adopted a Right-to-Farm Ordinance that states the County will not consider impacts arising from agricultural operations to be a nuisance if such operations are legal, consistent with accepted customs and standards and operated in a non-negligent manner.

Napa County General Plan Policies, as well as the policies and guidelines of the Regional Trails, including the Bay Trail, Vine Trail, and Ridge Trail, generally preclude or strongly discourage the placement of trails on prime farmland, or where they would displace important crops such as vineyards or orchards. Class I and Class II projects that have the potential to displace prime farmland or unique and important crops were designated as requiring further environmental study.

- b) Approximately 40 of the bicycle route segments are adjacent to agricultural land that is encumbered by Williamson Act Contracts. (Source: 14). Napa County's Williamson Act Policies allow open space recreational uses to occur on lands encumbered by Williamson Act contracts. **Less Than Significant.**
- c) – d) The proposed bicycle facility improvements would not conflict with existing zoning, cause the rezoning of forest land or timberland, result in the loss of forestland, or convert forestland to a non-forest use. **No Impact.**
- e) The bicycle improvements would attract bicyclists to areas that have been traditionally used for agriculture. Pesticide use, dust, odors and noise is associated with agricultural operations and could potentially cause a nuisance to bicyclists and trail users. Bicyclists could also potentially trespass onto agricultural property. These conflicts could lead to increased nuisance complaints. Implementation of Mitigation Measures **AG-2** through **AG-4** is anticipated to reduce this impact to a less than significant level. **Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporated.**

Mitigation Measures:

- AG-1 Final bicycle route alignments shall avoid conflicts with active agricultural lands to the greatest extent feasible by locating them within existing right-of-ways, and/or on roads or other disturbed lands. Should a trail route be located within an active agricultural parcel, then further studies will be completed to address impacts to agricultural land. The study would include consultation with property owners, Farm Bureau, Viticulture Associations, Napa Valley Grape growers and the Napa County Agricultural Commissioner's Office, and include:
 - a. Methods for minimizing trespassing and vandalism by trail users.
 - b. Procedures for minimizing pesticide exposure (spraying restrictions, notification, pathway closure etc.)
 - c. Design guidelines for pathway elements intended to prevent land use conflicts.
- AG-2 Prior to final design and construction of bicycle facility improvements, the Lead Agency shall coordinate with affected agricultural land owners, the Napa County Agricultural Commissioner's Office, Farm Bureau, Napa Valley Vintners, and/or Napa Valley Grape Growers Association, and members of the bicycling community to design facilities that minimize agricultural conflicts with the use of improvements including but not limited to: signage, fencing, striping and bollards.
- AG-3 Where bicycle facilities intersect agricultural roads, the bicycle route intersections shall be designed to accommodate agricultural equipment.
- AG-4 Information shall be provided at trailheads that would reduce agricultural land use conflicts including signage to inform bikepath users not to: (1) trespass onto agricultural lands, (2) litter, (3) pick food or handle the crops, or (4) feed or interfere with farm animals. In addition, signage regarding the County's Right-to-Farm Ordinance which provides protection for farmers against agricultural operation nuisance complaints shall also be displayed.

III. AIR QUALITY

Would the project:

	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporated	Less Than Significant	No Impact
a) Conflict with or obstruct implementation of the applicable air quality plan?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
b) Violate any air quality standard or contribute substantially to an existing or projected air quality violation?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
c) Result in a cumulatively considerable net increase of any criteria pollutant for which the project area is in non-attainment under applicable federal or State ambient air quality standards (including releasing emissions which exceed quantitative Standards for ozone precursors)?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
d) Expose sensitive receptors to substantial pollutant concentrations?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
e) Create objectionable odors affecting a substantial number of people?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>

Comment to Questions

a)-c) After they are built, the proposed bicycle improvement projects could potentially conflict with the implementation of an approved air quality plan. Some of the proposed bicycle improvements could increase traffic congestion in some locations by reducing the number of vehicle lanes and could therefore increase the amount of automobile related exhaust emissions. This impact would likely be offset by a reduction in the amount of exhaust emissions by creating more opportunities for people to bike as an alternative mode of transportation. In addition, as more people use the proposed bicycle facilities, there would be less vehicle congestion on local roads and streets, therefore lowering levels of exhaust emissions. This impact is considered to be less than significant. However, during construction of some of the proposed projects, particulate matter from dust, and particulate matter from exhaust from construction vehicles could conflict with the implementation of an air quality plan. **Mitigation Measure AQ – 1** would reduce this impacts to a less than significant level. **Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporated.**

Napa County and the participating cities are all located within the Bay Area Air Quality Management District (BAAQMD). The BAAQMD region is currently in a non-attainment status for state and national ozone standards and national particulate matter ambient air quality standards. Air emissions during construction of the bicycle improvements could potentially contribute to an existing air quality violation. These sources include: (1) dust (including particulate matter) from grading and earthmoving, (2) exhaust (including particulate matter, and precursors to ozone) from construction equipment, and (3) exhaust (including particulate matter, and precursors to ozone) from workers driving to the construction sites (Source 2). **Mitigation Measure AQ-1** recommended by the BAAQMD will reduce this impact to a less than significant level. **Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporated.**

d) Bicycle facilities are proposed in close proximity to major roads which could temporarily expose users of these facilities to carbon monoxide and other motor vehicle exhaust pollutants from vehicles adjacent to those roads. Most bicycle facility users are not considered to be sensitive receptors. Some facility users located near schools, hospitals and other occupied buildings may be considered to be sensitive receptors, but they will only be exposed to substantial pollutant

concentrations for brief periods. In order to reduce this impact to a less than significant level, **Mitigation Measure AQ-1** shall be implemented. **Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporated.**

Bicycle facility users may also be exposed to automobile emissions from farm equipment and vehicles on adjacent roads, as well as occasional agricultural spraying of crops located near the facility. As noted above, bicyclists are not normally considered sensitive receptors, and they will only be exposed temporarily while traveling on the bike routes, therefore exposure to the pollution concentrations would not be substantial. **Less Than Significant Impact.**

- e) During construction of the proposed bicycle facility improvements, construction vehicles, equipment and materials have the potential to create minor odors. These odors would be minimal and temporary and therefore the impact is less than significant. **Less Than Significant Impact.**

Mitigation Measures

AQ-1

1. Construction of the bicycle facilities shall comply with applicable BAAQMD dust control and all construction management guidelines.
2. During construction, all exposed surfaces (e.g. parking areas, staging areas, soil piles, graded areas, and unpaved access roads) shall be watered at least two times per day to control dust particulates.
3. All haul trucks transporting soil, sand, or other loose material off-site shall be covered.
4. All visible mud or dirt tracked-out onto adjacent public roads shall be removed using wet power vacuum street sweepers at least once per day. The use of dry power sweeping is not allowed.
5. All construction vehicle speeds on unpaved roads shall be 15 mph or less.
6. Idling times shall be minimized either by shutting equipment off when not in use or reducing the maximum idling time to 5 minutes. Clear signage on this and other air quality control requirements shall be provided for construction workers at all access points.
7. All construction equipment shall be properly maintained and tuned in accordance with the manufacturer's specifications. All equipment shall be checked by a certified visible emissions evaluator following BAAQMD regulations.
8. The project sponsor shall post a publicly visible sign with the telephone number and person to contact at lead agency and the BAAQMD phone number regarding dust and other air quality and noise complaints. The responsible lead agency representative shall respond and take appropriate corrective action within 48 hours.

IV. BIOLOGICAL RESOURCES

Would the project:

	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporated	Less Than Significant	No Impact
a) Have a substantial adverse effect, either directly or through habitat modifications, on a plant or animal population, or essential habitat, defined as a candidate, sensitive or special-status species identified in local or regional plans, policies, or regulations, or by the California Dept. of Fish and Game or U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
b) Have a substantial adverse effect on any riparian habitat or other sensitive natural community type?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
c) Have a substantial adverse effect on federally protected wetlands as defined by Section 404 of the Clean Water Act, through direct removal, filling, hydrological interruption or other means?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
d) Interfere substantially with the movement of any native resident or migratory fish or wildlife species, their wildlife corridors or nursery sites?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
e) Conflict with any local ordinances or policies protecting biological resources such as a tree preservation ordinance?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
f) Conflict with an adopted Habitat Conservation Plan, Natural Community Conservation Plan or other approved local, regional or State habitat conservation plan?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>

Comment to Questions

- a.) Eighty one special status plant species and sixty special status animal species have potential to occur in Napa County (Napa County EIR). These include avian animal species such as burrowing owl and Swanson's hawk, species endemic to salt marsh habitat such as salt-marsh harvest mouse, California clapper rail and black rail, as well as aquatic animal species such as coho salmon, steelhead trout, California red legged frog and western pond turtle. In addition a large number of special status plant species occupy unusual habitat conditions in Napa County such as tidal salt marsh, vernal pools and serpentine soils. Some of these are endemic (found nowhere else) to Napa County such as the federally endangered Calistoga popcorn-flower (*Plagiobothrys strictus*) and Napa blue grass (*Poa napensis*).

Proposed Class III bicycle facilities would be located within existing paved and disturbed rights-of-way and would not modify or otherwise impact sensitive species habitat because they only involve striping and signage. Impacts on special status species and sensitive habitat from Class III facility construction would therefore be less-than-significant. Sidewalk improvement and most Class II bike lane projects, including shoulder widening, curb extensions, bulb outs, and curb ramps would also primarily be built in the paved or disturbed right-of-way and would not impact special status species or their habitats. Impacts from the majority of these projects would therefore be **Less Than Significant**. In a few instances, the proposed facilities are located near enough to sensitive habitat that potentially significant impacts could occur and appropriate mitigation measures have been specified; reducing significant impacts to **Less Than Significant With Mitigation**. In some instances, not enough is known about a project or existing biological condi-

tions with respect to species occurrence or habitat conditions, and additional environmental studies are recommended (**Appendix B**).

Some portions of proposed Class I projects will not be constructed within existing paved/disturbed right-of-way and will require earthwork and paving. Where the construction of Class I projects require grading and/or substantial disturbance of vegetation and are located near sensitive habitats, as determined through GIS-assisted screening, construction activities could disturb natural areas that have the potential to support special status species. As with some Class II projects, there was not enough information available on the project or existing habitat and species occurrence conditions to allow an environmental determination, and additional environmental studies are recommended for some Class I projects as summarized in **Appendix B**.

Potential impacts and required mitigation measures for various kinds of special status species are discussed below:

Special Status Plant Species

Special status plant species known to occur in Napa County and that have a potential to occur near proposed Class I facilities are Clara Hunt's milk vetch (*Astragalus clarinus*; Federally endangered), Contra Costa goldfields (*Lasthenia conjugens*; Federally endangered), Mason's lilaeopsis (*Lilaeopsis masonii*; Federal species of concern), San Joaquin spearscale (*Atriplex Joaquiniana*; Federal species of concern), and showy rancheria clover (*Trifolium amoenum*; Federally endangered) among others. As previously discussed, most of the proposed projects are located in urbanized areas which do not provide suitable habitat for special-status plant species, the exceptions being Class I and some Class II projects near riparian habitats, tidal marsh or other wetland areas supporting sensitive plant communities. Additional environmental review has been recommended for these projects (**Appendix B**).

Implementing mitigation measures **BIO-1** and **BIO 4b-4d** will reduce potential impacts to special status plant species to less-than-significant levels. **Less Than Significant Impacts With Mitigation Incorporation.**

Special Status Bird Species

According to the CNDDDB, several special status avian or bird species, including nesting migratory birds protected under the Migratory Bird Treaty occur in Napa county and may nest in trees or other suitable habitat in or adjacent to proposed project sites. Noted special status birds include (but are not limited to), burrowing owl (*Athene cunicularia hypugaea*; CA species of special concern), California black rail, (*Laterallus jamaicensis coturniculus*; CA threatened), California clapper rail (*Rallus longirostris obsoletus*; Federal and California endangered), and Swanson's hawk (*Buteo swainsoni*; CA threatened). Tree thinning and removal, and even noise and disturbance near an occupied nest or habitat supporting these species can potentially cause the adult birds to flee the occupied nest, or may "harass" and otherwise impact state and federally protected species, including ground-nesting birds. Impacts to these protected species and other nesting bird species can be mitigated to less-than-significant levels through implementation of mitigation measure **BIO-2**. **Less Than Significant Impacts With Mitigation Incorporation.** As with special status plant species, some proposed Class I and II projects have been recommended for additional Environmental review (**Appendix B**).

Special Status Mammal Species

There are at least three bat species that could occur near some of the Class I and Class II projects including pallid bat (*Antrzous pallidus*; CA species of special concern), fringed myotis (*Myotis thysanodes*; threatened), and Townsend's big-eared bat (*Corynorhinus townsendii*; CA species of special concern). They occupy habitat such as oak woodland and riparian habitat with

suitable roosting sites. Bats occupy trees year round and are particularly susceptible to disturbance during the maternity season and during hibernation. Mitigation measure **BIO-3** will reduce potential impacts to bat species to less-than-significant levels.

Like the California clapper rail and California black rail, the endangered salt marsh harvest mouse is likely to occur near proposed projects located near salt marsh habitat. Implementing mitigation measure **BIO-2** will reduce impacts special status mammal species to less-than-significant levels. **Less Than Significant Impacts With Mitigation Incorporation.** As with special status plant species, some proposed Class I and II projects have been recommended for additional Environmental review (**Appendix B**).

Special Status Fish and Aquatic Species

Western pond turtle (*Actinemys marmorata*; CA species of special concern), and California red-legged frog (*Rana draytonii*), a California and Federally Protected Endangered Species are known to have potential occurrences near proposed projects near riparian areas such as the Napa River and its tributaries. Special status fish species such as coho salmon, delta smelt, and steelhead trout are known to occur in sloughs and other estuarine habitats in addition to brackish tributaries of the Napa River. Soil erosion, loss of protective canopy, accidental spills, and storm-water quality pollution during project construction can impact these species. Potential impacts to these and other aquatic animal species can be mitigated to less-than-significant levels by implementation of mitigation measures **BIO-1; BIO-4a to BIO-4f; BIO-6; and BIO-7. Less Than Significant Impacts With Mitigation Incorporation.** As with special status plant species, some proposed Class I and II projects have been recommended for additional Environmental review (**Appendix B**).

- b.) Class III bicycle facility projects would be located within existing paved and disturbed rights-of-way and only involve striping and signage. Therefore, they would have no impact on riparian habitat. Proposed sidewalk improvements projects and most Class II bike lane projects would also be built in the paved or disturbed right-of-way and have no impact on riparian habitat or other natural communities.

Portions of areas where Class I pathways, as well as some Class II bike lanes, are proposed contain tidal, freshwater and seasonal wetlands and riparian habitat, including along the Napa River and its lower tributaries which flows through the City of Napa and through Napa Valley. The Napa River and its tributaries, and many of these sensitive natural areas, are jurisdictional waters of the U.S. and California whose fill is regulated under Sections 401 and 404 of the Clean Water Act and Sections 1600-1616 of the California Fish and Game Code. These wetlands, creeks and other riparian areas provide habitat that supports a variety of plants and animals, including special-status species such as coho salmon, delta smelt, steelhead trout, California red-legged frog and western pond turtle. Construction of proposed projects adjacent to creeks have the potential to affect riparian habitat via the removal of existing vegetation (including tree canopy), potential to cause pollution near the creeks, or could result in creek bank destabilization. Disturbance of riparian habitat during construction, including tree thinning, limbing, and removal, accidental release or spill of construction related hazardous materials, and the placement of fill within the riparian corridor represents a potentially significant impact. For those projects where not enough existing information is known about the project and existing biological conditions to make a determination, additional environmental review has been recommended (**Appendix B**).

Native and serpentine grassland, vernal pool wetlands, tidal marsh, and oak woodland also are unique and sensitive habitat, and have a measure of protection in Napa County (Napa General Plan, Napa County Oak Woodland Management Plan). These habitats are home to several special status animal species and, in the case of native and serpentine grasslands and seasonal wetlands, special status plant species such as Clara Hunt's milk vetch and San Joaquin spearscale. Disturbance associated with construction can impact these habitats.

Implementation of mitigation measures **BIO-4a to BIO-4f; BIO-6; and BIO-7** will mitigate these potential impacts to less-than-significant levels. **Less Than Significant Impacts With Mitigation Incorporation.**

- c.) Proposed Class III, and most Class II bicycle facilities and sidewalk improvements would be located within existing paved or disturbed rights-of-way and therefore will have no impact on protected wetlands, as discussed above in item b. Although no proposed projects involve directly physically altering wetlands or stream channels, some Class I projects and in a few instances, Class II projects, associated with street or roadway improvements, involve installation of bridges over creeks or boardwalks crossing over wetlands. Some project construction elements and activities could potentially impact wetlands through the placement of bridge abutments, or rock riprap, in the channel to protect the bridge structures. Boardwalk structures placed on pier piles in wetland areas also constitutes fill. Most projects are expected to have less-than-significant impacts to any protected wetland with implementation of mitigation measures **BIO-4a to BIO- 4f; BIO-6; BIO-7. Less Than Significant Impacts With Mitigation Incorporation.** For those projects where not enough existing information is known about the project and existing biological conditions to make a determination, additional environmental review has been recommended (**Appendix B**).
- d.) Proposed sidewalk improvements projects and Class II and Class III bicycle facilities would be located within existing paved and disturbed rights-of-way, and therefore, none of these kinds of improvements proposed would impede wildlife movement. Construction of some of the Class I multi-use pathway projects would cross Napa County creeks or travel through and potentially bisect natural habitat areas. Most wildlife are adept at moving through urban and rural environments, often along creek corridors, and none of the proposed projects contain elements (i.e., fencing) that would directly affect the ability of wildlife species to move through a project and surrounding areas during or following construction. Implementation of mitigation measure **BIO-1** will reduce overall potential impacts to habitat areas and wildlife movement corridors to a less-than-significant levels. **Less Than Significant Impacts With Mitigation Incorporation.** For those projects where not enough existing information is known about the project and existing biological conditions to make a determination, additional environmental review has been recommended (**Appendix B**).
- e.) Napa County and all of its incorporated cities have policies regarding protection of sensitive biological resources, such as creeks, as well as protection of public and some privately owned heritage trees as part of their Municipal Codes (e.g., see Napa County Code chapters 12.44 and 12.45). For instance, the City of Napa has Tree Preservation Standards for all trees on public property, and trees designated as City of Napa Significant Trees on private property. These require that the appropriate permits be obtained before beginning any tree removal work.
- Tree trimming and removal of some streetscape trees may be required for some of the projects that involve street modifications as well as tree trimming and limbing for construction of bridges across several creeks and other riparian areas. Implementing mitigation measures **BIO-4b to 4d** and **BIO-5** will reduce impacts to trees to less-than-significant levels. **Less Than Significant Impacts With Mitigation Incorporation.** For those projects where not enough existing information is known about the project and existing biological conditions to make a determination, additional environmental review has been recommended (**Appendix B**).
- f.) A Habitat Conservation Plan for northern spotted owl encompasses lands off Spring Mountain Road in Saint Helena. Bicycle facilities in this area are limited to provision of on street facilities within existing right of way. None of the proposed bicycle projects conflict with any adopted Habitat Conservation Plan. **No Impact.**

Mitigation Measures

All bicycle projects will be required to adhere to applicable Napa County General Plan policies and County codes and ordinances, as well as the General Plan policies and municipal codes and ordinances of the Cities of Napa, American Canyon, and St. Helena. The implementation of the proposed General Plan policies and ordinances with additional mitigation measures would reduce potential effects on Biological Resources from construction of projects contained in the Napa Countywide Bicycle Plan to a less than significant level. As noted throughout the discussion of potential impacts on biological resources, not enough is known about some projects, including construction elements and existing conditions; these projects will be subject to further environmental studies and additional mitigation measures associated with detailed project review and approval.

BIO-1 NCBP projects shall be designed to minimize impacts to biological resources. Projects within or adjacent to sensitive biological areas and natural areas, including all creeks and wetlands, that could support special status species shall incorporate the following design features:

- The project area shall be assessed by a qualified biologist prior to design to determine if additional biological field investigations, including habitat surveys, special status species surveys, and tree surveys, are needed. If so, the appropriate studies shall be conducted by Qualified Biologists. The Biologist Report shall include additional mitigation measures, such as pre-construction surveys, use of exclusion fencing, construction worker biological resource sensitivity training, onsite biological monitoring, and preparation and implementation of Habitat Mitigation & Monitoring Plans.
- Existing trails shall be used and improved whenever possible, and bicycle facility alignments shall be designed to avoid and minimize impacts to sensitive habitat communities. Alignment and design modifications may be identified during the engineering design phase to further avoid and minimize effects on sensitive biological resources and special status species. Reduction in path width shall be considered in sensitive biological resource areas, to the extent that trail safety can be maintained. All projects adjacent to creeks, wetlands, and natural areas shall be designed, in consultation with the California Department of Fish and Game (CDFG), to avoid and minimize impacts to listed and candidate sensitive or special status species.
- Bicycle facilities shall be designed to avoid impacts to wildlife movement corridors (e.g., no fencing that precludes wildlife movement shall be used in natural areas, paths shall not bisect critical wildlife movement corridors, etc).
- Use of stabilized decomposed granite or equivalent pervious trail surface shall be considered where appropriate, where Class I trail facilities are located in or near sensitive biological habitat.
- No nighttime lighting shall be used in sensitive biological resource areas.

BIO-2 For project construction activities near trees that provide suitable nesting bird habitat, and that might occur during the bird nesting season (February 1 through August 31), a qualified biologist shall conduct nesting bird surveys no more than one week prior to tree pruning, tree removal, ground disturbing activities, or construction activities to locate nests on or immediately adjacent to the project site(s). If nesting birds are identified at or near project sites, the locations of active nests shall be mapped and protective measures implemented. Protective measures shall include establishment of clearly delineated (i.e. colored construction fencing) exclusion zones around each nest site. Each exclusion zone shall have a 300-foot radius centered on the nest tree for raptor nests and a 50-foot radius centered on the nest for other birds. Active nest sites shall be monitored periodically throughout the nesting season to identify any sign of disturbance. These protection measures shall remain in effect until the young have left the nest and are foraging in-

dependently, or the nest becomes inactive. Exclusion zones may be reduced in size if, in consultation with CDFG, a smaller exclusion zone is determined to adequately protect the active nest. Upon completion of construction activities, a report detailing the results of the preconstruction surveys and monitoring shall be prepared. The report shall be submitted to CDFG by November 30 of the year following completion of construction.

- BIO-3 For project construction activities near trees that provide suitable bat roosting habitat, a qualified biologist shall conduct bat surveys no more than three days prior to tree pruning, tree removal, ground disturbing activities, or construction activities to locate roosts on or immediately adjacent to the project site(s). If bats are discovered during the surveys, an exclusion zone of 100 to 150 feet radius centered on the roost shall be established. Active roost sites shall be monitored periodically throughout the construction period to identify any sign of disturbance and shall remain in effect unless the roost becomes inactive. Exclusion zones may be reduced in size if, in consultation with CDFG, a smaller exclusion zone is determined to adequately protect the active roost. Upon completion of construction activities, a report detailing the results of the preconstruction surveys and monitoring shall be prepared. The report shall be submitted to CDFG by November 30 of the year following completion of construction.
- BIO-4a All construction activities immediately adjacent to the creeks and wetlands shall take place outside of the salmonid migration period (December 1-March 30). Should the project demonstrate a need to conduct activities outside this time period, the project may request additional authorization for work outside of this period by obtaining approval from NOAA Fisheries and CDFG.
- BIO-4b Disturbance of soils and native vegetation for projects immediately adjacent to creeks and wetlands, including bridge and boardwalk construction, shall be minimized to the extent possible. Placement of any temporary construction access roads, staging areas, and other construction facilities shall be located outside of the riparian corridor to avoid and limit disturbance to the stream bank or stream channel habitat to the maximum extent possible. Work shall be performed from the top of creek bank only.
- BIO-4c If loss of riparian habitat elements (i.e. native trees and shrubs) cannot be avoided, impacted elements shall be replaced in like kind and amount, or as required by regulatory agencies, such that there is no net loss of the habitat element.
- BIO-4d To minimize the expansion of exotic plants into wetlands and the riparian corridor adjacent to bicycle facilities, only native plant species shall be used for reseeding and re-planting. Landscaping using native plant species near appropriate buffer areas should be implemented in accordance with wetlands mitigation and management plans, and in accordance with applicable permit requirements.
- BIO-4e All fueling and maintenance of vehicles and other equipment, and staging areas, shall be located at least 100 feet from creeks. Prior to the onset of work, the project applicant will prepare a plan for the prompt and effective response to any accidental spills into the creek (A Spill Control and Countermeasures Plan). All workers shall be informed of the importance of preventing spills and the appropriate measures to take should an accidental spill occur (see also HYDRO-2). In the event of a spill, the appropriate local Emergency Response Unit (Police, County sheriff, Fire Dept., etc) and the CDFG's Office of Spill Prevention and Response shall be notified immediately.
- BIO-4f Best management practices (BMPs) shall be implemented during all construction activities to control erosion and sediment into the stream and to prevent the spill of contaminants around the stream. These BMPs shall be described in a Stormwater Pollution Prevention Plan (SWPPP) that shall be prepared and submitted to San Francisco Bay Regional Water Quality Control Board along with a Notice of Intent (NOI), and an Erosion Control Plan in order to obtain a National Pollution Discharges Elimination System (NPDES) General Permit for Construction Activities. (see also Hydro 1-2)

- BIO-5 Significant, limbing, thinning, or removal of trees for the purpose of bicycle facilities construction shall be minimized to the greatest extent practicable. Any tree that must be removed shall be replaced according to the local jurisdictions/responsible agencies tree protection policies for construction of the bicycle projects. (See also AESTH-1) This will typically require replacement of removed trees on a 2:1 ratio for any tree removed larger than 3" dbh.
- BIO-6 The applicant shall obtain all necessary permits and/or authorizations under Sections 401 and 404 of the Federal Clean Water Act, and Section 1600 of the California Department of Fish and Game Code.
- BIO-7 Construction activities shall be timed to avoid impact to sensitive biological resources and protect water quality. To the extent possible, construction activities shall take place during the dry season, between April 15 and October 31, or as otherwise determined by permitting agencies, and in compliance with Section 401 of the Federal Clean Water Act.

V. CULTURAL RESOURCES

Would the project:

	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporated	Less Than Significant	No Impact
a) Cause a substantial adverse change in the significance of a historical resource as identified in Sec. 15064.5?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
b) Cause a substantial adverse change in the significance of an archaeological resource as identified in Sec. 15064.5?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
c) Directly or indirectly destroy a unique paleontological resource or site or unique geologic feature?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
d) Disturb any human remains, including those interred outside of formal cemeteries?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>

Comments to Questions

- a)-b) Some of the proposed Class I and Class II bicycle improvement projects would require grading or ground disturbance, which may have an impact on historical or archaeological resources. In order to reduce impacts to archaeological resources to a less than significant level, **Mitigation Measure CUL -1** shall be implemented. **Less than significant impact with mitigation incorporated.**
- c) Some of the proposed Class I and Class II bicycle improvement projects would required grading or ground disturbance and could have an impact on paleontological resources or unique geological features. In order to reduce this impact to a less than significant level, the Mitigation Measure CUL -2 shall be implemented. **Less-than significant with mitigation incorporated.**
- d) Some of the proposed Class I and Class II bicycle improvement projects would require grading or ground disturbance that may disturb human remains. In order to reduce this impact to a less than significant level, **Mitigation Measure CUL – 3** shall be implemented. **Less-than significant with mitigation incorporated.**

Mitigation Measures

CUL-1 If a potentially significant cultural resource is encountered during subsurface earthwork activities for the project, all construction activities within a 100-foot radius of the find shall cease until a qualified archaeologist determines whether the uncovered resource requires further study. The local jurisdiction where the project is located shall require the project applicant to include a standard inadvertent discovery clause in every construction contract to inform contractors of this requirement. Any previously undiscovered resources found during construction shall be recorded on appropriate California Department of Parks and Recreation (DPR) forms and evaluated for significance in terms of California Environmental Quality Act criteria by a qualified archaeologist. Potentially significant cultural resources consist of but are not limited to stone, bone, glass, ceramic, wood, or shell artifacts; fossils; or features including hearths, structural remains, or historic dumpsites. If the resource is determined significant under CEQA, the qualified archaeologist shall prepare and implement a research design and archaeological data recovery plan that will capture those categories of data for which the site is significant. The archaeologist shall also perform appropriate technical analyses, prepare a comprehensive report and file it with the appropriate Information Center (Sonoma State University), and provide for the permanent curation of the recovered materials.

CUL-2 In the event a fossil is discovered during any earthwork activities for the proposed project (Including those occurring at depths of less than 10 feet), all excavations within 100 feet of the find shall be temporarily halted or delayed until the discovery is examined by a qualified paleontologist, in accordance with Society of Vertebrate Paleontology standards. The paleontologist shall notify the jurisdiction where the project is located, to determine procedures to be followed before construction is allowed to resume at the location of the find. If the find is determined to be significant and the local jurisdiction determines that avoidance is not feasible, the paleontologist shall design and carry out a data recovery plan consistent with the Society of Vertebrate Paleontology standards. The plan shall be submitted to the local jurisdiction for review and approval. Upon approval, the plan shall be incorporated into the project.

CUL-3 If human remains are encountered during earth-disturbing activities for the project, all work in the adjacent area shall stop immediately and the Napa County Coroner's office shall be notified immediately. If the remains are determined to be Native American in origin, the Native American Heritage Commission shall be notified and will identify the Most Likely Descendent, who will be consulted for recommendations for treatment of the discovered remains.

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?
 - ii) Strong seismic ground shaking?
 - iii) Seismic-related ground failure, including liquefaction?
 - iv) Landslides?

	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporated	Less Than Significant	No Impact
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?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
ii) Strong seismic ground shaking?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
iii) Seismic-related ground failure, including liquefaction?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
iv) Landslides?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>

VI. GEOLOGY AND SOILS

Would the project:

	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporated	Less Than Significant	No Impact
b) 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?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
c) Result in substantial soil erosion or the loss of topsoil?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
d) Be located on expansive soil, creating substantial risks to life or property?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
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 wastewater?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>

Comments to Questions

ai-ii) There are at least four known and active faults in Napa County (West Napa, Hunting Creek, Green Valley and Cordelia) that are of concern. Of these, the West Napa Fault has the potential capacity to generate a 6.8 to 7.1 magnitude earthquake. In addition there are a number of Bay Area regionally significant active faults (San Andreas, Hayward, Rogers Creek, Calaveras) that could affect proposed project improvements. There is a 67% chance for a 6.7 or larger magnitude earthquake to occur in the San Francisco Bay Area by the year 2032. (Source: 4,5,15)

The proposed project is located in the northern San Francisco Bay Area, a region of intense seismic activity. Strong groundshaking at any of the sites could also result from a rupture of any of the major Bay Area regional earthquake faults, the more local West Napa, Hunting Creek, Green Valley and Cordelia faults (Source: 15). Such strong groundshaking motion could damage elevated structures such as boardwalks, bridges and overcrossings that are project elements. Generally, Class I projects requiring bridges and overcrossings were designated as requiring further technical studies and further environmental review. Compliance with **Mitigation Measure GEO – 1** would reduce the impact of seismically induced ground shaking to a less than significant level. **Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporated.**

aiii-iv) There is a significant risk of a major earthquake on several regional and local active faults during the next thirty years. The hazards related to groundshaking vary depending on the location of the proposed bicycle improvements and underlying soils and geologic conditions. In areas underlain by consolidated bedrock, seismic hazards include small rock falls and possibly landslides that could harm bicycle facility users and damage the improvements. In areas underlain by unconsolidated sediments, ground failure and differential settlement could result from a severe earthquake, damaging paved surfaces and elevated structures. The Association of Bay Area Governments (ABAG) has produced liquefaction hazard maps, which show areas of susceptibility to liquefaction. On those maps, areas in the vicinity of the Bay and along the lower and middle reaches of the Napa river are shown as having liquefaction potential (Source 7: ABAG Liquefaction map). Liquefaction potential is highest in areas underlain by poorly engineered Bay fills, Bay mud, and unconsolidated alluvium. Generally, Class I projects requiring bridges and overcrossings were designated as requiring further technical studies and further environmental review. For those Class I and II projects which were reviewed and determined to have sufficient information, but apparently less serious groundshaking potential, **Mitigation Measure GEO-1** shall be implemented. **Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporated.**

- c) The sidewalk improvements and Class II and Class III bicycle facilities that would be constructed within existing paved right-of-ways are unlikely to cause significant soil erosion or loss of topsoil. The proposed Class I pathway projects and several Class II bicycle projects located in hilly and mountainous areas where shoulder widening for the facilities require hillside cut and fill for shoulder widening and bike lane configuration, or involve the construction of a separate pathway, have the potential to cause erosion and sedimentation. Generally, Class I projects requiring bridges and overcrossings were designated as requiring further technical studies and further environmental review. For those Class I and II projects which were reviewed and determined to have sufficient information, but apparently less serious erosion potential, Mitigation Measures **GEO- 2** and **HYDRO – 2** would be implemented. These measures require the review of each proposed project regarding the need to prepare a Stormwater Pollution Prevention Plan (SWPPP) to prevent stormwater quality related impacts, including erosion and sedimentation during and following construction. Generally the Class I and II projects in hilly terrain were noted as requiring additional study and the development of project specific design and mitigation measures, and additional CEQA environmental review. Implementation of this mitigation measure for projects on less sloping ground would ensure that this impact is reduced to a less than significant level. **Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporated.**
- d) In areas underlain by expansive soils as found in portions of southern and central Napa Valley, high shrink/swell soil movement can disrupt or damage paved surfaces as well as the foundations of public access facility structures such as bridges. The sidewalk improvements and Class II and Class III bicycle facilities that would be constructed within existing paved right-of-ways are unlikely to cause significant shrink-swell related to soil movement. Generally, Class I projects requiring bridges and overcrossings were designated as requiring further technical studies and further environmental review. For those Class I and II projects which were reviewed and determined to have sufficient information, but apparently less serious expansive soil potential, **Mitigation Measure GEO -1** shall be implemented. **Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporated.**
- e) None of the proposed projects involve the construction of septic tanks or alternative waste water disposal systems. **No Impact.**

Mitigation Measures:

GEO-1 Prior to final design of Class I and Class II bicycle improvements that involve substantial new paving, significant ground disturbance, and substantial structures such as steep hillside cut and fill slopes, retaining walls, boardwalks, and bridge and overcrossing footings, etc., or are located within an area of known landslide deposits, highly erosive soils, high liquefaction potential or high shrink and swell potential or near active faults, the local jurisdiction shall complete a geotechnical investigation to identify hazards and develop design measures to mitigate impacts associated with poor soil conditions, unstable slopes, landslides, and earthquake related events such as groundshaking and ground failure. The facility construction plans shall implement those measures in the respective bicycle facility improvement plans.

GEO-2. An erosion control plan shall be prepared and implemented for all Class I and Class II bicycle facility construction projects that involve substantial ground disturbance in accordance with Erosion Control Ordinances (as applicable) of Napa County and the Cities of American Canyon, Napa, and St. Helena, and Regional Board Stormwater Pollution Prevention Control Guidelines (see also Mitigation Measure HYDRO -2).

VII. GREENHOUSE GAS EMISSIONS

Would the project:

	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporated	Less Than Significant	No Impact
a) Generate greenhouse gas (GHG) emissions, either directly or indirectly, that may have a significant impact on the environment?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
b) Conflict with an applicable plan, policy, or regulation of an agency adopted for the purpose of reducing the emissions of GHGs?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
c) Result in the exposure of local residents to hazards associated with climate change?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>

Comments to Questions a)-c)

None of the proposed Class I and Class II projects conflict with any Napa County-adopted or another applicable plan, policy or regulation (including those of the Cities of American Canyon, Napa, and St. Helena) adopted for the purpose of reducing the emission of greenhouse gases. The use of vehicles for the construction of the proposed bicycle improvements would temporarily increase levels of carbon dioxide (a greenhouse gas) during the construction period and some of the improvements may increase automobile congestion, thereby increasing levels of carbon dioxide during operation of the bicycle improvements. These impacts would be offset by the reduction of carbon dioxide after the improvements are built, by enabling people to bike and walk instead of driving vehicles. In addition, reducing the number of vehicles on the road will reduce traffic congestion and thereby reduce carbon dioxide levels. The proposed bicycle improvements are anticipated to reduce greenhouse gases and therefore would not conflict with a plan adopted to reduce greenhouse gases (Source: 12, 13). **Less Than Significant Impact.**

VIII. HAZARDS & HAZARDOUS MATERIALS

Would the project:

	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporated	Less Than Significant	No Impact
a) Create a significant hazard to the public or the environment through the routine transport, use or disposal of hazardous materials?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
b) Create a significant hazard to the public or the environment through reasonably foreseeable upset and accident conditions involving the release of hazardous materials into the environment?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
c) Emit hazardous emissions or handle hazardous materials, substances or waste within one-quarter mile of an existing or proposed school?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
d) Be located on a site which is included on a list of hazardous material sites compiled pursuant to Government Code Section 65962.5 and, as a result, create a significant hazard to the public or the environment?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>

VIII. HAZARDS & HAZARDOUS MATERIALS

Would the project:

	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporated	Less Than Significant	No Impact
e) Expose people or structure to a significant risk or loss, injury or death involving wildland fires, including where wildlands are adjacent to urbanized areas or where residences are intermixed with wildlands?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
f) Impair implementation of or physically interfere with an adopted emergency response plan or emergency evacuation plan?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
g) For a project 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, result in a safety hazard for people living or working in the project area?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
h) For a project within the vicinity of a private airstrip, result in a safety hazard for people living or working in the project area?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>

Comments to Questions

- a)-b) None of the proposed bicycle improvements involve the transport, use or disposal of hazardous materials other than construction related chemicals (concrete, paint, asphalt etc.) and would not create conditions which could lead to the release of hazardous substances. Accidental spills or release of construction related hazardous materials could occur, and is especially of concern near creeks and the Bay. Mitigation Measure **BIO-4e**, requiring the preparation of Spill Control and Counter Measures Plans for work within 100 feet of San Pablo Bay, along the Napa River, and along all creeks designated on the Napa County BDR creek resources layer would reduce this impact to less than significant. **Less than Significant with Mitigation Incorporated.**
- c) During construction of some projects, construction vehicle emissions might be released in close proximity to a school. Implementation of the measures contained in Mitigation Measure AIR-1 would reduce this impact to a less than significant level. **Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporated.**
- d) According to databases maintained by the California Department of Toxic Substances Control (Envirostor) and the California State Water Resources Control Board (Geotracker), there are approximately twenty sites in various locations within the County that are on the Cortese list of hazardous materials sites. Many of these sites are at gas stations or agricultural/industrial/energy facilities that would not be affected by the placement of surface improvements. Class I and Class II bicycle improvements that involve the disturbance of soil at or near these hazardous materials sites could potentially expose people and the environment to hazardous substances (Sources 9, 10). In order to mitigate this impact to a less than significant level, Mitigation Measure HAZ-1 shall be implemented. **Less Than Significant With Mitigation Measure Incorporated.**
- e) The risk of wildland fires is high throughout much of rural Napa County. The creation of new bicycle routes could place bicycle facility users in areas prone to wildland fires. The County has an existing “Napa Firewise” program that educates residents on the dangers of wildland fires and provides strategies landowners can take to reduce the threat of fires on their property. (Source 16). The continuation of this program and implementation of the Mitigation Measure HAZ – 2 below will reduce this impact to a less than significant level. **Less Than Significant with Mitigation Incorporated.**

- f) The proposed bicycle improvements would augment the existing circulation system making it easier to access various areas of the County giving people more options to escape from a hazard. Construction of the proposed projects would not impair the implementation or physically interfere with an adopted emergency response plan or emergency evacuation plan. **No Impact.**
- g) Bicyclists using the proposed facility improvements could potentially be exposed to safety hazards and temporary and intermittent excessive noise levels. Various proposed bicycle facility improvements are located within the Airport Land Use Compatibility Plans of the Napa County Airport, Parrett Field, and the Calistoga Gliderport. These plans establish policies and guidelines for land use compatibility to local jurisdictions affected by airport activities. The Napa County Airport Land Use Commission (ALUC) has the authority to review local plans for consistency with the Airport Land Use Compatibility Plan. Projects within the vicinity of Napa Airport facilities will be reviewed for consistency with the Napa County Airport Land Use Compatibility Plan by the Napa County Airport Land Use Commission, and projects may be realigned or subject to additional review if necessary in order to avoid airport land use conflicts. (Source 6). This established process reduces this impact to a less than significant level. **Less Than Significant Impact.**
- h) Various segments of the proposed bicycle routes would be in the vicinity of the following private airports: Lake Berryessa Seaplane Base, Moskowite Airport, River Meadow Farm Heliport and Pope Valley Airport. (Source 15). All of the bike routes in the vicinity of these airports would be on existing roads and would not result in a new safety hazard. **No Impact.**

Mitigation Measures:

- HAZ-1 Prior to construction of any bicycle improvements that require ground disturbance, hazardous waste sites lists maintained by the California Department of Toxic Substances Control (DTSC) and the State Water Resources Control Board (SWRCB) shall be consulted. Where a proposed Class I and Class II bicycle facility is located near an identified site, follow up Phase I, and as appropriate, Phase II hazardous waste site investigations shall be completed. No disturbance of contaminated soil shall be permitted unless an approved site cleanup and remediation plan has been implemented for the identified hazardous waste sites.
- HAZ – 2 Trailhead signage for rural bicycle facilities in high fire risk hazard areas shall provide information regarding hazards and risks and indicate that no smoking or use of open flames (i.e. campfires) will be allowed, except in specifically designated areas.

IX. HYDROLOGY AND WATER QUALITY

Would the project:

	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporated	Less Than Significant	No Impact
a) Violate any water quality standards or waste discharge requirements?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
b) Substantially deplete groundwater supplies or interfere substantially with groundwater recharge such that there would be a net deficit in aquifer volume or a significant lowering of the local groundwater table level?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>

IX. HYDROLOGY AND WATER QUALITY

Would the project:

	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporated	Less Than Significant	No Impact
c) Substantially alter the existing drainage pattern of the site or area in a manner which would result in substantial erosion, siltation or flooding on- or off-site?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
d) 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?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
e) 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?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
f) Place within a 100-year flood hazard area structures which would impede or redirect flood flows?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
g) 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?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
h) Potentially be inundated by seiche, tsunami, or mudflow?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>

Comments to Questions

a)-d) The Class II and Class III bicycle facilities that would be constructed within existing paved right-of-ways are unlikely to cause significant stormwater runoff pollution or violate water quality standards. Ground disturbance associated with construction of Class I and II for projects outside existing paved rights of ways could cause erosion and sedimentation into waterways, and paving bicycle facility surfaces with impermeable materials could increase the rate of runoff, also causing erosion and sedimentation, potentially contributing to the violation of water quality standards. For larger Class I projects, the increase in runoff from paved surfaces also has the potential to cause minor local flooding as would alteration of street storm drainage systems (if poorly engineered) to accommodate bulb-outs and other street and curb modifications for Class II projects and sidewalk improvements. In order to reduce the impacts to a less than significant level, **Mitigation Measures HYDRO-1 and HYDRO-2** shall be implemented. **Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporated.**

None of the proposed bicycle improvements would affect groundwater supplies. The addition of paved surfaces for the larger Class I and Class II projects has the potential to slightly reduce groundwater recharge. In order to reduce this impact to a less than significant level, **Mitigation Measure HYDRO-1** shall be implemented.

Some of the larger proposed Class I and Class II bicycle improvement projects could increase runoff, although it is unlikely the increase would affect the capacity of local drainage systems. Improperly modified street stormdrain systems, such as curb inlets, and/or modifications associated with sidewalk bulb-outs could reduce stormdrain capacity and cause the street drainage system to not function as well as under existing conditions. In order to mitigate this impact to a less than significant level, **Mitigation Measure HYRO-1** shall be implemented. **Less than Significant With Mitigation Incorporated.**

Erosion and sedimentation from construction related disturbance of some Class I and II projects could impact water quality (see also discussion Geology c, and Mitigation Measure GEO – 2). Generally, Class I projects requiring bridges and overcrossings were designated as requiring further technical studies and further environmental review. For those Class I and II projects which were reviewed and determined to have sufficient information, but apparently less serious erosion potential, Mitigation Measures **GEO- 2** and **HYDRO – 2** shall be implemented. **Mitigation Measure HYDRO-2** shall be implemented. **Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporated.**

- e)-f) No housing is proposed for 100-year floodplains as a part of the NCBP. Bicycle bridge crossings of a number of creeks and waterways are proposed as parts of several of the Class I and II projects and many of these proposed structures are located within FEMA designated 100-year floodplains. Unless properly designed and engineered, these facilities have the potential to block flood flows and/or divert floodwaters out of creeks and waterway channels. This is a potentially significant impact. Most, but not all of the Class I and II projects that include bridge construction have been designated as requiring further environmental review. Implementation of **HYDRO-3**, which requires the completion of a detailed design level hydraulic investigation of each bridge site to assist in facility design, will reduce potential impacts to an insignificant level. **Less Than Significant with Mitigation.**
- g) The proposed bicycle facility improvements would not expose people or structures to a significant risk of loss, injury or death involving flooding due to failure of a dam or levee because dams are routinely inspected and monitored for compliance with seismic safety standards. Localized flooding may occur in the event of levee break; however, this is anticipated to have a less than significant impact as none of the proposed projects involve the permanent placement of structures for occupancy of people in a flood prone area, or area at risk from inundation from a dam failure. The County and Cities will rely on their existing emergency notification and response warning and bikeway/trail evacuation procedures, should there be a dam break that releases floodwaters to areas containing bicycle facilities. This impact is considered to be **Less than Significant.**
- h) The proposed bicycle improvements that are in close proximity to the Napa River/SF Bay could potentially be inundated by a tsunami or seiche according to the ABAG tsunami inundation map for emergency planning; however, no structures are proposed associated with this project that could be damaged by a seiche or tsunami (Source 8). The Napa County Emergency Services would rely on its existing system of emergency notification developed for multi-hazard response to warn trail users and close trail segments as necessary. **Less Than Significant Impact.**

Mitigation Measures

HYDRO-1 Proposed bicycle improvements shall be designed to minimize impacts on surface and ground water quality, including maintaining existing runoff conditions. Stormwater management measures, including but not limited to the use of permeable pavement and stormwater treatment techniques such as bioswales and bioretention structures, shall be incorporated into project plans where practical and feasible, in order to maintain the pre-project hydrologic conditions and treat stormwater runoff.

HYDRO-2 The lead agency/local jurisdiction shall review each proposed bicycle improvement project prior to construction and determine if the project requires the preparation of a Stormwater Pollution Prevention Plan (SWPPP). Based on this review, the lead agency/local jurisdiction shall prepare a SWPPP that includes Best Management Practices to prevent or minimize stormwater pollution during construction activities, and post construction. All Class I and Class II projects along creeks, waterways, and wetlands that involve substantial ground

disturbance shall be required to prepare an Erosion Control and Revegetation Plan, and a Spill Control and Countermeasures Plan, regardless of whether a SWPPP is needed or not.

HYDRO-3 Prior to final design of any bicycle facility, such as a bridge or other structure that is placed within or over the flow line of a creek or waterway, or crosses over a creek, and where the proposed facility has the potential to block or impede flood flows and alter hydrologic conditions, the project proponent will complete a detailed hydraulic analysis of the site and facility. The objective of the analysis is to verify that the project is in compliance with the local Floodplain Management Ordinances and related General Plan Policies regarding flood protection and protection of creek resources, and to determine the proposed sizing, geometry, and elevations of the structures so as to not impact creek hydrology and flood flow conditions. The hydraulic analysis and design recommendations will require review and approvals of the local jurisdiction’s Engineer and Flood Plain Manager.

X. LAND USE

Would the project:

	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporated	Less Than Significant	No Impact
a) Physically divide an established community?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
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?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>

Comments to Questions

- a) The proposed bicycle facility improvements would enhance circulation in each City and within Napa County as a whole, making it easier to travel from one destination or community to another, and would not divide any established community. **No Impact.**
- b) The proposed bicycle improvements would not conflict with any applicable land use plan, policy or regulation of an agency with jurisdiction over the project that has been adopted for the purpose of avoiding or mitigating an environmental effect. The proposed bicycle facility improvements would not change designated land uses of any jurisdiction. The implementation of Mitigation Measures in this environmental document and adherence to the requirements in each respective jurisdiction’s General Plans, and Municipal Codes and Ordinances, would ensure conformance with plans, policies and regulations to avoid or mitigate an environmental effect. **No Impact.**

XI. MINERAL RESOURCES

Would the project:

	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporated	Less Than Significant	No Impact
a) Result in the loss of availability of a known mineral resource that would be of value to the region or the State?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
b) Result in loss of a locally important mineral resource recovery site delineated on a mineral resource plan, local general plan, specific plan or other land use plan?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>

Comments to Questions

a)-b) None of the proposed bicycle improvements would result in the loss of availability of a known mineral resource, or in the loss of a locally important mineral resource recovery site. **No Impact.**

XII. NOISE

Would the project:

	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporated	Less Than Significant	No Impact
a) Expose people to or generate noise levels in excess of standards established in the local general plan or noise ordinance, or other applicable standards?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
b) Expose people to or generate excessive groundborne vibration or groundborne noise levels?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
c) Create a substantial permanent increase in ambient noise levels in the project vicinity above levels existing without the project?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
d) Expose people living or working in the project area to excessive noise from a public or private airport?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
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?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
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?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>

Comments to Questions

a) – b) During construction of the proposed bicycle facilities, the use of construction vehicles and equipment has the potential to generate excessive levels of noise. Each of the local jurisdictions having authority over individual projects has adopted Noise Control Regulations that control construction noise levels, including working hours; therefore this impact is not considered to be significant.

Bicyclists may be exposed to noise from vehicles on streets and roads and also from agricultural equipment used on adjacent agricultural fields. However, the noise levels that the facility users

would be exposed to would be temporary and intermittent. Therefore this impact is not considered to be significant. In addition, use of bicycle facilities and related exposure to ambient noise conditions is a discretionary decision by the bicyclists. **Less Than Significant.**

Various bicycle facilities are located in Airport Land Use Compatibility Plan areas for the Calistoga Glideport, Parrett Field and the Napa County Airport. The noise impacts associated with those airports are discussed in VIII g). **Less Than Significant.**

- c) Use of the proposed bicycle facilities would not generate excessive noise and would not increase ambient noise levels in areas where they are located. **No Impact.**
- d) Some of the proposed bicycle routes are located in the vicinity of airports that may expose bicycle facility users to noise. There is an established process for review of plans and projects located in the vicinity of airports. In addition, as described in a)-b) above, this is a discretionary activity. Please refer to Section VIII g) for a discussion of these impacts. **Less Than Significant.**
- e)-f) Some of the proposed bicycle routes are within two miles of an airport or are located in the vicinity of private air strips. The temporary and intermittent nature of the noise exposure to bicyclists is not considered to be excessive and therefore is not considered to be significant. **Less Than Significant.**

XIII. POPULATION AND HOUSING

Would the project:

	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporated	Less Than Significant	No Impact
a) Induce substantial unexpected population growth or growth for which inadequate planning has occurred, either directly (for example, by proposing new homes and businesses) or indirectly (for example, through extension of roads or other infrastructure)?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
b) Displace substantial numbers of existing housing units, necessitating the construction of replacement housing elsewhere?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
c) Displace substantial numbers of people, necessitating the construction of replacement housing elsewhere?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>

Comments to Questions

- a) Implementation of the proposed Bicycle Plan does not involve the construction of additional vehicular roads or sewer and water lines that could induce population growth in the local jurisdictions. The proposed bicycle improvements would serve the existing population and would not add housing or jobs to the local jurisdictions (other than during construction) that would have a significant growth-inducing effect. Some additional out-of-area visitors/tourists may be attracted to Napa County as a result of implementation of NCBP elements, but this is also not considered to be significantly growth inducing. **No Impact.**
- b) - c) None of the proposed bicycle improvements would displace existing housing units or existing residents, or would require construction of replacement housing elsewhere. **No Impact.**

XIV. PUBLIC SERVICES

Would the project:

	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporated	Less Than Significant	No Impact
a) Result in substantial adverse physical impacts associated with the provision of 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:				
(i) Fire protection?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
(ii) Police protection?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
(iii) Schools?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
(iv) Library?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
(v) Other public facilities?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>

Comments to Questions

- a) i.,ii. Some of the proposed Class I bicycle facility improvements will increase public access to areas that are not currently accessible and therefore will require expanded police and fire patrol, emergency response, and protection services. The bicycle facilities will also increase access for use by police and fire protection services into areas with poor existing access. However, no new physical police or fire facilities would be required to serve proposed bicycle facilities. **Less Than Significant Impact.**
- iii, iv. None of the proposed bicycle facility improvements would result in an increase in the number of housing units or increase the population of the project area in a way that would have an impact on schools or libraries. **No Impact.**
- v. The proposed bicycle improvements would create new public access opportunities to open space areas not previously accessible to the public and will create recreational opportunities that did not previously exist. Access to existing park and open space facilities will be improved as a result of project implementation. The construction of the proposed bicycle facility improvements would not adversely impact the physical environment with the implementation of the mitigation measures required in this document. **Less Than Significant Impact.**

XV. RECREATION

Would the project:

	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporated	Less Than Significant	No Impact
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?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
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?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>

Comments to Questions

- a)-b) The proposed bicycle improvements will increase the use of neighborhood, regional parks or other recreational facilities because they will provide improved access to those facilities. However this impact is not considered to be significant. The increase in usage is not anticipated to significantly accelerate or cause the physical deterioration of those parks and facilities such that repair or expansion would be required. The proposed projects include non-motorized transportation facilities and recreational facilities that will require construction. However, with the implementation of the mitigation measures in this document, there would not be an adverse physical effect on the environment. **Less Than Significant Impact.**

XVI. TRANSPORTATION/TRAFFIC

Would the project:

	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporated	Less Than Significant	No Impact
a) Conflict with an applicable congestion management program, including, but not limited to level of service standards and travel demand measures, or other standards established by the county congestion management agency for designated roads or highways?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
b) Substantially increase hazards due to a design feature (e.g. sharp curves or dangerous intersections) or incompatible uses (e.g. farm equipment)?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
c) Result in inadequate emergency access?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
d) Result in inadequate parking capacity?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
e) Conflict with adopted policies, plans or programs supporting alternative transportation?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
f) Result in a change in air traffic patterns, including either an increase in traffic levels or a change in location that results in substantial safety risks?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>

Comments to Questions

- a) The Napa Countywide Bicycle Plan is a policy tool that is intended to improve bicycle facilities and facilitate projects that support non-motorized travel. It also includes specific, physical projects for implementation to achieve the Plan's overall goals and objectives. The Plan does not include components that would generate substantial new vehicle trips or increase the existing traffic load. Implementation of the Plan would encourage bicycling as an alternate means of transportation and therefore decrease vehicle traffic congestion on city streets and county roads. It would have a net beneficial impact for alternative modes of transportation as it improves accessibility and promotes safer and more convenient travel for bicycles throughout Napa County and its cities. Implementation of some aspects of the Plan, such as the Vine Trail and Napa River and Bay Trail, could attract more visitors and tourists to Napa Valley, but the expectation is that these new visitors and tourists would use bicycles to explore the Napa Valley.

Many of the proposed on-street bicycle facility improvements include the addition of bikeway signage and striping and do not require significant street modifications. These projects are considered categorically exempt from CEQA per Sections 15301(c) and 15304(h) of the

California Environmental Quality Act (CEQA) guidelines. These projects include all of the proposed bicycle routes (Class III) and those bicycle lanes (Class II) that would not require the significant alteration of travel lanes, curbside parking, or continuous two-way center turn lanes (see **Appendix B**).

The Plan identifies several street and roadway improvement projects that when implemented, could potentially affect Level of Service (LOS) of County roads and City streets for motor vehicles through physical changes at intersections and lane modifications. The proposed facilities that alter existing lane configurations of the streets by reducing lane widths or removing lanes could result in conflicts with local jurisdictions' General Plans that require the maintenance of adequate circulation. For these projects, as identified during environmental screening (**Appendix B**), additional traffic studies will need to be completed associated with approval of the construction plans and prior to project implementation. For these projects, and prior to final design, the local jurisdiction will conduct detailed reviews of the project to determine the need for removal or narrowing of any travel lanes to accommodate the facility improvements. If travel lane modification is necessary, the local jurisdiction will assess whether the intersections and street traffic flow will continue to function at an acceptable LOS under project conditions, or require design modifications and other mitigations.

Implementation of some of the identified Class I and II projects under the Plan will require project specific environmental review including follow-up, detailed traffic analysis to determine if they would have site specific impacts beyond those addressed in this Initial Study. At that time, proposed bicycle facilities that could result in significant traffic impacts may be redesigned (or potentially relocated to another street in the same travel corridor) if doing so would reduce the overall traffic impacts. Future site specific transportation impacts would need to be evaluated for some of the bicycle improvements as identified in the Appendix.

Implementation Mitigation Measures **TRANS-1** and **TRANS-2** would reduce potentially significant impacts that may conflict with performance of the local jurisdictions' roadways and street systems LOS to a **Less Than Significant** level.

Simultaneous construction of several of the proposed bicycle facility improvements under the Plan could result in local, short-term traffic congestion, but have a less-than-significant effect. Constructing bicycle lanes on a street in one month, and then repaving the street or planting street trees several months later, all of which can affect travel flow, is an example of a potential cumulative effect. Implementation of **Mitigation Measure TRANS-3** would reduce potentially significant impacts that may result from cumulative bicycle facility/streetscape/roadway construction to a less than significant level. **Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporated.**

- b) Implementation of the Plan will include the addition of signage will reduce hazards and improve bicyclist safety. For Bicycle Lanes (Class II), the projects will include roadway signs, lane delineation and pavement stenciling consistent with the California Manual of Uniform Traffic Control Devices (CAMUTCD). The addition of this signage and Class III signage and striping to existing roadways would improve wayfinding for bicyclists, alert drivers to the presence of bicyclists, and help roadway users more effectively share the public right-of-way, reducing hazards.

The proposed Class II and III signage and striping modifications would also not create traffic hazards because they would follow established design standards, guidelines, and best practices. The signing and striping program would improve traffic safety by providing additional guidance to bicyclists, and drivers. Therefore, signage and striping would have a beneficial effect on traffic flow, and the impact would be less than significant.

The Class I & II street and road lane modifications and intersection improvements proposed in the NCBP are intended to reduce hazards to bicyclists. The proposed physical modifications to intersections, including construction of bulb-outs, pedestrian refuge islands, and reduction of turning radii would have the effect of reducing motor vehicle speed, provide greater visibility of bicyclists, and enhance the safety of intersections. This is a less than Significant Impact. **Less Than Significant.**

- c) Implementation of some of the bicycle improvement projects would potentially impede emergency access if they would reduce the right-of-way width of any street to one that is less than the minimum standards or result in reduction of turn radii, reducing speed for traffic safety and emergency response, or result in substandard travel lane widths. This is a potentially significant impact. Local jurisdictions' Fire Departments are responsible for emergency response. The project would be required to maintain the existing right-of-way width on all streets and would maintain adequate travel and maneuvering space consistent with Fire Department Standards and existing conditions. Implementation of Mitigation Measure TRANS-1 would reduce this to a less than significant level. **Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporated.**
- d) The removal of on-street parking associated with bicycle facility construction is not considered an environmental impact under CEQA. A California Appellate Court decision regarding a challenge to the City of San Francisco's treatment of parking as a social (and not a physical) impact. San Franciscans upholding the Downtown Plan vs. City and County of San Francisco held that parking is not part of the permanent physical environment, and noted that parking conditions change over time on their own as communities redevelop and people and communities change their travel patterns, in response to recreation, housing, commercial centers, and jobs. Reduced parking availability causing unmet parking demand created through implementation of NCBP projects would be considered a significant impact under CEQA only if they cause significant secondary effects, or if it is an area of public controversy. Although project impact on parking availability is not an environmental issue under CEQA, it is discussed below because it is an area of potential public controversy. All projects that involve significant parking removal or reconfiguration will be subject to further study on a case-by-case basis, as shown in **Appendix B.**

Although available parking might be reduced in some locations, the development of improved bicycle facilities will encourage more bicycle use, reducing the demand for automobile parking. In addition, a lack of adequate parking in an area could encourage or entice people to use alternative modes of travel. **Mitigation Measure TRANS – 2** reduces the impact on decreased parking availability to a less than significant level. **Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporated.**

- e) The proposed bicycle improvements implement the local jurisdictions' adopted policies supporting alternative transportation. **No Impact.**
- f) The proposed bicycle improvements do not involve altering air traffic patterns. **No Impact.**

Mitigation Measures:

TRANS – 1 Prior to implementation of any of the bicycle facility projects listed in **Appendix B** as requiring further traffic analysis, the responsible agency shall prepare a LOS and queuing analysis of the intersection and street to determine whether the project would cause a significant impact per the agencies adopted LOS thresholds and standards, or would result in queuing that could affect traffic operations at near-by intersections. The analysis shall be prepared for both existing conditions, and existing conditions with project, using recent actual traffic count information (counts no more than 2 years old).

The responsible agency shall also evaluate the proposed project design to ensure that no project features such as curb bulb outs extend beyond the parking lane and into the travel lanes, and/or lane reductions narrow travel lanes below minimum widths of the agency and as described in State and Federal traffic and roadway design standards as adopted by the responsible agency.

Lane reductions, bulb outs, pedestrian refuge islands and other project design features such as speed bumps that affect traffic operation and emergency vehicle response shall also be reviewed with the respective local agency Police and Fire Departments to insure that emergency vehicle access is not impeded, and is consistent with adopted local agency standards and State and Federal standards.

If the proposed bicycle facility improvements result in a significant deterioration in LOS or a significant impact on operation of the project intersection or adjacent intersection, the responsible agency shall modify the project design to reduce LOS impacts to a degree that will be consistent with local agency adopted LOS thresholds and standards.

If the proposed bicycle facility improvements result in a significant deterioration in traffic operation or impedes emergency vehicle access, the responsible agency shall modify the project design to reduce impacts such that the final design will be consistent with adopted standards and practice considering operations, safety and emergency vehicle access and response times.

TRANS – 2 If a proposed project requires the removal of parking spaces, the lead agency/local jurisdiction shall review and consider redesigning or relocating the proposed bicycle improvement, or alternatively, shall prepare a supplemental parking analysis to develop mitigation measures related to loss of parking. This would include the responsible local agency coordinating and partnering with affected local businesses to develop and implement trip reduction and parking management.

TRANS – 3 The local agency/local jurisdictions shall integrate proposed bicycle projects into overlapping and concurrent roadway and street improvement projects such that construction staging occurs as a single project wherever feasible. Where the integration of such projects is feasible, the local agency/local jurisdiction shall schedule the implementation of projects to avoid any cumulative impacts to LOS that would be caused by the simultaneous construction of multiple roadway, street, and bicycle facility projects.

XVII. UTILITIES & SERVICE SYSTEMS

Would the project:

	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporated	Less Than Significant	No Impact
a) Exceed wastewater treatment requirements of the applicable Regional Water Quality Control Board?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
b) Require or result in the construction of new water or wastewater treatment facilities or expansion of existing facilities, the construction of which could cause significant environmental effects?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>

XVII. UTILITIES & SERVICE SYSTEMS

Would the project:

	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporated	Less Than Significant	No Impact
c) Require or result in the construction of new storm water drainage facilities or expansion of existing facilities, the construction of which could cause significant environmental effects?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
d) Have sufficient water supplies available to serve the public from existing entitlements and resources, or are new or expanded entitlements needed?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
e) Result in a determination by the wastewater treatment provider which serves or which may serve the project that it has adequate capacity to serve the project's project demand in addition to the provider's existing commitments?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
f) Be served by a landfill with sufficient permitted capacity to accommodate the project's solid waste disposal needs?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
g) Comply with federal, state, and local statutes and regulations related to solid waste?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>

Comments to Questions

- a)-b) The proposed bicycle improvements would not contribute to the need for new or updated wastewater treatment facilities or otherwise affect local wastewater treatment, resulting in requirements of the Regional Water Quality Control Board not being met. **No impact.**
- c) The proposed bicycle improvements would not require the construction of new stormwater management or treatment facilities. Local stormwater treatment, such as bioswales and bioretention facilities, will be included in the design of some facilities that include streetscape or separated pathway (Class I facility) construction, as discussed in **Mitigation Measure HYDRO-1. No impact.**
- d) None of the proposed bicycle improvements would increase the demand on the available water supply. **No impact.**
- e) None of the proposed bicycle improvements would increase the demand for wastewater treatment. **No impact.**
- f)-g) The proposed bicycle improvements would not generate substantial additional solid waste and therefore solid waste disposal regulations are not applicable. **No impact.**

XVIII. MANDATORY FINDINGS OF SIGNIFICANCE

	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporated	Less Than Significant	No Impact
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?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
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)?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
c) Does the project have environmental effects which will cause substantial adverse effects on human beings, either directly or indirectly?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>

Comments to Questions

- a), b), c) See specific impacts discussed above.
 As noted, some of the proposed Class I and II projects have been designated as requiring additional environmental study and analysis (**Appendix B**).

SOURCE REFERENCES

1. State of California Department of Conservation, Farmland Mapping and Monitoring Program Map 2010 <ftp://ftp.consrv.ca.gov/pub/dlrp/FMMP/pdf/2010/nap10.pdf>
2. Bay Area Air Quality Management District, California Environmental Quality Act, Air Quality Guidelines, Updated May 2011
4. California Department of Mines and Geology, Alquist Priolo Earthquake Fault Zone Map http://www.quake.ca.gov/gmaps/ap/ap_maps.htm
5. Uniform California Earthquake Rupture Forecast, Version 2, 2007 Working Group on California Earthquake Probabilities, 2008
6. Napa County Airport Land Use Compatibility Plan <http://www.countyofnapa.org/ALUC/>
7. Association of Bay Area Governments Liquefaction Hazard Map <http://gis.abag.ca.gov/website/liquefactionsusceptibility/>
8. Association of Bay Area Governments Tsunami Inundation Map <http://gis.abag.ca.gov/website/Tsunami/>
9. California Department of Toxic Substance Control, Envirostor website <http://www.envirostor.dtsc.ca.gov/public/>
10. California Water Resources Control Board, GeoTracker website <http://geotracker.swrcb.ca.gov/>
11. Napa County Municipal Code
12. AEP CEQA Guidelines 2011
13. Napa Countywide Bicycle Plan DRAFT
14. Napa County Baseline Data Report/Napa County GIS Database
15. Napa County General Plan Environmental Impact Report, 2007 <http://www.countyofnapa.org/Pages/DepartmentDocuments.aspx?id=4294967660>
16. Napa FIREWISE Program <http://www.napafirewise.org/defensable-space-live/index.html>

REPORT PREPARATION

Questa Engineering (Point Richmond, CA)

Jeffrey Peters
Margaret Henderson
Shaun O'Bryan
Alison Sand

Demetrius Camarillo

Michael Harris
Tom Hawbaker

W-Trans

Joshua Abrams (Santa Rosa, CA)

APPENDIX A

PROJECT MAPS

Study Area and Vicinity

Overview of Countywide Bicycle Facilities

Planning Area - North Valley

Planning Area - Mid Valley

Planning Area - City of Napa

Planning Area - South Valley

Existing and Proposed Bicycle Network, City of American Canyon

Existing and Proposed Bicycle Network, City of Napa

Existing and Proposed Bicycle Network, City of Saint Helena

Existing and Proposed Bicycle Network, Napa County

APPENDIX B
PROJECT LIST

Proposed Bicycle Network, American Canyon
Proposed Bicycle Network, City of Napa
Proposed Bicycle Network, Saint Helena
Proposed Bicycle Network, Napa County Unincorporated
Proposed Bicycle Network Calistoga
Proposed Bicycle Network Yountville

APPENDIX C

MITIGATION MONITORING AND REPORTING PROGRAM
