

COUNTY OF NAPA  
CONSERVATION, DEVELOPMENT & PLANNING DEPARTMENT  
1195 THIRD ST., SUITE 210  
NAPA, CA 94559  
(707) 253-4416

Initial Study Checklist  
(reference CEQA, Appendix G)

1. **Project Title:** Berryessa Peak Trail (Use Permit # P09-00472-UP)
2. **Property Owner(s):** John and Judy Ahmann
3. **Contact person and phone number:** Ronald Gee, Project Planner, 707.253.4417, [ronald.gee@countyofnapa.org](mailto:ronald.gee@countyofnapa.org)
4. **Project location and APN:** The Berryessa Peak Trail (aka Running Deer Ranch Public Trail Easement) consists of an approximately 0.5-mile pedestrian right-of-way near the top of Blue Ridge, in northeastern Napa County, located about 1.85 northeast of the intersection at Berryessa-Knoxville Road and Eastside Road, including all of Assessor's Parcel No. 015-260-004 and portions of 015-260-006 and 015-260-010. .
5. **Project Sponsor's Name and Address:** Napa County Regional Park and Open Space District, John Woodbury, General Manager, 1195 Third Street, Suite 210, Napa, CA. 94559
6. **General Plan description:** Agriculture, Watershed & Open Space, *Napa County General Plan, 2008*
7. **Zoning:** AW (Agricultural Watershed) District
8. **Project Description:**

District-sponsored project to construct and operate an approximately half-mile pedestrian trail within a trail easement over Running Deer Ranch property, along the Blue Ridge. The trail will provide a public pedestrian-only connection between state lands managed by the Department of Fish and Game, and the federal lands managed by the Bureau of Land Management. No trail or other improvements, other than possible directional signage, are proposed for any of these public lands. On the project site, that portion of the trail will be constructed with hand labor primarily using volunteers.

9. **Environmental setting and surrounding land uses:**

The Running Deer Ranch Trail Easement is an approximately one-half mile easement near the top of Blue Ridge, in eastern Napa County. The easement crosses plant communities comprised of annual grassland and chaparral. The land to the north is publicly-managed by the Department of Fish and Game (DFG) as the 21,500-acre Knoxville State Wildlife Area, to the south is the 9,100-acre Bureau of Land Management (BLM) Berryessa Peak unit, and to the east and west is private property. The trail crosses a generally steep portion of the ridge, a portion of which is used by cattle on the ranch.

The publicly-managed lands are primarily used as recreation areas. The DFG lands are used by the public as a hunting and hiking area. The BLM lands are used primarily as a hunting area, accessed by the surrounding private properties, including use by the Lakeview Gun Club. A transmitter bunker, surrounded by fence and barbed wire, sits on the summit of Berryessa Peak. A conservation organization owns land to the south of the BLM Berryessa Peak unit, and uses their access to lead the public on hiking tours of the BLM property.

The private lands on the Yolo and Napa side of the ridge are used as both private recreation areas, as well as cattle grazing lands. There are numerous ranch and fire roads surrounding the easement, including a ridge-top fire road to the east of the easement, a highly improved gravel private access road bisecting the Berryessa Peak unit, and several cabins on eastern ridges and valleys.

Overall, the most significant activities on adjacent public and private land are as follows:

1. Hunting
2. Hiking
3. Bird Watching
4. Camping
5. OHV use (private lands) and mountain biking (public lands)

10. **Other agencies whose approval is required** (e.g., permits, financing approval, or participation agreement).

County of Napa Use Permit

**JURISDICTIONAL BACKGROUND: Public Plans and Policies**

Based on an initial review, the following findings have been made for the purpose of the Initial Study and do not constitute a final finding by the County in regard to the question of consistency.

	YES	NO	N/A
Is the project consistent with:			
a) Regional and Subregional Plans and Policies?	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
b) LAFCOM Plans and Policies?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
c) The County General Plan?	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
d) Appropriate City General Plans?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
e) Adopted Environmental Plans and Goals of the Community?	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
f) Pertinent Zoning?	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>

Responsible (R) and Trustee (T) Agencies

None

Other Agencies Contacted

Bureau of Land Management  
Department of Fish and Game

**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" or "Less Than Significant with Mitigation Incorporation" as indicated by the checklist on the following pages.

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

**MITIGATION MEASURES:**

- X   None Required
- Identified By This Study - Unadopted (see attached Draft Project Revision Statement)
- Included By Applicant As Part of Project (see attached Project Revision Statement)
- Recommended For Inclusion As Part of Public Project (see attached Recommended Mitigation Measure List)

**ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACTS AND BASIS OF CONCLUSIONS:**

The conclusions and recommendations contained herein are professional opinions developed in accordance with current standards of professional practice. They are based on a review of the Napa County Environmental Resource Maps, the Napa County Baseline Data Report, field surveys for botanical and ornithological resources, specific documents referenced herein, other sources of information included or referenced in the record file, comments received, conversations with knowledgeable individuals, the preparer's personal knowledge of the area, and visits to the site and surrounding areas. For further information, please see the permanent record file on this project, available for review at the offices of the Napa County Regional Park and Open Space District, 1195 Third Street, Napa, Calif.

**AGENCY STAFF PARTICIPATING IN THE INITIAL STUDY:**

Resource Evaluation:	Ronald Gee	Date: October 29, 2009
Site Review:	Ronald Gee	Date: October 29, 2009
Planning/Zoning Review:	Ronald Gee	Date: October 29, 2009

**PRELIMINARY DETERMINATION:**

X No reasonable possibility of environmental effect has been identified, and a Negative Declaration should be prepared.

       A Negative Declaration cannot be prepared unless all identified impacts are reduced to a level of insignificance or avoided.

DATE: October 29, 2009

By: Ronald Gee

**FINAL DETERMINATION. (by Napa County)**

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

Ronald Gee, AICP  
Printed Name

October 29, 2009  
Date

Napa County Conservation, Development and Planning Department  
Lead Agency

## PROPOSED NEGATIVE DECLARATION

The Conservation, Development and Planning Director of Napa County has tentatively determined that the following project would not have a significant effect on the environment. Documentation supporting this determination is on file for public inspection at the Napa County Conservation, Development and Planning Department Office, 1195 Third St., Suite 210, Napa, California 94559. For further information call (707) 253-4416.

**Project Title:** Running Deer Ranch Public Trail Easement Trail Construction (Use Permit # P09-00472-UP)

1. **Project Sponsor's Name and Address:** Napa County Parks and Open Space District  
John Woodbury, General Manager  
1195 Third St., Suite 210,  
Napa, Ca. 94559
  
2. **Property Owner:** John and Judy Ahmann

### **PROJECT DESCRIPTION:**

District-sponsored project to construct and operate an approximately half-mile pedestrian trail within a trail easement over Running Deer Ranch property, along the Blue Ridge. The trail will provide a public pedestrian-only connection between state lands managed by the Department of Fish and Game, and the federal lands managed by the Bureau of Land Management. No trail or other improvements, other than possible directional signage, are proposed for any of these public lands. On the project site, that portion of the trail will be constructed with hand labor, primarily using volunteers.

**WRITTEN COMMENT PERIOD:** October 30, 2009 through November 30, 2009

**HEARING DATE and LOCATION:** December 2, 2009, 9:00 a.m., Napa County Board of Supervisors Chambers, 1195 Third Street, Third Floor, Napa, CA 94559.

**DATE:** October 29, 2009

BY THE ORDER OF

Hillary Gitelman  
Director  
Napa County Conservation, Development and Planning Department

**ENVIRONMENTAL CHECKLIST FORM**

	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporation	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
I. <b>AESTHETICS.</b> Would the project:				
a) Have a substantial adverse effect on a scenic vista?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" 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 type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
c) Substantially degrade the existing visual character or quality of the site and its surroundings?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
d) Create a new source of substantial light or glare which would adversely affect day or nighttime views in the area?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>

**Discussion:**

- a. The project is located within a scenic mountain range behind Lake Berryessa. The project would not have an adverse effect on the scenic vista of the mountain range as the nearest point at which the public can see the project is several miles away. As the project would be a trail of only a few feet in width, the trail will not be visible from any publicly accessible areas.
- b. See "1.a" above. No rock outcrops will be modified, and no mature trees will be removed. There are no historic structures in the area.
- c. See "1.a" above
- d. See "1.a" above. No reflective materials will be used for the trail construction. No lights will be installed.

**Mitigation Measure(s):** None.

---

	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporation	Less Than Significan t Impact	No Impact
II. <b>AGRICULTURE RESOURCES.</b> In determining impacts to agricultural resources are significant environmental effects, lead agencies may refer to the California Agricultural Land Evaluation and Site Assessment Model (1997) prepared by the California Dept. of Conservation as an optional model to use in assessing impacts on agriculture and farmland. Would the project:				

	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporation	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
a) Convert Prime Farmland, Unique Farmland, or Farmland of Statewide Important (Farmland) as shown on the maps prepared pursuant to the Farmland Mapping and Monitoring Program of the California Resources Agency, to non-agricultural use?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
b) Conflict with existing zoning for agricultural use, or a Williamson Act contract?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
c) Involve other changes in the existing environment which, due to their location or nature, could result in conversion of Farmland, to non-agricultural use?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>

**Discussion:**

- a. The project does not propose any conversion of farmland. The project is an easement over private property, located on steep slopes where there is presently no farming. Portions of the project are grazed, but the project will not prevent grazing from continuing. The project includes repair of boundary fencing, which will benefit the cattle grazing which takes place on the private property.
- b. See "II.a" above. Outdoor recreational activities are considered consistent with Williamson Act contracts
- c. See "II.a" above

**Mitigation Measure(s):** None.

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

	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporation	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
e) Create objectionable dust or odors affecting a substantial number of people?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>

**Discussion:** The proposed facility and associated earthwork would not result in significant adverse impacts to air quality.

- a. The proposed changes would not conflict with or obstruct the implementation of an applicable air quality plan. The only foreseeably resulting emissions would consist of mobile sources, including vehicles travelling to and from the trail created by the project. The *Bay Area Air Quality Management Plan* states that projects that do not exceed a threshold of 2,000 vehicle trips per day will not impact air quality and do not require further study (BAAQMD CEQA Guidelines, p. 24). It is virtually impossible that the project could result in that many additional vehicle trips, due to the remoteness of the area and the difficulty of the proposed trail. Further, by facilitating more parks and recreational facilities within Napa County, residents will not have to drive out-of-county to enjoy an outdoor recreational experience. By offering non-motorized recreational opportunities, visitors to the county will also be more likely to reduce the amount they drive while visiting the area. This project thus will not conflict with or obstruct the implementation of an applicable air quality plan.
- b. See "III.a." above.
- c. See "III.a." above. The proposed project would not result in a cumulatively considerable net increase in any criteria pollutant for which the project region is in non-attainment under an applicable federal or state ambient air quality standard, and as discussed above may result in a modest decrease in pollutants from motor vehicles.
- d. The proposed changes will not expose sensitive receptors to substantial pollutant concentrations.
- e. The project is a hiking trail, and will not create objectionable odors affecting a substantial number of people.

**Mitigation Measure(s):** None.

	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporation	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
<b>IV. BIOLOGICAL RESOURCES.</b> Would the project:				
a) Have a substantial adverse effect, either directly or through habitat modifications, on any species identified as a candidate, sensitive, or special status species in local or regional plans, policies, or regulations, or by the California Department of Fish and Game or U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
b) Have a substantial adverse effect on any riparian habitat or other sensitive natural community identified in local or regional plans, policies, regulations or by the California Department of Fish and Game or US Fish and Wildlife Service?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>

	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporation	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
c) Have a substantial adverse effect on federally protected wetlands as defined by Section 404 of the Clean Water Act (including, but not limited to, marsh, vernal pool, Coastal, etc.) through direct removal, filling, hydrological interruption, or other means?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
d) Interfere substantially with the movement of any native resident or migratory fish or wildlife species or with established native resident or migratory wildlife corridors, or impede the use of native wildlife nursery sites?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
e) Conflict with any local policies or ordinances protecting biological resources, such as a tree preservation policy or ordinance?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
f) Conflict with the provisions of an adopted Habitat Conservation Plan, Natural Community Conservation Plan, or other approved local, regional, or state habitat conservation plan?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>

**Discussion:**

- a. In order to determine potential impacts to candidate, sensitive, or special status species, biological surveys were conducted during spring, 2009. The surveys were conducted by Roger Willmarth, a retired environmental reviewer for the California Department of Parks and Recreation. Three trips were conducted over the course of the spring to identify the plants (ferns and higher) and vertebrate animals observed on the easement during the three trips. Only indigenous plant species were recorded since the understory shows the effects of more than 150 years of cattle grazing and is dominated by annual non-native plants that need no protection.

The only herptiles recorded along the easement were Sceloporous lizards. The only mammals observed in the area were Beechy ground squirrels. (The DFG property below, by contrast, was much richer in observable flora and fauna.) There were signs of other mammals such as deer tracks and pellets, woodrat nests, and pocket gopher mounds.

Method for observing habitats: Surveys followed the vegetation association names and descriptions used in the Running Deer Ranch Preliminary Biological Resources Assessment. The three associations traversed by the trail corridor are blue oak woodland, mesic east county chaparral, and chamise chaparral. In addition, the corridor touches on small areas of rocky bluff associations, especially along the southern-most section of the easement.

Method for observing plants: Plants were identified to species. Some samples were collected for later identification at home or at The Jepson Manual (1993) UCD Herbarium. Findings were also compared with a plant list of the Running Deer Ranch (July, 2006) of which the easement is a part, and also an on-going checklist of plants identified at the BLM-owned Payne Ranch, located some 20 miles to the north (Dean, 2009).

Birds were noted by sight and sound. The rocky bluffs were scanned for raptor roosts or nests (finding only raven and vulture roosts and nests), using Sibley's Field Guide to Birds of Western North America (2003) if needed. This list represents birds that were present and active during the surveys while passing through the easement corridor.

Species list:

- Trees
- Aesculus californica - California buckeye
- Pinus sabiniana - grey or foothill pine
- Quercus douglasii - blue oak
- Quercus wizlizenii - interior live oak



### Shrubs

Adenostoma fasciculatum - chamise  
Arctostaphylos sp (glandulosa or manzanita) -  
Ceanothus cuneatus - buckbrush  
Cercis occidentalis - redbud  
Cercocarpus betuloides - birch-leafed mountain mahogany  
Eriodyctium californicum - yerba santa  
Heteromeles arbutifolia - toyon  
Keckellia lemmonii -  
Lepechinia calycina - pitcher sage  
Lotus scoparius -deerweed  
Lupinus albifrons var. albifrons  
Mimulus aurantiacus - bush monkey flower  
Quercus (berberifolia or wizlizenii var. frutescens) - scrub oak  
Rhamnus illicifolia - holly-leafed redberry  
Rhus trilobata - skunkbrush  
Solanum parishii - Parish's nightshade  
Toxicodendron diversilobum - poison oak

### Perennials

Chlorogallum pomeridianum - soap plant  
Dichelostemma volubile - twining brodiaea  
Dichelostemma capitatum - blue dicks  
Dicentra chrysantha -golden eardrops  
Eriophyllum lanatum - wooly sunflower  
Triteleia laxa - lthuriel's spear

### Annuals

Eschscholtzia californica - california poppy  
Clarkia single-flowered clarkia or ....  
Streptanthus breweri var. breweri - jewel flower

### Ferns

Pellaea mucronata var. mucronata - bird's foot fern

### Birds

Cathartes aura - turkey vulture  
Buteo jamaicensis - redtail hawk  
Falco sparverius - American kestrel  
Oreortyx pictus - mountain quail  
Callipepla californica - California quail  
Zenaida macroura - mourning dove  
Calypte anna - Anna's hummingbird  
Melanerpes formicivouos - acorn woodpecker  
Picoides nuttallii - Nuttall's woodpecker  
Dryocopus pileatus - pileated woodpecker!  
Myarchus cineracens - ash-throated flycatcher  
Tyrannus verticalis - western kingbird  
Aphelocoma californica - western scrub jay  
Corvus corax - common raven  
Baelophus inornatus - oak titmouse  
Sitta carolinensis - white-breasted nuthatch  
Troglodytes aedon - house wren  
Salpinctes obsoletus - rock wren

Polioptila caerulea - blue-grey gnatcatcher  
 Sialia mexicana - western bluebird  
 Dendroica townsendi - Townsend's warbler  
 Papilo maculatus - spotted towhee  
 Papilo crissalis - California towhee  
 Aimophila ruficeps - rufous-crowned sparrow  
 Carduelis psaltria - lesser goldfinch

No special status, listed, or candidate species were observed during the surveys. The project will have no impact on sensitive species.

- b. This project would not have an impact on riparian habitat, as it is located on uplands, away from water. The project would not impact sensitive species as outlined in section 'a', above.
- c. This project is located on steep, dry uplands near a ridge, and thus would not impact any wetlands, including seeps or springs.
- d. This project will not create impediments to wildlife corridors or migration. By creating a more direct route between blocks of protected public lands, it may actually enhance wildlife movement potential.
- e-f. There are no Habitat Conservation Plans, Natural Community Conservation Plans or other approved local, regional, or state habitat conservation plans applicable to the subject parcel.

**Mitigation Measure(s):** None are required

	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporation	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
V. CULTURAL RESOURCES. Would the project:				
a) Cause a substantial adverse change in the significance of a historical resource as defined in CEQA Guidelines §15064.5?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
b) Cause a substantial adverse change in the significance of an archaeological resource pursuant to CEQA Guidelines §15064.5?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
c) Directly or indirectly destroy a unique paleontological resource or site or unique geological feature?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
d) Disturb any human remains, including those interred outside of formal cemeteries?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>

**Discussion:**

a.-d. The project area is unlikely to contain historical resources. The steep, dry hillsides are unsuitable for habitation. There are no impacts to cultural, archaeological, paleontological resources or human remains, which are foreseeable at this time. This project will thus not cause a substantial adverse change in the significance of a historic resource, cause a substantial adverse change in the significance of an archaeological resource, directly or indirectly destroy a unique paleontological resource or site or unique geological feature, or disturb any human remains.

**Mitigation Measure(s):** None.

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

VI. GEOLOGY AND SOILS. Would the project:

- |                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                        |                          |                          |                                     |                                     |
|----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|--------------------------|--------------------------|-------------------------------------|-------------------------------------|
| a) Expose people or structures to potential substantial adverse effects, including the risk of loss, injury, or death involving:                                                                                                                                                       |                          |                          |                                     |                                     |
| i) Rupture of a known earthquake fault, as delineated on the most recent Alquist-Priolo Earthquake Fault Zoning Map issued by the State Geologist for the area or based on other substantial evidence of a known fault? Refer to Division of Mines and Geology Special Publication 42. | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/>            | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> |
| ii) Strong seismic ground shaking?                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                     | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/>            | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> |
| iii) Seismic-related ground failure, including liquefaction?                                                                                                                                                                                                                           | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/>            | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> |
| iv) Landslides?                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                        | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/>            |
| b) Result in substantial soil erosion or the loss of topsoil?                                                                                                                                                                                                                          | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/>            | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> |
| c) Be located on a geologic unit or soil that is unstable, or that would become unstable as a result of the project, and potentially result in on- or off-site landslide, lateral spreading, subsidence, liquefaction or collapse?                                                     | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/>            |
| d) Be located on expansive soil, as defined in Table 18-1-B of the Uniform Building Code (1997), creating substantial risks to life or property?                                                                                                                                       | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/>            | <input checked="" 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 waste water?                                                                                                   | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/>            | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> |

**Discussion:**

- Ai-iii. The most recent Alquist-Priolo earthquake fault map identifies no earthquake fault zones on or within two miles of the subject parcel and project area.
- aiv. Napa County Environmental Resource Maps (*Landslide Line*, *Landslide Polygon*, and *Landslide Geology* layers) indicate the presence of landslides and landslide deposits in a number of locations throughout the subject parcel. However, as this project proposes no development of structures, and use of the trail will be transient, the project will not expose people to significant risks related to landslides.
- b. Based on Napa County environmental resource mapping (*Soil Type* layer), the *Soil Survey of Napa County, California* (G. Lambert and J. Kashiwagi, Soil Conservation Service), and the *Soil Survey of Solano County, California* (L. Bates, Soil Conservation Service), the subject parcel includes soils classified as Bressa-Dibble Complex (50 to 75 percent slopes), and Maymen-Millsholm-Lodo association (30 to 75 percent slopes). Bressa-Dibble Complex consists of very steep soils on side slopes and narrow ridgetops on uplands. These soils are so intermingled that it was not practical to separate them at the scale used in mapping. This complex is about 70 percent Bressa soils, 15 percent Dibble soils, and 15 percent Lodo, Los Gatos, Maymen, Millsholm, and Sobrante soils, an inextensive clayey soil, and areas of severely eroded soils. Runoff is rapid to very rapid. The hazard of erosion is moderate to high. The rooting depth is shallow in the areas of severely eroded soils. Maymen-Millsholm-Lodo consists of steep and very steep soils on hills mainly in the northern part of Napa County bordering Yolo County and extending southward to Lake

Berryessa. The Maymen soils in this association are in convex areas on north-facing slopes of mainly 30 to 75 percent. The Millsholm soils are in convex areas on south-facing slopes of mainly 50 to 60 percent near ridge peaks. The Lodo soils are in convex areas on south-facing slopes of mainly 30 to 75 percent. This complex is about 50 percent Maymen soils, 20 percent Millsholm soils, 20 percent Lodo soils, and 10 percent Rock outcrop. Runoff is rapid on slopes of less than 50 percent and very rapid on slopes of more than 50 percent. The hazard of erosion is high or very high. It is higher in the Lodo soils than in the other soils of this association.

This project proposes minimal grading of a foot path using hand tools. There will likely be some localized sloughing of uphill soil down and on to the trail, but the disturbance will be so minimal as to have no significant impact resulting from soil erosion.

c.-d. As the project is a dirt trail, with minimal excavation and an unfinished dirt surface, there is no potential impact of liquefaction or soil expansion having a negative impact off-site.

e. There are no septic systems proposed as part of this project.

Mitigation Measure(s): None are required.

	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporation	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
<b>VII. HAZARDS AND HAZARDOUS MATERIALS.</b> Would the project:				
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 reasonable 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 or acutely hazardous materials, substances, or waste within one-quarter mile of an existing or proposed school?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
d) Be located on a site which is included on a list of hazardous materials sites compiled pursuant to Government Code Section 65962.5 and, as a result, would it create a significant hazard to the public or the environment?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" 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 result in a safety hazard for people residing or working in the project area?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
f) For a project within the vicinity of a private airstrip, or, where such a plan has not been adopted, within two miles of a public airport or public use airport, would the project result in a safety hazard for people residing or working in the project area?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
g) 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"/>

	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporation	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
h) Expose people or structures to a significant risk of loss, injury or death involving wild-land fires, including where wild-lands are adjacent to urbanized areas or where residences are intermixed with wild-lands?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>

**Discussion:**

- a.-g. Recreational trails do not typically use hazardous materials except very small quantities of routinely uses items such as gasoline to run maintenance equipment, and the like. There will be no camping on the trail and thus there will be no use of camping fuels. The project is not located within 2-miles of a private or public airstrip, and is not located on a hazardous materials site. There is no reason to believe that the project or use would impair or physically interfere with an adopted emergency response plan or evacuation plan.
- h. The hillside oak forests and grasslands that dominate the project area are subject to a heightened wildland fire risk during the dry season. While the proposed changes may lead to increased recreational use in the area, the distance from water and higher air temperatures during fire season will likely dissuade users from using the project during fire season. The remoteness of the project, coupled with the above issues, will make use of the project naturally occur during cooler months of the year, when fire is not as much of a concern. Deer hunting, which is the primary late-summer activity in the mountains in this part of Napa County, is expressly prohibited within the project area per the terms of the easement, and will preclude this user group from being present during the fire season. By the terms of the trail easement, a management plan for the project is required to be approved by both the District and the property owner prior to the start of construction. The management plan will include measures to lessen risk of fire, including seasonal closures during periods of highest fire risk, and standing emergency communication protocols with emergency service providers. Thus, risks associated with wildland fire from the proposed actions are expected to be less than significant, and certainly much less than the risk that currently exists in the adjacent Knoxville Wildlife Area due to deer hunting.

**Mitigation Measure(s):** None.

	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporation	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
VIII. HYDROLOGY AND WATER QUALITY. Would the project:				
a) Violate any water quality standards or waste discharge requirements?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" 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 lowering of the local groundwater table level (e.g., the production rate of pre-existing nearby wells would drop to a level which would not support existing land uses or planned uses for which permits have been granted)?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>

	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporation	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
c) Substantially alter the existing drainage pattern of the site or area, including through the alteration of the course of a stream or river, in a manner which would result in substantial erosion or siltation on- or off-site?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
d) Substantially alter the existing drainage pattern of the site or area, including through the alteration of the course of a stream or river, or substantially increase the rate or amount of surface runoff in a manner which would result in flooding on- or off-site?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
e) Create or contribute runoff water which would exceed the capacity of existing or planned stormwater drainage systems or provide substantial additional sources of polluted runoff?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
f) Otherwise substantially degrade water quality?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
g) Place housing within a 100-year flood hazard area as mapped on a federal Flood Hazard Boundary or Flood Insurance Rate Map or other flood hazard delineation map?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
h) Place within a 100-year flood hazard area structures which would impede or redirect flood flows?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
i) Expose people or structures to a significant risk of loss, injury or death involving flooding, including flooding as a result of the failure of a levee or dam?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
j) Inundation by seiche, tsunami, or mudflow?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>

**Discussion:**

- a. The minimal grading of the trail would not violate water quality standards or waste discharge requirements.
- b. There will not be any water used by this project. This, there will be no impact to groundwater levels.
- c.-e. There are no existing or planned stormwater systems that would be affected by this project. The vast majority of the project area is either grassland, woodland, or bedrock; such areas are pervious and have the capacity to absorb runoff.
- f. There is nothing included in this proposal that would otherwise substantially degrade water quality. Native vegetation and annual grasslands surround the project and will serve as a substantial buffer to any watercourses.
- g.-i. The project area is located high on a mountain ridge, and does not include housing development. It is not within a flood zone or flooding area, thus no project impact will occur related to flooding.
- j. The project location is between 1800 and 2100 feet in elevation and there is no known history of mud flows in the vicinity. The project will not subject people or structures to a significant risk of inundation from tsunami, seiche, or mudflow.

**Mitigation Measures:** None are required.

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

IX. **LAND USE AND PLANNING.** Would the project:

- |                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                             |                          |                          |                          |                                     |
|-------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|--------------------------|--------------------------|--------------------------|-------------------------------------|
| a) Physically divide an established community?                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                              | <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"/> |
| c) Conflict with any applicable habitat conservation plan or natural community conservation plan?                                                                                                                                                                                                           | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> |

**Discussion:**

- The project is located within a rural, undeveloped part of the County, and will not divide an established community.
- The project will not conflict with any applicable plans.
- There are no habitat conservation plans or natural community conservation plans applicable to the property.

**Mitigation Measures:** None are required

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

X. **MINERAL RESOURCES.** Would the project:

- |                                                                                                                                                                       |                          |                          |                          |                                     |
|-----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|--------------------------|--------------------------|--------------------------|-------------------------------------|
| a) Result in the loss of availability of a known mineral resource that would be of value to the region and the residents of the state?                                | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> |
| b) Result in the loss of availability of a locally-important mineral resource recovery site delineated on a local general plan, specific plan or other land use plan? | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> |

**Discussion:**

- Historically, the two most valuable mineral commodities in Napa County in economic terms have been mercury and mineral water. More recently, building stone and aggregate have become economically valuable. Mines and Mineral Deposits mapping included in the Napa County Baseline Data Report (*Mines and Mineral Deposits*, BDR Figure 2-2) indicates that there are no known mineral resources nor any locally important mineral resource recovery sites located on or near the project site. Land to the north of the project site is part of the Department of Fish and Game's Knoxville State Wildlife Area, and will not be developed for mineral extraction. The subject parcel is in the process of obtaining a conservation easement, which would preclude mineral extraction. Thus, the proposed trail project would not have any impact on potential mineral resource extraction.

**Mitigation Measures:** None are required.

	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporation	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
<b>XI. NOISE.</b> Would the project result in:				
a) Exposure of persons to or generation of noise levels in excess of standards established in the local general plan or noise ordinance, or applicable standards of other agencies?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
b) Exposure of persons to or generation of excessive groundborne vibration or groundborne noise levels?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
c) 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) A substantial temporary or periodic 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"/>
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 type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" 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 type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>

**Discussion:**

- a.-d. The project will not generate noise, as it is a foot path for non-motorized use. The property is, and will remain, home to agricultural uses. No construction or other noise-generating development is proposed. Hand tools will be used to construct the project. Napa County Code §18.16.090(E) exempts agricultural activities from noise restrictions and residential uses at 40 acre or larger lot sizes are typically not significant sources of noise or vibration. The project will not result in the exposure of persons to or generation of noise or vibration either permanently or temporarily.
- e.-f. The project site is not located within an airport land use plan nor is it within two miles of a public airport or private airstrip.

**Mitigation Measures:** None are required

	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporation	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
<b>XII. POPULATION AND HOUSING.</b> Would the project:				
a) Induce substantial population growth in an area, either directly (for example, by proposing new homes and businesses) or indirectly (for example, through extension of roads or other infrastructure)?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>



	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporation	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
b) Displace substantial numbers of existing housing, 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"/>

**Discussion:**

- a. No new homes or roads are proposed as a component of this project. The project is a foot path, and will not create a potential route for housing development.
- b.-c. The proposed project will not result in the loss of any existing housing units and will not necessitate the construction of replacement housing elsewhere. No one will be displaced as a result of the project.

**Mitigation Measures:** None are required.

	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporation	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
<b>XIII. PUBLIC SERVICES.</b> Would the project result in:				
a) Substantial adverse physical impacts associated with the provision of new or physically altered governmental facilities, need for new or physically altered governmental facilities, the construction of which could cause significant environmental impacts, in order to maintain acceptable service ratios, response times or other performance objectives for any of the public services:				
Fire protection?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
Police protection?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
Schools?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
Parks?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
Other public facilities?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>

**Discussion:**

- a. This project adds very insignificantly to the total amount of recreational trails in the region. The construction and use of the trail will have no impact on fire protection, as fire protection access to the area is available through existing ranch roads. The project may make it easier for fire crews to access the remote area and make fire protection easier. The proposed project will have no impact on other public services, including police, schools, parks, and other public facilities, as it does not include residential development.

**Mitigation Measures:** None are required.

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

XIV. RECREATION. Would the project:

- |                                                                                                                                                                                              |                          |                          |                          |                                     |
|----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|--------------------------|--------------------------|--------------------------|-------------------------------------|
| a) Increase the use of existing neighborhood and regional parks or other recreational facilities such that substantial physical deterioration of the facility would occur or be accelerated? | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input checked="" 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 type="checkbox"/> | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> |

Discussion:

- a.-b. This project, while providing a slight increase in recreational opportunities, would not create a foreseeable increase in use of existing public recreational lands such that they could be deteriorated. Recreation in the region of the project is very dispersed, due to the tens of thousands of open public lands surrounding. Existing recreational facilities at Lake Berryessa are centered around water use, and would not be impacted by this project.

The project does not require development or increase in recreational facilities, other than the trail itself. Public users of the trail would primarily access the trail from the Knoxville Wildlife Area (KWA). No new trail construction is needed in the KWA, since existing dirt roads within the KWA provide several access points. Turnouts on the Knoxville-Berryessa Road are more than sufficient to accommodate the small number of vehicles that would be needed by public users of the trail. This project includes no development and will not, in and of itself, result in any increased demand for recreation resulting from population growth. The project does not include recreational facilities that would have a significant adverse effect on the environment.

Mitigation Measures: None are required.

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

XV. TRANSPORTATION/TRAFFIC. Would the project:

- |                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                        |                          |                          |                          |                                     |
|----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|--------------------------|--------------------------|--------------------------|-------------------------------------|
| a) Cause an increase in traffic which is substantial in relation to the existing traffic load and capacity of the street system (i.e., result in a substantial increase in either the number of vehicle trips, the volume to capacity ratio on roads, or congestion at intersections)? | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> |
| b) Exceed, either individually or cumulatively, a level of service standard 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"/> |
| c) 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"/> |

	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporation	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
d) 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 type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
e) Result in inadequate emergency access?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
f) Result in inadequate parking capacity?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
g) Conflict with adopted policies, plans, or programs supporting alternative transportation (e.g., bus turnouts, bicycle racks)?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>

**Discussion:**

a.-b. The project would be accessed off of Knoxville-Berryessa Road, approximately 2 miles north of Lake Berryessa. The area surrounding the access point is sparsely populated, and the road is lightly travelled. The heaviest use of the road is during deer and turkey hunting season, and the completion of this project is not expected to increase this traffic, as hunting is not allowed on the easement. The project does not include any residential or commercial development, and adds only marginally to an already extensive trail system accessible off of Knoxville Road. The project itself requires substantial effort to reach, including a 3-mile hike up approximately 2000-feet in elevation to reach the beginning of the easement. As such, there is no foreseeable significant increase in traffic from the project. The existing public lands are lightly used, with the exceptions being opening day of deer and hunting season; an activity which this project would not increase.

Given both the limited scope of the traffic impacts proposed here and the lack of traffic congestion in the Knoxville Road area generally, this project will not result in a significant increase in traffic or a net negative change in the existing roadway level of service either individually or cumulatively.

c. This proposed project would not result in any change to air traffic patterns.

d.-g. This project proposes no development and will not result in any change to existing roadways or parking areas. The public lands can never be subdivided or developed by the terms of their acquisition, and the private land over which the trail crosses is in the process of being protected through arangeland conservation easement, which would prevent any subdivision of those lands. There will be no project impacts related to roadways, parking, non-motorized transportation, public transportation, or emergency vehicle access.

**Mitigation Measures:** None are required.

	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporation	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
XVI. <b>UTILITIES AND SERVICE SYSTEMS.</b> Would the project:				
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"/>

	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporation	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
b) Require or result in the construction of a new water or wastewater treatment facilities or expansion of existing facilities, the construction of which could cause significant environmental effects?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
c) Require or result in the construction of a new storm water drainage facilities or expansion of existing facilities, the construction of which could cause significant environmental effects?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
d) Have sufficient water supplies available to serve the project 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 may serve the project that it has adequate capacity to serve the project's projected 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"/>

**Discussion:**

- a-e. The project will not exceed wastewater treatment requirements as established by the Regional Water Quality Control Board and will not result in a significant impact related to wastewater discharge. No development is proposed as part of this project.
- f-g The only solid waste that will be a very minor amount generated by hikers using the trail. Trail users will be expected to carry out whatever they carry in. This is a standard approach for wilderness trails.

**Mitigation Measure(s):** None are required.

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

**XVII. MANDATORY FINDINGS OF SIGNIFICANCE**

- |                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                          |                          |                          |                          |                                     |
|----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|--------------------------|--------------------------|--------------------------|-------------------------------------|
| a) Does the project have the potential to degrade the quality of the environment, substantially reduce the habitat of a fish or wildlife species, cause a fish or wildlife population to drop below self-sustaining levels, threaten to eliminate a plant or animal community, reduce the number or restrict the range of a rare or endangered plant or animal or eliminate important examples of the major periods of California history or prehistory? | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input checked="" 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 type="checkbox"/> | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> |
| c) Does the project have environmental effects that will cause substantial adverse effects on human beings, either directly or indirectly?                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                               | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> |

**Discussion:**

- The project would have no impact on wildlife resources. As analyzed above, no sensitive resources or biologic areas will be converted or affected by this project. Also as analyzed above, the project would not result in a significant loss of native trees, native vegetation, or important examples of California’s history or pre-history. Use along the trail would be recreational, non-hunting use. The adjacent private property already has significant use by hunters, as part of the Lakeview Gun Club. It also has hunting cabins and roads. This project would not increase those uses, or introduce substantial numbers of people to the area to disturb wildlife.
- As discussed above, the proposed project does not have impacts that are individually limited, but cumulatively considerable.
- There are no environmental effects caused by this project that would result in substantial adverse effects on human beings, whether directly or indirectly. No hazardous conditions resulting from this project have been identified. The project would not have any environmental effects that would result in significant impacts. In fact, the project will have a positive impact, in that it will allow for more exercise and recreation, which is beneficial to human beings.

**Mitigation Measure(s):** none are required.