



**Napa County Regional Park
and Open Space District**

Harold Kelly—Vice President
Director Ward One

Tony Norris
Director Ward Two

Guy Kay—President
Director Ward Three

Dave Finigan
Director Ward Four

Myrna Abramowicz
Director Ward Five

AGENDA

BOARD OF DIRECTORS REGULAR MEETING

Monday December 10, 2007 2:00 P.M.
1195 Third Street, Third Floor, Napa, CA

GENERAL INFORMATION

Agenda items will generally be considered in the order indicated below, except for Set Matters, which will be considered at the time indicated. Agenda items may from time to time be taken out of order at the discretion of the President.

The meeting room is wheelchair accessible. Assistive listening devices and interpreters are available through the District Secretary. Requests for disability related modifications or accommodations, aids, or services may be made to the Secretary's office no less than 48 hours prior to the meeting date by contacting (707) 259-8603.

Any member of the audience desiring to address the District on a matter on the Agenda, please proceed to the rostrum and, after receiving recognition from the President, give your name, address, and your comments or questions. In order that all interested parties have an opportunity to speak, please be brief and limit your comments to the specific subject under discussion. Time limitations shall be at the discretion of the President.

State law requires agency officers (Directors and Officers) to disclose, and then be disqualified from participation in, any proceeding involving a license, permit, or other entitlement for use, if the officer has received from any participant in the proceeding an amount exceeding \$250 within the prior 12 month period. State law also requires any participant in a proceeding to disclose on the record any such contributions to an agency officer.

1. Call to Order

2. Public Comment

In this time period, anyone may address the Board of Directors regarding any subject over which the Board has jurisdiction but which is not on today's posted agenda. In order to provide all interested parties an opportunity to speak, time limitations shall be at the discretion of the President. As required by Government Code, no action or discussion will be undertaken on any item raised during this Public Comment period.

3. Set Matters

None

4. Administrative Items

- A. Consideration of and potential approval of Minutes of Board of Directors meeting of November 5, 2007.

- B. Appointment of Melissa Von Loesch as District Secretary.
- C. Consideration and adoption of Board of Directors meeting calendar for 2008.
- D. Consideration of and potential approval of actions related to the proposed Berryessa Vista Wilderness Park, including adoption of the proposed Findings and Negative Declaration under the California Environmental Quality Act, and adoption of Resolution 07-05 authorizing the Board Chair or the General Manager to sign all associated agreements and documents, and take any and all other actions as may be necessary to complete the acquisition and open and operate the land as a public park.
- E. Approval of and authorization for the Board Chair to sign a Professional Services Agreement with Bartig, Basler and Ray to prepare an independent audit for FY 2006-7.
- F. Receipt of report on contracts approved by the General Manager.
- G. Consideration of becoming a sponsor of the California Preservation Society Annual Conference to be held in the Napa Valley on April 23-26, 2008.
- H. Discussion and possible action regarding the District's first annual celebration
- I. Review of Projects Status Report.

5. Announcements by Board and Staff

In this time period, members of the Board of Directors and staff will announce meetings, events and other matters of interest. No action will be taken by the Board on any announcements.

6. Agenda Planning

In this time period, members of the Board of Directors and staff will discuss matters for possible consideration at future meetings. No action will be taken by the Board other than whether and when to agendize such matters.

7. Adjournment



**Napa County Regional Park
and Open Space District**

Harold Kelly—Vice President
Director Ward One

Tony Norris
Director Ward Two

Guy Kay—President
Director Ward Three

Dave Finigan
Director Ward Four

Myrna Abramowicz
Director Ward Five

MINUTES

BOARD OF DIRECTORS REGULAR MEETING

Monday November 5, 2007 2:00 P.M.
1195 Third Street, Third Floor, Napa, CA

1. Call to Order

Meeting called to order at 2:00 p.m. by President Kay. All present.

2. Public Comment

John Woodbury presented Chino Yip, working for the Parks District on a contract basis. He will be putting together presentations for different groups in the community, developing the District's volunteer program and related tasks. He will be contacting directors to see if they are available to attend various meetings.

3. Set Matters

None.

None

4. Administrative Items

- A. Consideration of and potential approval of Minutes of Board of Directors meeting of October 8, 2007.

Minutes approved as presented.

TN-HK-MA-DF-GK

- B. Consideration and potential approval of amendments to the By-Laws of the District regarding the process for the election of Board President and Vice-President and the powers and duties of Board and Administrative Officers.

John Woodbury presented the report. The board voted to accept all proposed changes and to reject all options as listed under item II B.

DF-MA-GK-TN-HK

- C. Receipt of report on contracts approved by the General Manager.

John Woodbury presented report. The board voted to receive the report as presented.

MA-DF-GK-HK-TN

- D. Consideration of and potential approval of a support position on AB 697 (Ruskin).
John Woodbury presented the report. The board moved to sign a letter of support.
TN-DF-HK-TN-GK
- E. Review of Projects Status Report.
John Woodbury presented the report. He stated that he has submitted the grant application for the bay trail project. The grant request is for \$1.3 million and the City of American Canyon has another grant for \$800,000 which we can use as a match. Regarding Camp Berryessa the signed MOU should be coming in the mail and the next step would be to put together a grant proposal. The Special Projects Committee recommendation goes to the Board of Supervisors in December for funding for various projects

5. Announcements by Board and Staff

In this time period, members of the Board of Directors and staff will announce meetings, events and other matters of interest. No action will be taken by the Board on any announcements.

None.

6. Agenda Planning

In this time period, members of the Board of Directors and staff will discuss matters for possible consideration at future meetings. No action will be taken by the Board other than whether and when to agendize such matters.

Dave Finigan wished to discuss Skyline and the land use policies appropriate for that property. Tony Norris expressed the idea of an annual celebration of the District creation and asked that appointment of an ad hoc planning committee it be added to the agenda for the next meeting.

7. Adjournment

Board voted to adjourn at 3:03 p.m.

MA-DF-HK-GK-TN

GUY KAY, Board President

ATTEST:

C. RENEE LEDERER,
Acting District Secretary

Key

Vote: HK = Harold Kelly; TN = Tony Norris; GK = Guy Kay; DF = David Finigan; MA = Myrna Abramowicz

The maker of the motion and second are reflected respectively in the order of the recorded vote.

Notations under vote: N = No; A = Abstain; X = Excused



Napa County Regional Park
and Open Space District

STAFF REPORT

Date: December 10, 2007
Agenda Item: 4.B
Subject: Appointment of Melissa Von Loesch as District Secretary.

Recommendation

Designate Melissa Von Loesch as District Secretary

Background

The District's By-Laws (section III.C) specify that the Board of Directors shall designate a Secretary to perform a variety of duties specified by Public Resources Code Section 5535, Resolution 07-03 and the By-Laws themselves. The District has contracted with the County to fill this position. Since the promotion to other duties of the District's first Secretary, the District has utilized two County employees as Interim District Secretary.

The Conservation, Development and Planning Department has recently filled a newly-created position whose duties include serving as clerk to the County Planning Commission and the Watershed Information Center Conservancy. She is highly qualified and available to serve as Secretary to the Napa County Regional Park and Open Space District.



Napa County Regional Park
and Open Space District

STAFF REPORT

Date: December 10, 2007

Agenda Item: 4.C

Subject: Consideration and adoption of Board of Directors meeting calendar for 2008.

Recommendation

Adopt the attached Board of Directors meeting calendar for 2008

Background

The District's By-Laws (section IV.A) specify that the Board of Directors shall annually, at its last meeting in December, adopt a schedule for its regular meetings for the subsequent calendar year. Attached is a proposed calendar for 2008.



**Napa County Regional Park
and Open Space District**

Harold Kelly
Director Ward One

Tony Norris
Director Ward Two

Guy Kay
Director Ward Three

Dave Finigan
Director Ward Four

Myrna Abramowicz
Director Ward Five

Board of Directors Regular Meeting Calendar 2008

D R A F T

<u>Day</u>	<u>Date</u>	<u>Major Planned Topics (tentative-subject to change)</u>
Monday	January 14 th	Election of Officers
Monday	February 11 th	TBD
Monday	March 10 th	TBD
Monday	April 14 th	Adoption of Master Plan
Monday	May 12 th	Review of Preliminary Budget for FY 2007-8 and setting of Public Hearing for June 16th
Monday	June 16 th	2007-8 Final budget hearing and adoption 2007-8 Work Program adoption
Monday	July 14 th	Procurement Policies Adoption
Monday	August 11 th	TBD
Monday	September 8 th	TBD
Monday	October 13 th	TBD
Monday	November 10 th	TBD
Monday	December 8 th	2008 Calendar of Regular Meetings Adoption

Note

Board meetings are normally the second Monday of each month. **Exceptions are indicated in red.**



Napa County Regional Park
and Open Space District

STAFF REPORT

Date: November 5, 2007

Agenda Item: 4.D

Subject: Consideration of and potential approval of actions related to the proposed Berryessa Vista Wilderness Park, including adoption of the proposed Findings and Negative Declaration under the California Environmental Quality Act, and adoption of Resolution 07-05 authorizing the Board Chair or the General Manager to sign all associated agreements and documents, and take any and all other actions as may be necessary to complete the acquisition and open and operate the land as a public park.

Recommendation

- (1) Adopt the proposed findings and Negative Declaration pursuant to the California Environmental Quality Act.
- (2) Approve Resolution 07-05 authorizing the Board Chair or the General Manager to sign all agreements and documents, and take any and all other actions as may be necessary, to complete the acquisition of approximately 224 acres of real property (APN# 019-220-009, 018 and 026) and open and operate the land as a public park.

Background

The Board at its November 12, 2007 meeting approved the District's purchase of the properties referred to as Berryessa Vista for the purpose of establishing a public park. The actions now being requested provide the authorities necessary to implement this direction.

The purchase of land for the purpose of establishing a park is exempt from the California Environmental Quality Act, but the establishment of a public park is not exempt. Therefore, staff has prepared an Initial Study related to establishing a public park at Berryessa Vista, pursuant to the California Environmental Quality Act, and issued a Notice of Intent to adopt a Negative Declaration. Interest agencies and the public have until 2:00 pm on December 10, 2007 to comment on the proposed Negative Declaration. Prior to the Board acting on the proposed Negative Declaration, staff will report on whether any comments have been submitted, after which the Board should consider adoption of proposed Negative Declaration including the findings contained therein. The Initial Study and proposed findings are attached.

Numerous authorizations and actions are required in order for the District to complete the purchase and open and operate the land as a public park. These include but are not limited to:

- (1) entering into a land tenure agreement in a form acceptable to the State of California, which assures that funds provided through Proposition 12 will be used for the intended purpose for a minimum of 20 years;

- (2) approving and recording a certificate of acceptance, as required by Government Code Section 27281;
- (3) obtaining a Title Report and purchasing Title Insurance; and
- (4) setting up escrow, preparing escrow instructions, and carrying out the District's responsibilities per the escrow instructions.

Since time is of the essence in completing the purchase of the property, and not all of the necessary actions and agreements are known at this time, Resolution 07-05 provides a general authorization for either the Board Chair or the General Manager to take any and all actions necessary to complete the transaction and open the property as a public park.. Resolution 07-05 is attached.

Attachment A: Initial Study and Proposed Negative Declaration
Attachment B: Resolution 07-05

NAPA COUNTY REGIONAL PARK AND OPEN SPACE DISTRICT
1195 THIRD ST., SUITE 210
NAPA, CA 94559
(707) 253-4416

Initial Study Checklist

1. **Project title:** Berryessa Vista Wilderness Park
2. **Property owners:** Land Trust of Napa County, Napa County Regional Park and Open Space District
3. **Contact person and phone number:** John Woodbury, 707-259-5933
4. **Project location and APN:** Adjacent to Bureau of Reclamation Land on the southern shore of Lake Berryessa, between Steel Canyon Road and the Berryessa-Knoxville Road (APN 019-220-009,018 and 026)
5. **Project sponsor's name and address:** Napa County Regional Park & Open Space District, 1195 Third St, Rm 210, Napa, CA 94559
6. **General Plan description:** AW (Agricultural Watershed)
7. **Zoning:** Agricultural Watershed
8. **Description of Project.:** The project involves establishment of a 224 acre wilderness park on property which the Napa County Regional Park and Open Space District is acquiring from the Land Trust of Napa County. Several existing dirt roads are proposed to be used as non-motorized public trails. Public access to the park would initially be by boat (primarily kayaks and canoes) using the U.S. Bureau of Reclamation's Lake Berryessa. No physical changes to the property are proposed other than the installation of informational signs and one or more gates as needed to prevent trespass by off-road recreational vehicles. No docking facilities are proposed on the shore of Lake Berryessa at the location where the public would pull out their boats to access the park. No on-site amenities are proposed, and users will be expected to haul out their own trash. District staff, and volunteers organized by the District, will monitor park usage and utilize adaptive management practices to protect the park's natural resources and maintain a clean and safe environment.
9. **Describe the environmental setting and surrounding land uses:** The property consists of steep, heavily wooded terrain. Approximately two-thirds of the site consists of Chamise-Wedgeleaf Ceanothus Alliance, with the remainder classified as Interior Live Oak Alliance. There are no structures and no improvements, other than a few existing dirt roads, on the property. Adjacent properties are also undeveloped. The property is adjacent to additional public land to the south of the property owned by the Bureau of Land Management. Neither the subject property nor the Bureau of Land Management properties have legal public access to a public road. The Bureau of Reclamation in its Record of Decision adopted in 2007 has plans for a shoreline trail which will eventually provide overland, non-motorized access to the park via the Knoxville-Berryessa Road and Steel Canyon Road. Since acquiring the property in 2002, the Land Trust of Napa County has sponsored periodic group excursions to the property. Off-road recreational vehicles occasionally trespass on the property and as a result there are a few locations where soil erosion is occurring.
10. **Other agencies whose approval may be required:**
Bureau of Reclamation agreement allowing the public to access the property utilizing federal property.
County of Napa Use Permit to allow public park and recreation use in the Agricultural Watershed/Open Space Zoning District

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

County of Napa (R)
 Department of Fish and Game (T)
 Central Valley Regional Water Quality Control Board (T)

Other Agencies Contacted

U.S. Bureau of Reclamation

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 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 / Soils |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Hazards & Hazardous Materials | <input type="checkbox"/> Hydrology / 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 / Service Systems | <input type="checkbox"/> Mandatory Findings of Significance | |

MITIGATION MEASURES:

- 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)

BASIS OF CONCLUSIONS:

The conclusions and recommendations contained herein are professional opinions derived in accordance with current standards of professional practice. They are based on a review of the Napa County Environmental Resource Maps including vegetation mapping prepared by the Institute of Conservation Ecology at U.C. Davis, soil maps prepared by the U.S. Geological Survey, archaeological and cultural resource maps based on data provided by Sonoma State University, 2002 aerial photography, and both the current and proposed update to the Napa County General Plan.

All documents used in the preparation of this Initial Study are available in the Napa County Regional Park and Open Space files and incorporated herein by reference.

AGENCY STAFF PARTICIPATING IN THE INITIAL STUDY:

Resource Evaluation: John Woodbury
 Planning/Zoning Review: John Woodbury
 Site Review/Inspection: John Woodbury

PRELIMINARY DETERMINATION:

- 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: November 5, 2007

BY: John Woodbury

FINAL DETERMINATION. (by Napa County Regional Park and Open Space District)

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

John Woodbury
Printed Name

November 5, 2007 _____
Date

Napa County Regional Park and Open Space District
For

PROPOSED NEGATIVE DECLARATION

The General Manager of the Napa County Regional Park and Open Space District 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) 259-5933.

Owners: Land Trust of Napa County (proposed seller of property), Napa County Regional Park and Open Space District (proposed purchaser of property)

APN: 019-220-009, 018-026 (223.95 acres)

Action: Establishment of a public park, including application to the County of Napa for a Use Permit

PROJECT DESCRIPTION: The project involves establishment of a public park on 224 acres of land which the Napa County Regional Park and Open Space District is acquiring from the Land Trust of Napa County. Public access to the park would initially be by boat from Lake Berryessa. Several existing dirt roads on the property would be designated as public trails. No physical changes to the property are proposed other than the installation of informational signs and one or more gates as needed to prevent trespass by motor vehicles. While not part of this project, it is expected that the Bureau of Reclamation will at some point finish planning for and construct a shoreline line which will provide overland, non-motorized access to the park via the Knoxville-Berryessa Road and Steel Canyon Road.

WRITTEN COMMENT PERIOD: November 9, 2007 to December 10, 2007

DATE: November 5, 2007

BY THE ORDER OF

John Woodbury

General Manager

Napa County Regional Park and Open Space District

ENVIRONMENTAL CHECKLIST FORM

	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporation	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
I. AESTHETICS. Would the project:				
a) Have a substantial adverse effect on a scenic vista?	<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 type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
c) Substantially degrade the existing visual character or quality of the site and its surroundings?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input 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 checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>

DISCUSSION:

No physical construction is proposed other than minor informational and directional signage and installation of gates are necessary to control trespass. No trees, rock outcroppings, historic buildings or other visually attractive features will be adversely affected. No lighting will be installed on the trails.

	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporation	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
II. AGRICULTURE RESOURCES. <i>(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).</i> Would the project:				
a) Convert Prime Farmland, Unique Farmland, or Farmland of Statewide Important (Farmland) as shown on the maps prepared pursuant to the Farmland Mapping and Monitoring Program of the California Resources Agency, to non-agricultural use?	<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 checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input 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 checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>

DISCUSSION:

None of the property is used for agricultural purposes; the lack of overland access to the property, the lack of water and the rugged terrain make the property inappropriate for future agricultural use.

	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporation	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
III. AIR QUALITY. Where available, the significance criteria established by the applicable air quality management or air pollution control district may be relied upon to make the following determinations. Would the project:				
a) Conflict with or obstruct implementation of the applicable air quality plan?	<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 checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>

	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporation	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
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 checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
d) Expose sensitive receptors to substantial pollutant concentrations?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
e) Create objectionable odors affecting a substantial number of people?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>

Discussion:

No earthmoving is proposed as part of the project, so no airborne dust will be caused by construction activities. The limited amount of public use of the existing roads on the property is not expected to generate any measurable airborne dust. The installation of gates as needed to control existing illegal off-road motor vehicle use could have a minor positive effect in reducing the potential for airborne dust from such activities. Park usage is expected to be very light due to the remoteness and limited access to the site; the greatest number of vehicle trips generated by users of the park on a peak day is not expected to exceed 10-20 trips.

Land uses such as schools, playgrounds, child care centers, hospitals and convalescent homes are considered sensitive to poor air quality, because infants and children, the elderly, and people with health afflictions, especially respiratory ailments, are more susceptible to respiratory infections and other air quality related health problems than the general public. None of these sensitive receptors are located near the project site. Residential areas are also considered to be sensitive to air pollution because residents, which include children and the elderly, tend to be at home for extended periods of time. The closest residential area is several miles from the project site.

	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporation	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
IV. BIOLOGICAL RESOURCES. Would the project:				
a) Have a substantial adverse effect, either directly or through habitat modifications, on any species identified as a candidate, sensitive, or special status species in local or regional plans, policies, or regulations, or by the California Department of Fish and Game or U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input 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 checked="" 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 (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 checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input 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 checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input 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 checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input 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-b. No vegetation will be removed, and no habitat will be altered. According to the Department of Fish and Game CNDDDB, there are no listed species on the subject property. The proposed minimal public use of the property is expected to have little or no impact on wildlife in the area.
- c. There are no federally protected wetlands on the project site.
- d. No perimeter fencing of the property is proposed. The installation of gates as needed to control motor vehicle access to the property will not impede any wildlife movement. The minimal amount of public use of the property is not expected to impede or discourage any wildlife movement.
- e-f. There are no local policies or ordinances protecting biological resources with which the proposed project would be in conflict. There are no Habitat Conservation Plans, Natural Community Conservation Plans or other similar plans applicable to the project site.

		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 checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input 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 checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
	c) Directly or indirectly destroy a unique paleontological resource or site or unique geological feature?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
	d) Disturb any human remains, including those interred outside of formal cemeteries?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>

Discussion:

There are no known historic buildings or sites, archaeological resources, paleontological resources, unique geological features, nor human remains on the project site.

		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 checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
	ii) Strong seismic ground shaking?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
	iii) Seismic-related ground failure, including liquefaction?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input 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 checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input 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 checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>

	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporation	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
e) Have soils incapable of adequately supporting the use of septic tanks or alternative wastewater 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"/>

Discussion:

- a. The project site could experience potentially strong ground shaking and other seismic related hazards based on the number of active faults in the San Francisco Bay region. The project does not include the construction of new residences or other facilities (i.e. enclosed areas where people can congregate) that would be subject to seismic forces. Two small questionable landslide deposits have been identified on the property, but these are remote from the existing roads and inaccessible to people due to heavy vegetation and steep slopes. The northeast corner of the property, near where access to the property via Lake Berryessa would occur, has been identified by the USGS as the approximate location of a possible fault, but this is noted in their database as being very uncertain. Given these facts, and the fact that people using the property will be out-of-doors, relatively few in number and dispersed along the trail, the potential for the proposed project to expose people to substantial adverse effects, including the risk of loss, injury, or death involving fault rupture, ground shaking, liquefaction, and landslides would be less than significant.
- b. The use of existing dirt roads, and the limited level of expected public use, no significant soil erosion is expected.
- c. An earthquake or heavy rains could result in landslides. However, the potential for landslides is the same whether or not the area is operated as a public wilderness park.
- d. No structures are proposed, so the issue of expansive soils is not relevant.
- e. No septic or wastewater systems are included in the project.

	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporation	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
VII. HAZARDS AND HAZARDOUS MATERIALS. Would the project:				
a) Create a significant hazard to the public or the environment through the routine transport, use, or disposal of hazardous materials?	<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 checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input 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-c. The project does not use any hazardous materials.
- d. The project is not on any of the lists of hazardous waste sites enumerated under Government Code Section 65962.5 (per Napa County GIS: Hazardous Facilities layer).
- e-f. The project is not located near any public or private airport or airstrip.
- g. The number of people would might be using the park at any given time , and need to use public roads to evacuate the area in the event of an emergency, is not expected to even at a peak time to involve more than 10-20 vehicles; this is so few compared to the number of people and vehicles in the general area that it is not expected to have any significant impact on the implementation of any emergency response or emergency evacuation. The only possible use of the site in an emergency would be by emergency vehicles (such as fire equipment) wishing to use the existing private dirt roads which cross the site. If requested by County fire officials, keys to any gates installed on these existing dirt roads to control illegal trespass will be provided in advance to the appropriate fire officials.
- h. No structures are proposed as part of the project. The area is one of high wildfire risk, but the risk is no more significant than in much of Napa County. Further, the proximity of the project site to Lake Berryessa provides a quick escape route in the event the area is subject to wildfire.

	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 checked="" 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 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 checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
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 checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input 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 checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
f) Otherwise substantially degrade water quality?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input 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"/>

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

Discussion:

a-f. The proposed project will not involve any pollutants that could enter the adjacent wetlands, and will not change runoff rates, direction of water flow, water temperature, or sediment loading.

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

i-j. None of the project site is within a flood zone, or subject to the effects of a tsunami. It is conceivable that there would be a mudflow on the property during or after an extremely heavy period of rainfall. However, there is no evidence of active slides, and even if there were a mudflow the potential is extremely low that it would affect any users of the park.

	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 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:

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

b. The Agricultural Watershed zone within which the project is located allows park and rural recreational uses upon the grant of a use permit. The project complies with the general standards (Section 18.104.340) as well as the environmental performance standards for outdoor recreation (Section 18.104.350).

c. There are no habitat conservation plans or natural community conservation plans applicable to project site or adjacent parcels. The restoration plan for the salt plant site explicitly identifies the proposed route as appropriate for a public access trail that is designed in the manner which is proposed for this project.

	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 checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>

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

- a-b. Mineral and oil rights on the property were reserved as part of past transfer of fee interest (Deed of Dorothy Beckman to Lewis Allen, recorded April 26, 1951), and could be exercised regardless of the proposed project. However, the subject parcel is not in an area of a known mineral resource of value to the region or state, or within a known mineral resource recovery site (Napa County Baseline Data Report Version 1, Nov., 2005). Therefore, no impacts to mineral resources are anticipated.

	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporation	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
XI. NOISE. Would the project result in:				
a) Exposure of persons to or generation of noise levels in excess of standards established in the local general plan or noise ordinance, or applicable standards of other agencies?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input 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 checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input 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 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 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. The project site is located in a remote setting with few people and uses within sound range of the project site. The only noise generated by the project will be from human voices.
- b. Activities associated with the proposed project would not result in the generation of groundborne vibration or groundborne noise levels.
- c-d. Trail operation will generate very little noise. Current boating activities on nearby Lake Berryessa already generate a greater level of noise. There will be no measurable permanent, periodic or temporary increase in ambient noise.
- e-f. The project site is not near any public or private airport or airstrip.

	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporation	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
XII. POPULATION AND HOUSING. Would the project:				
a) Induce substantial population growth in an area, either directly (for example, by proposing new homes and businesses) or indirectly (for example, through extension of roads or other infrastructure)?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input 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-c. The project will not have a significant effect on population growth in the area, will not displace any existing housing, and will not displace any people. It will have the small beneficial impact on improving the quality of life of residents in Berryessa Estates to several miles to the east, as well as Napa County residents generally.

	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporation	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
XIII. PUBLIC SERVICES. 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 checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Police protection?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Schools?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Parks?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Other public facilities?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>

Discussion:

- a. The proposed project will not have any measurable impact on the need for or provision of fire protection, schools, or other public facilities. It will improve the availability of outdoor recreation opportunities. The project sponsor is proposing to patrol the park with its own staff and with volunteers organized by the project sponsor, which will minimize the need for police protection. Due to the lack of public vehicular access to the site, little need for police enforcement is anticipated.

	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 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"/>

Discussion:

- a.-b. The proposed project will improve the availability of public recreation opportunities for wilderness use. There will be a small increase in the number of people using either the public boat launch at Capell Cove or the private boat launch at Steele Park Resort, but the numbers will be

insignificant compared to existing usage of these launches. The Capell Cove boat launch is large enough to handle approximately 75 vehicles with trailers, or twice that number of vehicles without trailers. The Steele Park Resort parking area can hold several times that number of vehicles. Peak usage at the boat launches is during hot summer days, whereas nearly all usage of the proposed park is expected to be during the cooler fall, winter and spring seasons. No new launching facilities will be needed as a result of the project.

	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 checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input 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 checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input 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"/>
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 checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
e) Result in inadequate emergency access?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
f) Result in inadequate parking capacity?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input 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. Automobile traffic from people using the park will be insignificant compared to background traffic levels and road capacity. All of the local roads providing access to the trail currently have far more capacity than needed. It is highly unlikely that more than 10-20 cars would ever be needed to serve the number of people who would be using the trail at any given time, this number of vehicle trips is insignificant compared to existing traffic volumes, particularly since there are two different roads and boat launches by which people can access the park, and four different major roads providing access to this part of Napa County.
- c. The project would not affect existing air traffic and thus no impacts on either air traffic patterns and/or air traffic safety are anticipated.
- d. The road network serving the two boat launches from which users would access the site have no inherent hazardous design features beyond those typical for all rural roads in Napa County. The project will therefore not increase traffic hazards.
- e. Emergency access is available by boat via Lake Berryessa. In addition, while there is no legal overland access to the site, emergency fire vehicles can access the site using existing dirt roads that cross other properties, and will be allowed to continue to do so.
- f. There is ample public parking available at the two boat launches which provide access to the property (the Cappell Cove boat launch operated by the Bureau of Reclamation, and the Steele Park Resort boat launch)—see discussion in Section IX above.
- g. The proposed project does not conflict with adopted alternative transportation policies.

	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporation	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
XVI. UTILITIES AND SERVICE SYSTEMS. Would the project:				
a) Exceed wastewater treatment requirements of the applicable Regional Water Quality Control Board?	<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 checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input 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 checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
g) Comply with federal, state, and local statutes and regulations related to solid waste?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>

Discussion:

- a-b. The proposed project would not generate wastewater; therefore, there would be no impact.
- c. Minor storm water drainage control improvements could potentially be required in the future to prevent erosion on the existing dirt roads on the property. However, even if necessary, the preferred technique is to avoid concentrating the runoff with culverts and ditches, but instead to disperse water downhill to its natural locations through proper outslloping of dirt roads. Therefore, there will be no impact.
- d. The project does not require any water.
- e. The project generates no wastewater.
- f. The project will generate only small amounts of solid waste from users of the trail. If not using the trail, these people would generally still produce a comparable amount of waste, so the net impact on landfill capacity is little to none.
- g. Park users will be expected to carry out their trash, and dispose of it in appropriate off-site trash containers.

	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 checked="" 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 that will cause substantial adverse effects on human beings, either directly or indirectly?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>

Discussion:

- a. The project is for a wilderness park involving no significant physical or use changes.
- b. The project will not add to cumulative impact of growth and development in the area. The future construction by the Bureau of Reclamation of the Lake Berryessa Trail, which would facilitate some increased public use of the project site, could potentially result in more impacts. However, any discussion of those impacts at this time is purely speculative, since the alignment, design and operational parameters of that trail has not been defined, and there is currently no funding nor schedule for construction of that trail. Any cumulative impacts of that trail will need to be analyzed by the Bureau at such time as they decide whether to actually construct the trail.
- c. No adverse impacts on human beings have been identified. The project should have a positive impact on human beings.

Exhibits:

Figure 1 – Project Location Map

Figure 2 – Site Plan

RESOLUTION No. 07-05

**RESOLUTION OF THE BOARD OF DIRECTORS OF THE
NAPA COUNTY REGIONAL PARK AND OPEN SPACE DISTRICT (NCRPOSD)
AUTHORIZING THE BOARD CHAIR AND/OR THE GENERAL MANAGER
TO SIGN ALL AGREEMENTS AND DOCUMENTS, AND TAKE ANY AND ALL
OTHER ACTIONS AS MAY BE NECESSARY, TO COMPLETE THE ACQUISITION
OF APPROXIMATELY 224 ACRES OF REAL PROPERTY (APN# 019-220-009,
018 AND 026), KNOWN AS BERRYESSA VISTA, AND OPEN AND OPERATE
THE PROPERTY AS A PUBLIC PARK.**

WHEREAS, the Napa County Regional Park and Open Space District (“District”) desires to acquire approximately 224 acres of real property (APN#’s 019-220-009,018 and 026), known as Berryessa Vista (“Property”), for the purpose of opening, improving and operating the property as a public park; and

WHEREAS, funding for the acquisition is expected to be provided by the County of Napa using a portion of its share of Proposition 12 per capita grant funds provided by the State of California; and

WHEREAS, the Land Trust of Napa County, is interested in selling the property to the District, subject to a conservation easement intended to protect certain conservation values of the property.

NOW, THEREFORE, BE IT RESOLVED by the Board of Directors of the Napa County Regional Park and Open Space District that the Chair of the Board of Directors and/or the General Manager is authorized to take the following actions:

1. Sign and record with the County Recorder an agreement, deed of trust and/or any other documents as needed to satisfy the land tenure requirements associated with the use of Proposition 12 funds for the purchase of the Property, the purpose of which is to assure that the Property will be operated as a public park for a period of not less than 20 years.
2. Sign and record a Certificate of Acceptance, as required by Government Code Section 27281, indicating the District accepts ownership of the Property.
3. Obtain a Title Report and Title Insurance for the Property.
4. Set up escrow, prepare escrow instructions, and carry out the District’s responsibilities per the escrow instructions.
5. Prepare and sign any other documents or agreements, and take any and all other actions necessary to complete the acquisition of the Property by the District and open and operate the Property as a public park.

Approved and adopted the 10th day of December, 2007.

Guy Kay, NCRPOSD President

Ayes:

Noes:

ATTEST:

Absent:

District Secretary

APPROVED AS TO FORM
Office of County Counsel
By: *Chris R.Y. Apallas*
(By E-signature)

Date: September 20, 2007

**APPROVED BY THE NAPA COUNTY
REGIONAL PARK AND OPEN SPACE
DISTRICT BOARD OF DIRECTORS**
Date: _____
Processed by:

District Secretary



Napa County Regional Park
and Open Space District

STAFF REPORT

Date: November 5, 2007
Agenda Item: 4.E
Subject: Approval of and authorization for the Board Chair to sign a Professional Services Agreement with Bartig, Basler and Ray to prepare independent audit for FY 2006-7

Recommendation

Approve and authorize the Board Chair to sign a Professional Services Agreement with Bartig, Basler and Ray in the amount of \$3,200 to prepare an independent audit for FY 2006-7.

Background

The District's adopted budget includes \$5,000 to pay for the preparation of an independent audit of the District's financial accounts. The proposed agreement will pay for the preparation of the audit for the past year (FY-2006-7). Because this is the District's first audit, audit templates and background information must be created, the cost is higher than would otherwise be the case. However, this first audit will only cover the period April 1, 2007-June 30, 2007, since prior to that time the District did not have its own budget. As a result, there will be savings in this year's budget in this budget category. These savings can either be transferred by the Board to other purposes at a later time, or rolled into next year's budget.



Napa County Regional Park
and Open Space District

STAFF REPORT

Date: December 10, 2007
 Agenda Item: 4.F
 Subject: Report on actions of the General Manager

Recommendation

Receive this report on contracts approved by the General Manager

Background

Section III.A (7) authorizes the General Manager to bind the district for supplies, materials, labor and other valuable consideration, in accordance with board policy and the adopted District budget, up to \$10,000 for non-construction purposes and up to \$25,000 for construction purposes, provided that all such expenditures are subsequently reported to the Board of Directors.

Pursuant to this authorization, the following information is provided to the Board:

<u>Date</u>	<u>Amount</u>	<u>Action</u>
10/8/07	\$130.15	Payment to Alliant Insurance Services for 30 day extension to District insurance while insurance renewal negotiations are completed. Paid out of insurance budget category.
11/7/07	\$50.00	Payment to County Registrar for Proposed Negative Declaration filing fee for Bay/River Trail Phase I. Paid out of office expenses budget category.
11/19/07	\$59.39	Payment to UPS for mailing of River Parkway Grant application. Paid out of office expenses budget category.
11/28/07	\$115.51	Payment to Napa Valley Engraving and Awards for name tags for Directors and staff. Paid out of office expenses budget category.



Napa County Regional Park
and Open Space District

STAFF REPORT

Date: November 5, 2007

Agenda Item: 4. G

Subject: Consideration of becoming a sponsor of the California Preservation Society Annual Conference to be held in the Napa Valley on April 23-26, 2008.

Recommendation

Approve the District being a sponsor of the CPS annual conference subject to availability of volunteers to assist with conference planning.

Background

The California Preservation Society is holding its next annual conference in the Napa Valley on April 23-26, and is seeking sponsors for the event. There is no cost to being a sponsor, but it does require distributing conference announcements to our distribution list, as well as providing volunteer assistance in the planning and implementation of the event.

Historic preservation is very relevant to the mission of the District, and sponsorship of the next annual conference would be appropriate, especially given its location in Napa County. However, District staff is already spread very thin, and while staff can provide some planning assistance to the conference, additional assistance from one or more Board members would be needed to adequately fulfill sponsor obligations.

Annual California Preservation Conference INFORMATION FOR PARTNERING ORGANIZATIONS

Each year, the California Preservation Foundation (CPF) partners with several local organizations in the Conference area to produce the Annual California Preservation Conference. These organizations often include but are not limited to regional historical or preservation societies, city and county governments, museums, community or ethnic organizations, environmental groups and often the Chamber of Commerce, Business Improvement District, and Visitor's Bureau. The California Preservation Conference brings over 500 people to the local community, benefiting the local economy and giving partnering organizations exposure to a statewide audience. **The relationship between CPF and Partnering Organizations is mutually beneficial.**

Benefits for Partners

Listing in all Conference materials and publications, including:

- The Save-the-Date postcard (distribution to 17,000 people and organizations)
- The Registration Brochure (distribution to 5,000 people and organizations)
- CPF's website (average 34,000 hits per month)
- CPF's newsletter (distribution to 1,000)
- Pre- and Post-Conference Email Blasts (2 per month, each goes out to 3,000 addresses)
- Some Conference print ads (space permitting)
- Event Posters (to be posted through downtown Napa and the Valley)

Complimentary Conference registrations:

CPF offers each Partner three registrations to give to community leaders, decision-makers or other individuals that would benefit from the educational aspects of the Conference.

Showcase your community:

Architects, historians, government planners, contractors, developers, attorneys, real estate agents, historic property owners, and many more from the preservation community attend the California Preservation Conference. This is the chance to demonstrate local issues, but also the best of what your region has to offer!

Additionally, Partners receive the benefits of association with a highly regarded organization and event. The California Preservation Foundation is an established, trusted, and high-profile preservation non-profit that is notable to be affiliated with.

How Partners Can Support CPF

- ✦ Appoint a staff person or lay leader to sit on the Conference Steering Committee – encourage this person to spend 5 -10 hours per month on Conference planning
- ✦ Share your mailing list (for privacy, lists may be sent directly to the mailhouse)
- ✦ Share your connections and resources for in-kind donations (venue facilities, wine, catering, advertising, printing, mailing, transportation, auction items, etc.)
- ✦ Share your volunteers – over 100 volunteers are needed at the Conference
- ✦ Put up a Conference notice and link on your website
- ✦ Include a CPF Conference advertisement or blurb in your newsletter
- ✦ Attend the Conference Sessions, Tours and Events - and bring your friends!
- ✦ Bid at the Silent and Live Auctions
- ✦ Become a CPF Member



5 THIRD STREET, SUITE 424 | SAN FRANCISCO, CA 94103

415-495-0349 PHONE | 415-495-0249 FAX

WWW.CALIFORNIAPRESERVATION.ORG | CPF@CALIFORNIAPRESERVATION.ORG

Annual California Preservation Conference
PARTNER COMMITMENT

Organization	Website
Billing Address	
Steering Committee Appointee	Appointee E-Mail
Appointee Office Phone	Appointee Cell Phone
Signature	Date

Yes, I want to become a CPF Member!

CPF ASSOCIATE MEMBERSHIP BENEFITS (Associate is the minimum level for organizations or businesses):

- ✦ Subscription to CPF's newsletter and all monthly updates and notices to all events
- ✦ 20 % Discount on CPF Publications,
- ✦ 4- Discounted registration for Conference, PDA, and Workshops

CPF PRESIDENT'S CIRCLE MEMBERSHIP (minimum level \$500):

This special donor group receives all the benefits of Associate membership listed above plus the following:

- ✦ Printed recognition in our Annual Conference and Preservation Design Award Programs
- ✦ **NEW!** Now our Annual PC events all take place at exclusive historic venues!
- ✦ Cloisonné lapel pin for first-time President's Circle members
- ✦ 1 ticket to our President's Circle Reception at the Annual Conference
- ✦ 1 ticket to an annual PC event at an exclusive historic venue
- ✦ 1 Conference registration

Please sign me up for: <input type="checkbox"/> Associate Membership (\$150) or <input type="checkbox"/> President's Circle (\$500)	
<input type="checkbox"/> Paying by Check <input type="checkbox"/> VISA <input type="checkbox"/> MasterCard <input type="checkbox"/> Discover <input type="checkbox"/> AMEX	
Credit Card Number	Expiration Date



5 THIRD STREET, SUITE 424 | SAN FRANCISCO, CA 94103
 415-495-0349 PHONE | 415-495-0249 FAX | WWW.CALIFORNIAPRESERVATION.ORG |
 CPF@CALIFORNIAPRESERVATION.ORG



Napa County Regional Park
and Open Space District

STAFF REPORT

Date: November 5, 2007

Agenda Item: 4. H

Subject: Discussion and possible action regarding the District's first annual celebration

Recommendation

Appoint two members of the Board to an ad hoc planning committee for the District's first annual celebration, and authorize up to \$300 to cover miscellaneous expenses.

Background

At the October meeting the Board asked that this item be agendaized. Director Abramowicz has secured an offer for free use of the Hatt Building meeting room on the evening of January 28m, 2008 for the event. Most if not all of the food and drink for the event will be donated. However, staff recommends the Board authorize up to \$300 from the reserve/special projects account in case there are costs which cannot be covered through donations.

Napa County Regional Park and Open Space District

Plan of Projects

Status Report for December 10, 2007

<u>Name of Project</u>	<u>Description</u>	<u>Status</u>
Bay/River Trail -- American Canyon to Napa	An 8+ mile recreational trail between the cities of American Canyon and Napa generally following the Napa River and interior levees of associated wetlands.	Feasibility study completed. The District has submitted a Grant application to River Parkway program for Phase I (between American Canyon and Green Island Road) in partnership with City of American Canyon. The comment period on the Proposed Negative Declaration for Phase I between American Canyon and Green Island Road has ended, and no comments were received. The District has initiated the process of obtaining approval from the State Lands Commission and the Napa-Vallejo Waste Management Authority to use a public access easement in the vicinity of the American Canyon landfill (the Authority Board is scheduled to consider this request on December 6, 2007). The District has also started the process of obtaining a Use Permit from the County for a public trail (the Use Permit is scheduled to be heard on January 3, 2008).
Berryessa Estates	Bureau of Land Management has declared 160 acres next to Berryessa Estates as surplus, and BLM has expressed willingness to transfer to District under their Recreation and Public Purpose Act procedure. Would serve as a wilderness park for residents of Berryessa Estates, and could eventually be the northern trailhead for a trail between Berryess Estates and Pope Canyon.	Draft trail plan prepared. CDF has indicated its crews will be available to clear brush for a combined firebreak and trail; crews cost \$200/day. Next step is to hold another community meeting in Berryessa Estates to get input from and determine level of support in the community, then submit RPP application to BLM
Camp Berryessa	Redevelopment of former Boy Scout Camp into a group/environmental education camp.	Draft MOU with Bureau of Reclamation has been approved by BOR and by District counsel. The signed copy of the MOU has been received by the District.
Eticuar Creek Lake	Berryessa Kayak Launch County providing \$30,000 to assist Bureau of Reclamation complete a hand boat launch facility at the north end of Lake Berryessa.	Proposition 12 funds could not be used for this project because the Burerau of Reclamation was unable to meet Land Tenure Agreement requirements. The \$30,000 was reallocated by the Board of Supervisors to assist with the purchase of Berryessa Vista property

Lake Hennessey North Shore Trails	Would open up several miles of existing dirt access road, and construct approximately 1 mile of new single track trail, into a loop trail system on the north side of Lake Hennessey	Next step is to complete draft trail plan, management plan and CEQA review.
Milliken Reservoir Trails and Picnic Area	Would construct approximately 3 miles of Bay Area Ridge Trail plus additional feeder and loop trails, along with a staging and picnic area	Feasibility study final draft is being reviewed by District staff; completion of the study is due by end of Dec 2007. District staff is preparing a draft management and operations plan for the project. District staff has begun researching parameters for "trail host" program for the site.
Napa River Ecological Reserve	Improvements to the reserve including paving parking area, controlling vehicle access through placement of rock barriers, replacement of old signage and information panels.	Paving and rock installation complete. Staff is working to complete the paperwork to get reimbursement for costs through Proposition 12. Working with DFG on signage. State Coastal Conservancy staff is recommending approval of a \$100,000 grant applicaton for habitat restoration, environmental education and improved signage, which will go to their Board for approval in December. A Notice of Exemption under CEQA has been filed on this project. An Eagle Scout candidate has constructed and installed a trash enclosure and refurbished the main refuge sign.
Napa River Flood Control Easement	Conservation easement held by District to facilitate Flood District project and grant funding	Easement completed.
Newell Preserve	Provide on-site water supply for group campground and so cattle can be restricted from access to riparian areas.	City of American Canyon is seeking bids for the drilling of the well. The project will not be ready for the installation of the solar water pump and distribution system in time for us to use Prop 12 funds. However, as part of the arrangement with the land trust on the District's purchase of Berryessa Vista, the land trust will use some of the proceeds from their sale of Berryessa Vista to fund the pump and distribution system.
Oat Hill Mine Trail	Grand opening to the Oat Hill Mine Trail with weekend of signage installation, brush removal and erosion control	As a result of litigation, the volunteer work party weekend has been rescheduled for May 16-18, 2008. A volunteer planning committee has been formed and is continuing to work on planning for the event.
River to Ridge Trail	Lot line adjustment to legalize River to Ridge Trail as constructed (it curenly encroaches on private property in two locations)	Lot line adjustment approved by Syar Properties. Awaiting approval by Department of General Services. District staff is working with an Eagle Scout candidate on the installation of interpretive materials near the trail entrance.

Skyline Park Protection	Acquisition of Skyline Park	Legislation by Senator Wiggins to authorize sale to the County was vetoed by the Governor. The County is considering alternatives for assuring the property continues to be available for park use.
Skyline Park Improvements	Erosion control work on Lake Marie Road, and paving of campground loop road.	All work is complete. Final paperwork is in preparation.
Stags Leap Ridge Trail	Construction of staging area and 3+ miles of Ridge Trail climbing east from Silverado Trail near Rector Creek.	Have meet with Veterans Home staff, who are supportive. Property boundaries have been researched, and preliminary staging area design developed. CEQA on this project was completed several years ago--may require minor updating. The project concept has been approved by the District Board, and the next step is a formal request to Department of Veteran's Affairs.
Wild Lake Ranch	Possible joint management of trails, camping and picnic areas through agreement between the Land Trust, the District and State Parks	Continuing discussions with the Land Trust of Napa County and California State Parks regarding development of Master Plan and long-term ownership and management arrangements
Vallejo Lakes	Possible purchase of 1100 acres of surplus Vallejo Water District lands, of which 200 acres are located in Napa County	Staff-level discussions between the District, the Land Trust of Napa County, the County of Solano and the Solano Land Trust indicate a common desire to work together to purchase this property adjacent to Skyline Park. The Vallejo Water District Board has approved surplusing of the property.
Berryessa Vista	Purchase of 224 acres from the Land Trust of Napa County for use as a public park.	The County Board of Supervisors has approved use of Prop 12 funds for the purchase. The District Board has approved going forward with the purchase. The land trust Board of Directors has approved sale to the District. The District has completed an appraisal of the property. The Bureau of Reclamation has approved use of Lake Berryessa for the public to access the property. The District has issued a Notice of Completion of a Proposed Negative Declaration for a wilderness park (comment period to end December 10th), and has prepared a Use Permit application for the project (scheduled for hearing on January 3, 2008). District staff is working with the State regarding terms of land tenure agreement required by Proposition 12, and is negotiating terms of a conservation easement with the land trust.
South Wetlands Opportunity Area	Transfer to the District those wetlands owned by the Napa County flood control district between the Napa River, Highway 29 and Newport Drive for use as habitat and nature-based recreation.	Transfer approved in concept by the flood control district advisory committee and Board of Directors. District staff is researching flood district documents related to the site, and has begun outreach to neighbors, the City of Napa and other interested parties.