



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

Harold Kelly—Vice President  
*Director Ward One*

Tony Norris  
*Director Ward Two*

Guy Kay  
*Director Ward Three*

Dave Finigan—President  
*Director Ward Four*

Myrna Abramowicz  
*Director Ward Five*

## AGENDA

### BOARD OF DIRECTORS REGULAR MEETING

**Monday January 12, 2009 2:00 P.M.**  
1195 Third Street, Third Floor, Napa, CA 94559

#### 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.

All materials relating to an agenda item for an open session of a regular meeting of the Board of Supervisors which are provided to a majority or all of the members of the Board by Board members, staff or the public within 72 hours of but prior to the meeting will be available for public inspection, on and after at the time of such distribution, in the Conservation, Development and Planning Department Office at 1195 Third Street, Suite 210, Napa, California 94559, Monday through Friday, between the hours of 8:00 a.m. and 5:00 p.m., except for County holidays. Materials distributed to a majority or all of the members of the Board at the meeting will be available for public inspection at the public meeting if prepared by the members of the Board or County staff and after the public meeting if prepared by some other person. Availability of materials related to agenda items for public inspection does not include materials which are exempt from public disclosure under Government Code sections 6253.5, 6254, 6254.3, 6254.7, 6254.15, 6254.16, or 6254.22.

#### 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

4. Administrative Items

- A. Consideration of and potential approval of Minutes of Board of Directors meeting of December 8, 2008.
- B. Election of Officers
- C. Appointment of Tracy Schulze as District Auditor
- D. Continued discussion and potential adoption of a Master Plan for the District, and adoption of a Negative Declaration pursuant to the California Environmental Quality Act.
- E. Extension of Agreement No. 08-03 with Questa Engineering.
- F. Receipt of report on expenditures, encumbrances and donations approved by the General Manager.
- G. Discussion of and potential action regarding proposal to the City of Napa for recreational use of Lake Hennessey and Milliken Reservoir properties
- H. 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, unless specifically noted otherwise.

7. Adjournment

Adjourn to 5:30 at the Hatt Building



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

Harold Kelly—Vice President  
*Director Ward One*

Tony Norris  
*Director Ward Two*

Guy Kay  
*Director Ward Three*

Dave Finigan—President  
*Director Ward Four*

Myrna Abramowicz  
*Director Ward Five*

## DRAFT MINUTES

### BOARD OF DIRECTORS REGULAR MEETING

Monday December 8, 2008 2:00 P.M.  
1195 Third Street, Third Floor, Napa, CA 94559

1. Call to Order

Meeting was called to order at 1:58 pm  
Pat Tyrell filled in for District Counsel Chris Appalas.

2. Public Comment

Matt Zacks stated he had an unspecified proposal on future parks in Napa, and requested the District contract with him to learn about the proposal.

3. Set Matters

- A. 2:00 P.M. Oath of office administered by Judge Stephen Kroyer  
All members of the Napa County Regional Park and Open Space district were sworn in for another term.
- B. 2:45 P.M. Presentation by flood district regarding their education and outreach efforts  
Jack Betourne, Stormwater Specialist gave the presentation.

4. Administrative Items

- A. Consideration of and potential approval of Minutes of Board of Directors meeting of November 10, 2008.  
Minutes were approved with corrections to the Public Comments section.  
TN-HK-MA-GK-DF
- B. Continued discussion of and potential direction to staff regarding the draft Master Plan for the District.  
Bernhard Krevet of Friends of the Napa River spoke on several projects identified for this meeting. Regarding the first item--A23. San Francisco Bay and Napa River Water Trail Development—he asked that the project encompass the responsible use of these

water ways by including destinations providing facilities and amenities for all persons. Friends of the Napa River published a study in 2003 which identifies 27 potential access points on the river that they would like to suggest be included or referenced in the Master Plan.

They feel that hand boats as well as environmentally friendly boats should be included as they are promoting eco tours of marshlands and Lake Hennessey.

Regarding project D.6, on developing a volunteer participation program, he asked that the District have a full time volunteer or designated person to coordinate volunteer restoration activities such as those proposed for the Napa River.

Dee Swanhuysen, North Bay field director for the Bay Area Ridge Trail Council, gave applause on the terrific job done on the Draft Master Plan. She expressed the importance of supporting multi-use trails for hiking, equestrians, and bicyclists, as they are a major foundation of the Ridge Trail, and that we try and serve as many people as possible on all the trails that we can. She noted that all of the Ridge Trails and Bay Trail projects are identified by ABAG (Association of Bay Area Governments) as Priority Conservation Area projects; she would like to see that noted in the Master Plan to give a more regional perspective in hopes that it would be helpful down the road for implementation and funding opportunities.

Dee finished with a quote from Charles Jordan;  
 “We would do well to remember what people don’t understand they will not value,  
 And what they will not value, they will not protect.  
 And what they will not protect, we will loose.”

Cheryl Harris of the Napa Solano Audubon Society and previous Napa County Parks and Open Space Advisory Committee member congratulated the Board on a job well done, and agreed with the importance of sustainable guidelines and the need for a stronger PR campaign. She shared that she is pleased as a hiker and excited with the new trails, but is concerned that most of the projects do not address habitat except in very limited ways. As a representative of the Audubon Society she is particularly concerned for habitat preservation and restoration as they have suffered habitat losses. She requested that the District develop a specific policy about habitat management for all of the properties they are acquiring and that it would be a requirement under goal B “To preserve, restore and protect open space lands natural resources and special habitat areas”. Cheryl suggests it include all habitats and not just special habitats. She asked to recognize that acquisition does not necessarily equal habitat protection and won’t renew habitat. She stated that the project descriptions include very few measures to identify habitat problems such as invasive weed species, nor breaks in habitat connectivity, and does not address loss of mature trees and snags required by cavity nesting birds. Her recommendation is that the District develop a policy that supports the following:

- Value of habitat should be a priority consideration when determining all acquisitions.
- Habitat and biodiversity studies for every project.
- Habitat restoration plan put in place with each acquisition.

The Board provided additional guidance on how to address comments which have been received to date on the following: (The Boards guidance is listed below each comment)

- (1) Add a project whose purpose is to work with the Land Trust of Napa County to define mutual roles, responsibilities and ways each with assist the other.
  - ▶ Create a new project D-15 that would talk about partnerships in general with additional language about special needs and development with the Land Trust.
- (2) Add a project to work with the Zinfandel Subdivision Association to develop and manage the small park property within that subdivision.
  - ▶ Since the District focus must be on regionally significant projects, a park in this area should be considered only as part of the larger Napa Valley Vine Trail proposal.
- (3) Include a project to develop trail connections between the Napa Valley area and the Lake Berryessa area.
  - ▶ Incorporate General Plan Maps that talk about a number of trails in this area rather than create a specific project.
- (4) Change Guiding Principle 9 on page IV-3 so that it does not support fees for day use of trails.
  - ▶ Modify language so that it does not encourage fees for trail users, but leaves this up to determination on a case by case basis.
- (5) Add a project whose purpose is to provide directional signage and interpretive materials at Cedar Roughs.
  - ▶ Create a new project C-9, involving signing and interpretive materials for the entrance to the Cedar Roughs area.
- (7) Add a project showing a trail in the Henry Road area connecting to the diRosa Preserve, Milliken Peak and Browns Valley.
  - ▶ Create a new project A-25 to investigate developing a new trail in this area.

The Board also asked that the wording for project A.24 be modifies to specifically mention the proposed Vine Trail.

Directors voted to approve the comments listed and incorporate them into the Draft Master Plan.

MA-TN-GK-HK-DF

- (6) Add a project to provide areas for target shooting.
  - ▶ Directors moved to include investigation of this concept in section 9 of the Draft Master Plan.

HK-TN-GK-MA-DF  
 N N N  
 Motion did not pass.

- C. Consideration and potential approval of contract to maintain the Napa River Ecological Reserve.  
 Directors voted to approve the maintenance contract.  
 TN-GK-MA-HK-DF
- D. Consideration and potential approval of professional services contract to provide project management services.  
 Directors voted to approve a contract with Elizabeth Wroblicka, dba Land Conservation Associates.  
 MA-GK-HK-TN-DF
- E. Consideration and potential appointment of Board representative to the advisory committee for the development of the Napa County Skyline Wilderness Park Master Plan.  
 Directors voted to appoint Director Harold Kelly as Board Representative.  
 MA-GK-TN-HK-DF
- F. Consideration and potential action on scope of proposal to the City of Napa for trails on the City's Milliken Reservoir and Lake Hennessey properties.  
 Directors voted to submit a request to the City of Napa for constructing and operating trails and associated facilities on the City's Milliken Reservoir and Lake Hennessey properties, with the following specific provisions:
- (a) trails at Lake Hennessey should be multi-use;
  - (b) at Milliken Reservoir, trail segment "E" should be included; and
  - (c) at Milliken Reservoir, water, septic and picnic area improvements should be included at the staging area.
- GK-HK-MA-TN-DF
- G. Receipt of report on expenditures, encumbrances and donations approved by the General Manager.  
 John Woodbury gave the report.
- H. Receipt of First Quarter Financial Report and consideration of recommended budget adjustments.  
 Directors voted to;
- (1) Receive the attached first quarter financial report.
  - (2) Add a new revenue line item for Moore Creek, and budget \$39,800 in revenues.
  - (3) Increase the PSS: Other account by \$27,000.
  - (4) Increase the SDE: Other account by \$12,800
- GK-TN-MA-HK-DF
- I. Review of Projects Status Report.  
 John Woodbury gave the report with discussions on Napa River and Bay Trail, Berryessa Vista, Lake Hennessey, Miliken Creek, Moore Creek, Napa Ecological Reserve, Newell Preserve, Oat Hill Mine Trail, and Rector Ridge.

5. Announcements by Board and Staff

- ▶ John Woodbury shared that they were sending the December volunteers working on the Oat Hill Mine Trail thank you photos.
- ▶ Director Dave Finigan and Guy Kay are trying to arrange a meeting at Lake Berryessa on the Draft Master Plan.
- ▶ Director Tony Norris and Myrna Abramowicz made a presentation of the Draft Master Plan in American Canyon that was well received. The American Canyon city offices will be moving to a new location January 12, 2009 to 4381 Broadway, Suite 201 and they will be having an Open House and Grand Opening on January 17, 2009.

6. Agenda Planning

- A. Adoption of calendar of meetings for 2009  
 Directors voted to approve the Calendar with corrections: The July meeting will be on Monday July 13th, 2009, and the schedule of meetings to be adopted in December will be for the year 2010.
- B. Second Year Celebration, January 12, 2009, 5:30 pm at Hatt Building  
 Director Abramowicz noted that Harry Price had agreed to make the ballroom at the Napa River Inn available at no charge for the second year celebration, to be held immediately after the next Board meeting.

7. Adjournment

President Finigan adjourned the meeting. The next meeting will be a Regular Meeting to be held on January 12, 2009.

---

DAVE FINIGAN, Board President

ATTEST:

---

MELISSA GRAY  
 District Secretary

Key

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

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

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



Napa County Regional Park  
and Open Space District

## STAFF REPORT

Date: December 8, 2008  
 Agenda Item: 4.B  
 Subject: Continued discussion of and potential direction to staff regarding the draft Master Plan for the District.

### Recommendation

- (1) Take public comment on the draft Master Plan
- (2) Provide guidance to staff on how to incorporate comments received to date on the Master Plan

### Background

The Board of Directors held a special meeting on November 10, 2008 starting at 6:30 pm in the Yountville Community Hall to make a presentation on the draft Master Plan and take public comment. Today's meeting is a second formal public forum for taking comments. Additional public comments have been received by staff and Board members, and will continue to be accepted up to and including the January 12, 2009 Board meeting, at which time the Board will be asked to adopt the final Master Plan.

In order to have the draft Master Plan in as close to its final form as possible prior to Board action on the Plan on January 12<sup>th</sup>, staff requests the Board to provide initial guidance on how to address comments which have been received to date. Substantive comments are summarized below. Note that editorial or other comments or suggestions which are already included in the draft Plan or which do not have policy implications, are not included in this list, since staff will simply incorporate the suggestions where appropriate.

- (1) Add a project whose purpose is to work with the Land Trust of Napa County to define mutual roles, responsibilities and ways each with assist the other.
- (2) Add a project to work with the Zinfandel Subdivision Association to develop and manage the small park property within that subdivision.
- (3) Include a project to develop trail connections between the Napa Valley area and the Lake Berryessa area.
- (4) Change Guiding Principle 9 on page IV-3 so that it does not support fees for day use of trails.
- (5) Add a project whose purpose is to provide directional signage and interpretive materials at Cedar Roughs.
- (6) Add a project to provide areas for target shooting.
- (7) Add a project showing a trail in the Henry Road area connecting to the diRosa Preserve, Milliken Peak and Browns Valley.





Napa County Regional Park  
and Open Space District

## STAFF REPORT

Date: January 12, 2007  
Agenda Item: 4.C  
Subject: Appointment of Tracy Schulze as District Controller

### Recommendation

Appoint Tracy Schultze as District Controller effective at the end of the business day on January 30, 2009.

### Background

The District's By-Laws (section III.B) specify that the Board of Directors shall appoint a Controller to perform a variety of duties required of the District by Article 3 of Chapter 3 of the Public Resources Code and the District's By-Laws. The District has in the past contracted with the County to fill this position, utilizing the County's Auditor-Controller. With the retirement of Pam Kindig, Tracy Schulze has been appointed by the County Board of Supervisors to serve as Auditor-Controller for the remainder of Pam Kindig's term, effective at the end of the business day on January 30, 2009.

Appointing the County Auditor-Controller as the District's Controller is the most efficient method for the District to meet its legal obligations to maintain a system of auditing and accounting.



Napa County Regional Park  
and Open Space District

## STAFF REPORT

Date: January 12, 2008  
 Agenda Item: 4.D  
 Subject: Continued discussion and potential adoption of Master Plan for the District.

### Recommendation

- (1) Take public comment on the draft Master Plan.
- (2) Adopt the Proposed Negative Declaration for the Master Plan pursuant to the California Environmental Quality Act.
- (3) Discuss and provide direction on any further changes to the draft Master Plan.
- (4) Adopt the January 12, 2009 draft of the Master Plan, with any amendments proposed at the meeting, or direct staff to further amend and agendize consideration of and potential adoption of the Master Plan for the regular February Board meeting.

### Background

The Board of Directors held a special meeting on November 10, 2008 starting at 6:30 pm in the Yountville Community Hall to make a presentation on the draft Master Plan and take public comment. Further comments were heard by the Board at its regular meeting on December 12, 2008, and direction to staff was provided on a number of issues. Directors Abramowicz and Norris presented the plan to and forwarded to staff comments provided by the City of American Canyon park and open space committee. Finally, Directors Finigan and Kay presented the plan to the Lake Berryessa community at a meeting on January 5, 2009 with the assistance of the Berryessa Chamber of Commerce and forwarded to staff comments received at that meeting.

Based on input received to date, and direction provided by the Board at its December meeting, in addition to miscellaneous non-substantive corrections and clarifications, the following notable changes have been made to the draft Master Plan:

- (1) Project A.25 was added related to trail development in the Henry Road/Milliken Peak area.
- (2) Project A.26 was added related to developing a countywide trail network, which includes possible connections between the Napa Valley and Lake Berryessa.
- (3) Project C.9 was added related to developing interpretive signage for the Cedar Roughs trailheads on Pope Canyon Road.
- (4) Project D.15 was added related to District efforts to expand its partnership with the Land Trust of Napa County and other local land conservation and public organizations and public recreation agencies, to define mutual roles, responsibilities and ways each with assist the other.
- (5) Project D.16 was added related to preparing and adopting habitat stewardship guidelines.

- (6) The possibility of including the small park area owned by the Zinfandel Subdivision Association as part of the Napa Valley Greenway/Vine Trail was mentioned in Project A.24.
- (7) Guiding Principle 9 on page IV-3 was changed so that it does not prejudge the question of whether there would be fees for the day use of trails.

Overall, the draft Master Plan has been revised to incorporate in some manner all of the suggestions received from the public and from Board members, with two exceptions:

- (1) Based on the Board's discussion at its December 12, 2008 meeting, a potential project to investigate the development of a target shooting area has not been included.
- (2) At the Lake Berryessa Senior Center meeting, a request was made for the District to develop an area for off-road vehicle recreation. Staff subsequently received a more detailed email request to this effect from the same person, a copy of which will be distributed at the meeting. The specific location requested in the email is located on land owned by the California Department of Fish and Game, whose regulations prohibit using the area for motorized recreation. However, the broader policy question of whether the District should pursue off-road recreational vehicle areas should be addressed by the Board.

Pursuant to the California Environmental Quality Act, the General Manager prepared a Notice of Intent to Adopt a Negative Declaration pursuant to the California Environmental Quality Act. This notice was sent to the State Clearinghouse for distribution to various State agencies, and published in the Napa Valley Register on November 20, 2008, with a public comment period specified for November 21, 2008 through December 22, 2008. No comments were received on the Proposed Negative Declaration.

Initial Study Checklist

1. **Project title:** Napa County Regional Park and Open Space District Master Plan
2. **Property owners:** n/a
3. **Contact person and phone number:** John Woodbury, General Manager 707-259-5933
4. **Project location and APN:** Napa County
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:** Primarily Agricultural Watershed and Open Space (AWOS), but other General Plan designations may ultimately be affected.
7. **Zoning:** Primarily Agricultural Watershed, but other Zoning designations may ultimately be affected.
8. **Description of Project.:** The District Master Plan provides a description of existing natural resources and park and trail facilities in the County, a policy framework for guiding District efforts, and a work program of 56 projects. The Plan builds on and is consistent with the policies and priorities of the Napa County General Plan adopted June 2008, and is intended to satisfy one of the General Plan's action objectives (Action Item ROS-2.1). Other than a few projects contained in the work program which have already been completed or have already been subject to environmental review, the work program does not commit the District to any particular projects, but only indicates possible projects which the District will further research, evaluate the feasibility of, and only potentially implement. The purpose of the work program is to show the range of projects which the District is interested in further evaluating. Which and how many of the projects are implemented will depend on whether property can be acquired or the permission of affected land owners obtained, the ability to obtain permits, the availability of funding, and further prioritization between those projects which are found to be feasible. Prior to making a decision to implement any specific project, an analysis of impacts pursuant to the California Environmental Quality Act will be prepared.
9. **Describe the environmental setting and surrounding land uses:** The District is authorized to operate in all parts of Napa County, including both incorporated and unincorporated areas. However, the focus of the District, as described in the policy and guiding principles sections of the Plan, is on nature-based recreation and outdoor environmental education. Thus, most of the work program contained in the Plan involves projects which are in the less developed and more natural open spaces within the County.
10. **Other agencies whose approval may be required:**  
None.

**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) LAFCO Plans and Policies?	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
c) The County General Plan?	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
d) Appropriate City General Plans?	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input 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**

**Other Agencies Contacted**

County of Napa (T)  
 City of Napa (T)  
 City of American Canyon (T)  
 Town of Yountville (T)  
 City of St. Helena (T)  
 City of Calistoga (T)  
 Bay Conservation and Development Commission (T)  
 Department of Fish and Game (T)  
 Department of Parks and Recreation (T)  
 Central Valley Regional Water Quality Control Board (T)  
 U.S. Bureau of Reclamation (T)  
 U.S. Bureau of Land Management (T)  
 U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service (T)  
 California Department of Transportation (T)

Napa County Sanitation District  
 Napa County Flood Control and Water Conservation District  
 Napa-Vallejo Waste Management Authority

**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.

Documents used in the preparation of this Initial Study include:

- (1) *Napa County Baseline Data Report*, November 2005,
- (2) *Napa County General Plan*, adopted June 2008,
- (3) *Napa County Regional Park and Open Space District Master Plan, 2008-2013*, October 2008 draft,
- (4) *Great Day Hikes in and around the Napa Valley*, by Ken Stanton, 2008,
- (5) *Journal of Wildlife Management, "Foraging Shorebird Response to Trail Use Around San Francisco Bay"*, by Sokal and Trulio, 2008
- (6) The Nature Conservancy, "*Conserving the Landscapes of Napa County*", January 2003
- (7) Blue Ridge Berryessa natural Area Conservation Partnership, "*Opportunities for Conservation in the Blue Ridge- Berryessa Natural Area: Land Acquisitions and Easements*", n.d.
- (8) The Land Trust of Napa County, "*An Open Space Eden: An Integrated Plan for Acquisition of Conservation Lands in Napa County, California*", n.d.

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: n/a

**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 18, 2008

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 18, 2008  
Date

Napa County Regional Park and Open Space District  
For

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:** n/a

**APN:** n/a

**Action:** Adoption of a Master Plan for the Napa County Regional Park and Open Space District, including general goals, policies, guiding principles and a work program for 2008-2013.

**PROJECT DESCRIPTION:** The District Master Plan provides a description of existing natural resources and park and trail facilities in the County, a policy framework for guiding District efforts, and a work program of 56 projects. The Plan builds on and is consistent with the policies and priorities of the County of Napa's recently adopted General Plan, and is intended to satisfy one of the General Plan's action objectives (Action Item ROS-2.1). Other than a few projects contained in the work program which have already been completed or have already been subject to environmental review, the work program does not commit the District to any particular projects, but only indicates possible projects which the District will further research, evaluate the feasibility of, and only potentially implement. The purpose of the work program is to show the range of projects which the District is interested in further evaluating. Which and how many of the projects are implemented will depend on whether property can be acquired or the permission of affected land owners obtained, the ability to obtain permits, the availability of funding, and further prioritization between those projects which are found to be feasible. Prior to making a decision to implement any specific project, an analysis of impacts pursuant to the California Environmental Quality Act will be prepared.

**WRITTEN COMMENT PERIOD:** November 21, 2008 to December 22, 2008

**DATE:** November 18, 2008

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
<b>I. AESTHETICS.</b> 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:**

The Master Plan does not commit the District to any new projects nor have plans proceeded beyond the conceptual stage, so discussion of any potential adverse impacts is at this time purely speculative. Furthermore, any projects which the District may eventually decide to pursue within the unincorporated portions of the County must be consistent with the County General Plan, and obtain a Use Permit from the County. Policy ROS-3 of the General Plan states that "Recreational facilities and improvements on open space lands should be the minimum necessary to achieve recreation objectives and be limited in density, intensity, need for public services, impacts on the natural environment, growth inducement and impacts on neighboring properties. Uses on open space lands shall respect the character of the surrounding area, require a minimum of public support services...contain a minimum of paved surfaces, structures, natural landform alteration or other introduced or constructed features inconsistent with the environment; require minimal water usage, wildlife habitat removal and usage of herbicides and pesticides, and shall not contribute to the likelihood that additional non-agricultural uses of agricultural land will be proposed to support or be accessory to the continued existence of the recreational use."

	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporation	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
<b>II. AGRICULTURE RESOURCES.</b> <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 checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input 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:**

The Master Plan does not commit the District to any new projects nor have plans proceeded beyond the conceptual stage, so discussion of any potential adverse impacts is at this time purely speculative. Furthermore, any projects which the District may eventually decide to pursue within the unincorporated portions of the County must be consistent with the County General Plan, and obtain a Use Permit from the County. The Napa County General Plan contains numerous policies which assume that recreation and agriculture are compatible activities, and that recreation will be promoted in ways that do not adversely affect agriculture. Napa County General Plan Policy ROS-16 states: "Recreational uses on lands designated for agriculture should be encouraged only where those uses will not deplete or degrade natural resources on which nearby or on-site agriculture depends, and will not adversely affect the commencement, intensification, or continuation of



local agricultural activity." Policy ROS-10 includes the requirement to "utilize temporary and seasonal trail closures, and type and intensity of use restrictions as appropriate...to avoid conflict with agricultural operations." 17

	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 checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input 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 checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
d) Expose sensitive receptors to substantial pollutant concentrations?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
e) Create objectionable odors affecting a substantial number of people?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>

**Discussion:**

The Master Plan does not commit the District to any new projects nor have plans proceeded beyond the conceptual stage, so discussion of any potential adverse impacts is at this time purely speculative. Furthermore, any projects which the District may eventually decide to pursue within the unincorporated portions of the County must be consistent with the County General Plan, and obtain a Use Permit from the County. Among the requirements for a Use Permit for all outdoor recreational activities are performance standards prohibiting the production of dust and obnoxious off-site odors. In addition, the provision of local park and nature-based recreation facilities should serve to reduce the amount of driving people currently must do in order to recreate outdoors. Finally, possible future projects are all relatively small in scale and are distributed around rather than concentrated in any one part of the county. The Master Plan includes guiding principles that state "Seek to develop recreation facilities and programs at locations in close proximity to the County's population centers", "Promote non-motorized recreation facilities such as hiking trails, bicycle routes and other facilities that link the County's cities, town and communities to each other and to regional parks and other important destinations", and "Provide recreation opportunities in all areas of Napa County."

Question III.a is indicated to have "No Impact" because all projects must be consistent with air quality plans, and none of the projects could obstruct the implementation of any air quality plan. The other questions are indicated as "Less Than Significant Impact" because it is conceivable that some of the projects could have a minor effect on air quality, although projects would not be able to obtain a County Use Permit unless the impacts were insignificant.

	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporation	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
IV. <b>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 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"/>

	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 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:**

One of the four goals of the Master Plan is to “Preserve, restore and protect open space lands, natural resources and special habitat areas.” The Master Plan does not commit the District to any new projects nor have plans proceeded beyond the conceptual stage, so discussion of any potential adverse impacts is at this time purely speculative. Furthermore, any projects which the District may eventually decide to pursue within the unincorporated portions of the County must be consistent with the County General Plan, and obtain a Use Permit from the County. In addition to County General Plan Policy ROS-3 (see discussion on air quality above), included in the Master Plan is a guiding principal stating “Improve and expand public access to park and open space lands where appropriate and consistent with the preservation of natural, historical and cultural resources and the protection of agriculture.”

Question IV-f: is indicated as “No Impact” because there are no Habitat Conservation Plans, Natural Community Conservation Plans or other similar plans within Napa County, so it is not possible for there to be any impact.

	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporation	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
V. <b>CULTURAL RESOURCES.</b> 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:**

The Master Plan does not commit the District to any new projects nor have plans proceeded beyond the conceptual stage, so discussion of any potential adverse impacts is at this time purely speculative. Furthermore, any projects which the District may eventually decide to pursue within the unincorporated portions of the County must be consistent with the County General Plan, and obtain a Use Permit from the County. Included in the Master Plan is a guiding principal stating “Improve and expand public access to park and open space lands where appropriate and consistent with the preservation of natural, historical and cultural resources and the protection of agriculture.”

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

		Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporation	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
VI.	<b>GEOLOGY AND SOILS.</b> 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"/>
	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 checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>

**Discussion:**

The Master Plan does not commit the District to any new projects nor have plans proceeded beyond the conceptual stage, so discussion of any potential adverse impacts is at this time purely speculative. Furthermore, any projects which the District may eventually decide to pursue within the unincorporated portions of the County must be consistent with the County General Plan, and obtain a Use Permit from the County. Napa County General Plan policies contained in the Safety Element (SAF-8, SAF-9 and SAF-10) assure that potential geologic and soils hazards are fully evaluated and either avoided or mitigated to a level of insignificance.

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

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

The Master Plan does not commit the District to any new projects nor have plans proceeded beyond the conceptual stage, so discussion of any potential adverse impacts is at this time purely speculative. Furthermore, any projects which the District may eventually decide to pursue within the unincorporated portions of the County must be consistent with the County General Plan, and obtain a Use Permit from the County. General Plan Policy ROS-3 calls for park and recreation facilities to involve a minimum of herbicides and pesticides (see section on air quality above for text). Given the types of activities the District is contemplating, any potential future use of hazardous materials would be incidental and limited in scope, and would be subject to specific environmental evaluation. One possible future trail projects is adjacent to the Napa County Airport, but has been determined by Airport Land Use Commission staff to comply with airport policies and not pose a significant risk. County General Plan policy ROS-10 states in part to "as appropriate, combine trails with fire breaks and design trails to facilitate access for control of wildfires" and to "utilize temporary and seasonal trail closures, and type and intensity of use restrictions as appropriate during periods of high wildfire risk..."

Question VII-e. is indicated as "No Impact" because none of the projects involve either residents or workers, so none of the projects can result in a safety hazard to such people.

	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporation	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
VIII. <b>HYDROLOGY AND WATER QUALITY.</b> 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 checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>

	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporation	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
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"/>
h) Place within a 100-year flood hazard area structures which would impede or redirect flood flows?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
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 checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
j) Inundation by seiche, tsunami, or mudflow?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>

**Discussion:**

The Master Plan does not commit the District to any new projects nor have plans proceeded beyond the conceptual stage, so discussion of any potential adverse impacts is at this time purely speculative. One of the four goals of the Master Plan is to “Preserve, restore and protect open space lands, natural resources and special habitat areas”, and several of the guiding principles in the Master Plan are designed to protect natural resources including water quality. Furthermore, any projects which the District may eventually decide to pursue within the unincorporated portions of the County must be consistent with the County General Plan, and obtain a Use Permit from the County. County General Plan Policy ROS -3 (see air quality discussion above) requires the District to minimize disruption to drainage patterns and runoff rates.

Question VIII-g is indicated as “No Impact” because none of the projects involve constructing or relocating housing, so the 100-year flood hazard area is irrelevant.

	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporation	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
IX. <b>LAND USE AND PLANNING.</b> Would the project:				
a) Physically divide an established community?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input 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 checked="" 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:**

The Master Plan does not commit the District to any new projects nor have plans proceeded beyond the conceptual stage, so discussion of any potential adverse impacts is at this time purely speculative. Furthermore, any projects which the District may eventually decide to pursue within the unincorporated portions of the County must be consistent with the County General Plan, and obtain a Use Permit from the County. Within incorporated areas, the District is subject to the land use regulations of the affected city or town. Rather than physically divide any established community, the Master Plan includes the guiding principles that states “Promote non-motorized recreation facilities such as hiking trails, bicycle routes and other facilities that link the County’s cities, town and communities to each other and to regional parks and other important destinations.

Question IX.c is indicated as “No Impact” because there are no adopted habitat conservation plans or natural community conservation plans within Napa County.

	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporation	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
X. <b>MINERAL RESOURCES.</b> 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"/>
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:**

The Master Plan does not commit the District to any new projects nor have plans proceeded beyond the conceptual stage, so discussion of any potential adverse impacts is at this time purely speculative.

Question X.b is shown as "No Impact" because none of the projects are located in an area identified as a locally-important mineral resource recovery site.

	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporation	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
XI. <b>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 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 checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input 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 checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
f) For a project within the vicinity of a private airstrip, would the project expose people residing or working in the project area to excessive noise levels?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>

**Discussion:**

The Master Plan does not commit the District to any new projects nor have plans proceeded beyond the conceptual stage, so discussion of any potential adverse impacts is at this time purely speculative. Furthermore, any projects which the District may eventually decide to pursue within the unincorporated portions of the County must be consistent with the County General Plan, and obtain a Use Permit from the County. Among the requirements for a Use Permit for all outdoor recreational activities are performance standards prohibiting the generation of excessive noise. County General Plan Policy ROS-3 requires that recreational uses "respect the character of the surrounding area".

Question XI.f is indicated as "No Impact" because none of the projects involve residential or employment activities, so there can be no added noise exposure to people residing or working in the project area.

	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 checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
b) Displace substantial numbers of existing housing, necessitating the construction of replacement housing elsewhere?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
c) Displace substantial numbers of people, necessitating the construction of replacement housing elsewhere?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>

**Discussion:**

The Master Plan may eventually make Napa County a more desirable place to live, but the impact of population growth would be insignificant. Population growth rates in Napa County are primarily a function of ABAG "fair share" housing requirements, limitations on building permits issued each year, urban growth boundaries, and strong agricultural protection policies. The Master Plan does not commit the District to any new projects nor have plans proceeded beyond the conceptual stage, so discussion of any potential adverse impacts is at this time purely speculative. Nonetheless, nothing identified in the goals, policies or work program in the Master Plan contemplates destroying existing housing or displacing existing residents, except possibly as a very minor indirect effect of acquiring open space property which might contain the occasional house.

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

**Discussion:**

The Master Plan does not commit the District to any new projects nor have plans proceeded beyond the conceptual stage, so discussion of any potential adverse impacts is at this time purely speculative. Furthermore, any projects which the District may eventually decide to pursue within the unincorporated portions of the County must be consistent with the County General Plan, and obtain a Use Permit from the County. County General Plan Policy ROS-3 states that "Recreational facilities and improvements on open space lands should be the minimum necessary to achieve recreation objectives and be limited in density, intensity, need for public services..." To the extent that the Master Plan leads to future projects, it will have beneficial impact on the provision of parks, some projects may facilitate access for fire protection, and some projects may provide facilities that support environmental education of interest to schools.

	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporation	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
XIV. <b>RECREATION.</b> 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:**

The Master Plan does not commit the District to any new projects nor have plans proceeded beyond the conceptual stage, so discussion of any potential adverse impacts is at this time purely speculative. To the extent that the Master Plan leads to future projects, it will have beneficial impact on the provision of recreation opportunities. One of the guiding principles in the Master Plan is to “improve and expand public access to park and open space lands where appropriate and consistent with the preservation of natural, historical and cultural resources...” Furthermore, any projects which the District may eventually decide to pursue within the unincorporated portions of the County must be consistent with the County General Plan, and obtain a Use Permit from the County. County General Plan Policy ROS-3 (see air quality discussion above) requires recreation facilities and improvements minimize impacts on the environment.

	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporation	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
XV. <b>TRANSPORTATION/TRAFFIC.</b> 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 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:**

The Master Plan does not commit the District to any new projects nor have plans proceeded beyond the conceptual stage, so discussion of any potential adverse impacts is at this time purely speculative. Furthermore, any projects which the District may eventually decide to pursue within the unincorporated portions of the County must be consistent with the County General Plan, and obtain a Use Permit from the County. To the extent that the Master Plan eventually leads to the provision of local park and nature-based recreation facilities, these should serve to reduce the amount of driving people currently must do in order to recreate outdoors. Possible future projects are all relatively small in scale and are distributed around rather than concentrated in any one part of the county, so there should not be any locally concentrated effects. The Master



Plan includes guiding principles that state “Seek to develop recreation facilities and programs at locations in close proximity to the County’s population centers” , “Promote non-motorized recreation facilities such as hiking trails, bicycle routes and other facilities that link the County’s cities, town and communities to each other and to regional parks and other important destinations”, and “Provide recreation opportunities in all areas of Napa County.” Finally, emergency access will be evaluated at such time as project plans are more fully developed.

Question XV.c is indicated as “No Impact” because none of the projects will change air traffic patterns, levels or locations in any way. Question XV.g is indicated as “No Impact” because none of the projects could conceivably conflict with policies, plans or programs supporting alternative transportation.

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

The Master Plan does not commit the District to any new projects nor have plans proceeded beyond the conceptual stage, so discussion of any potential adverse impacts is at this time purely speculative. Furthermore, any projects which the District may eventually decide to pursue within the unincorporated portions of the County must be consistent with the County General Plan, and obtain a Use Permit from the County. General Plan Policy ROS-3 (see air quality discussion above for text) requires that facilities minimize impact of public services and require minimal water.

		Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporation	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
XVII.	<b>MANDATORY FINDINGS OF SIGNIFICANCE</b>				
	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"/>

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

The goals and guiding principles of the Master Plan are all oriented toward preserving and often improving the natural environment. At the same time, The Master Plan does not commit the District to any new projects nor have plans proceeded beyond the conceptual stage, so discussion of any potential adverse impacts is at this time purely speculative. The Master Plan builds on and is consistent with the recently adopted County General Plan, which found the types of nature-based recreation and open space protection activities contemplated in the General Plan to be complementary and consistent with protecting the natural, agricultural, and human environment.



Napa County Regional Park  
and Open Space District

## STAFF REPORT

Date: January 12, 2007

Agenda Item: 4.E

Subject: Extension of Agreement No. 08-03 with Questa Engineering to September 30, 2009.

### Recommendation

Extend Agreement No. 08-03 to September 30, 2009

### Background

On June 16, 2008 the Board of Directors authorized Agreement No. 08-03 with Questa Engineering to prepare a feasibility study and preliminary design and engineering services for the development of an environmental and group camp at the former Camp Berryessa site. A key first step for the study is to do soil testing to determine the capacity of the site to handle wastewater (failure of the former Camp Berryessa septic system was a major factor in the closure of that facility). Unfortunately, work on the study has been delayed because the consultant has had to wait until the Bureau of Reclamation completes an archaeological and cultural survey of the site before it can perform soil tests. Completion of the survey is expected soon.

That original agreement with Questa Engineering terminated on December 31, 2008. Because of the delay in starting work, staff recommends the agreement be extended to September 30, 2009.



Napa County Regional Park  
and Open Space District

**STAFF REPORT**

Date: January 12, 2008  
 Agenda Item: 4.F  
 Subject: Receipt of report on expenditures, encumbrances and donations approved by the General Manager

Recommendation

Receive this report on expenditures and encumbrances 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. Section III.A(8) of the By-Laws authorizes the General Manager to apply for grants and receive donations, subject to reporting such actions to the Board of Directors.

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

Date	Purpose	Recipient	Amount
12/18/2008	Master Plan CEQA Legal Notice	Napa Valley Register	\$331.46



Napa County Regional Park  
and Open Space District

## STAFF REPORT

Date: January 12, 2007

Agenda Item: 4.G

Subject: Discussion of and potential action regarding proposal to the City of Napa for recreational use of Lake Hennessey and Milliken Reservoir properties

### Recommendation

Receive oral status report and take action as appropriate.

### Background

The District Board at its December 8, 2008 meeting reviewed a report from the district general manager concerning the status of the proposal to the City of Napa for trails on the City's Milliken Reservoir and Lake Hennessey properties. It was noted with this report that City and District staffs had not reached consensus on the inclusion of trail loop E, staging area size and inclusion of a water well, tank and small leach field at Milliken Reservoir and trail access for bicyclists and equestrians at Lake Hennessey. After reviewing this report the District Board authorized the general manager to proceed with the presentation of the Districts proposal for a trails system at these two facilities to the Napa City Council.

In following up on the District Board's decision the District Board President initiated a meeting on December 18<sup>th</sup> with the Napa City Manager Mike Parness to review and attempt to reconcile these outstanding issues. At this meeting an additional issue was raised concerning the proposed use of a portion of the existing road at Milliken reservoir to access a special overlook site for picnicking and day use. The city manager expressed interest in reviewing these issues further and a second meeting has been scheduled for January 8 with the City Manager and his staff on this matter.

It is planned to review the outcome of this second meeting with the full Board at the January 12<sup>th</sup> meeting. At this time the Board can review the status of these two trail projects and determine if additional action is needed.

## Plan of Projects

Status Report for January 12, 2009

<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. Environmental review has been completed, and a Use Permit obtained, for the first phase of the project (American Canyon to Green Island Road. The District has been awarded a \$1,032,300 grant from the California River Parkway Grant Program; <u>this grant was frozen in December 2008 pending resolution of the State budget crisis.</u> The City of American Canyon has obtained an easement from the Department of Fish and Game for a spur trail that will provide a direct connection to the Napa River, and the City and District are close to an agreement with the Napa-Vallejo Waste Management Authority for another spur trail that would loop around the landfill. The County Board of Supervisors has approved \$50,000 for the District to complete CEQA for the remainder of the trail. The District has prepared a draft MOU with DFG for the phase one trail, which is now under review by DFG.
Berryessa Estates	Acquire 160 acres next to Berryessa Estates from BLM at no fee through their Recreation and Public Purpose Act procedure. Would serve as a wilderness park for local residents 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
Berryessa Vista	Planning and stewardship of this 224 acre wilderness park.	Volunteers working with the District have completed detail GIS mapping showing all existing roads, creek crossings, vista points and potential campsites. Continuing damage by off-road vehicles trespassing on the property was noted. A letter introducing the District and the park adjacent and nearby landowners is in preparation, and planning for signage and gate(s) is underway. A key adjacent property is expected to be on the market in the coming year.
Blue Ridge/Berryess Peak Trail	Obtain right of way and construct trail to provide public access to extensive federal lands on Blue Ridge and to Berryessa Peak	Obtained donated trail easement from the Ahmann family to close gaps between existing public lands on Blue Ridge. <u>Undertook a reconnaissance of the trail route in December 2008. Next step is to revise the easement description based on the reconnaissance.</u>
Camp Berryessa	Redevelopment of former Boy Scout Camp into a group/environmental education camp.	MOU with Bureau of Reclamation has been approved by BOR and by the District granting District an 18 month period to develop a plan for the camp. Questa Engineering has begun the market analysis and prepared some initial design concepts; soil testing for wastewater disposal design is on hold while the BOR completes a cultural survey for the site.

<p>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, and connecting to the planned Moore Creek Open Space Park trail system.</p>	<p>This project is being combined with the Milliken Ridge Trail project for purposes of seeking City of Napa approvals to construct and operate trails on their property. A revised project description has been prepared from City staff review.</p>
<p>Master Plan Development</p>	<p>Board Master Plan subcommittee presented the plan outline, and some illustrative section, to the Board at the March meeting. The draft plan is in the public comment period, and is scheduled for Board approval at its January 2009 meeting.</p>
<p>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</p>	<p>The feasibility study has been completed, and the Board of Directors has accepted the feasibility study. District staff is in active discussions with City of Napa staff to develop a draft agreement and operations plan that can be presented to the City Council for direction prior to completing environmental review for the proposed project. City staff has asked for modifications to the proposal. District staff has discussed these modifications with the Ridge Trail Council and others, <u>and the District Board at its December meeting approved a revised project description for submittal to the City Council.</u></p>
<p>Moore Creek Acquisition and Park Development Acquisition of 673 acres of open space adjacent to City of Napa watershed lands at Lake Hennessey to protect habitat, provide recreational trails, and overnight camping facilities.</p>	<p>District in June 2008 entered into an option to purchase the property. By November all of the required \$2.8 million in funding for the purchase, plus \$500,000 for improvements, had been approved, and title issues resolved. <u>Escrow closed on December 24, 2008.</u></p>
<p>Napa River Ecological Reserve Restoration Remove invasive plants and restore native vegetaion in the entryway meadow, replace damaged signage and information panels, restorate the interior trail and interpretive elements, and if feasible install a seasonal bridge.</p>	<p>The State Coastal Conservancy has approved a \$100,000 grant for habitat restoration, environmental education and improved signage; <u>this grant was frozen in December 2008 pending resolution of the State budget crisis.</u> A Notice of Exemption under CEQA has been filed on this project. The grant contract has been signed and the District's partners on the project have met to review approaches and roles. The District is continuing to work with the Resource Conservation District and the Department of Fish and Game and the Conservancy on grant contract documents. One of the District's proposed partners, Acorn Soupe, closed its doors due to financial difficulties; the RCD will assume the student environmental education responsibilities which Acorn Soupe had been slated to provide. The District has assumed the County's role in managing the preserve under the joint management agreement with DFG. The deteriorated information kiosk, which had become a serious eyesore, was removed in November 2008.</p>
<p>Napa River Ecological Reserve Maintenance Routine maintenace to remove litter and grafitti</p>	<p>RFP issued seeking a non-profit contractor to provide the maintenance issued in October 2008. <u>A one-year contract with Options3 was approved in December 2008.</u></p>
<p>Newell Preserve Improvements Provide on-site water supply for group campground and so cattle can be restricted from access to riparian areas.</p>	<p>As part of the arrangement with the land trust on the District's purchase of Berryessa Vista, the land trust is willing to use some of the proceeds from the transaction to fund a well pump and distribution system at the Preserve. However, the first well drilled by the City of American Canyon came up dry. The City has said it will make a second attempt at developing a viable well, but a contract for this work has not yet been approved.</p>

Oat Hill Mine Trail	Grand opening to the Oat Hill Mine Trail with weekend of signage installation, brush removal and erosion control	A major volunteer work party weekend took place May 16-18, 2008, and the trail was then formally opened. <u>A second group of 18 volunteers in November 2008 spent a day doing additional erosion control work. The judge hearing the legal challenge to the trail in December 2008 denied the substance of all of the issues raised by the plaintiff; the County is now waiting to see whether the plaintiff will drop the challenge or appeal the ruling.</u>
Rector Ridge/Stags Leap Ridge Trail	Construction of staging area and 6+ miles of Ridge Trail climbing east from Silverado Trail near Rector Creek.	CEQA on this project was completed several years ago--though this may require minor updating. The project concept has been approved by the District Board. Staff has met with the Pathway Home Project leadership at the Veterans Home, who are supportive of the trail as an amenity which will benefit their program. District staff with assistance from the Ridge Trail Council is now preparing a draft agreement for consideration by the Veterans Home.
River to Ridge Trail	Lot line adjustment to legalize River to Ridge Trail as constructed (it currently encroaches on private property in two locations), and improvements to the Highway 221 entrance to the trail.	Lot line adjustment approved by Syar Properties. The California Department of General Services has decided it cannot do a lot line adjustment without legislative authorization; sponsoring legislation to accomplish this has been added to the County's legislative agenda for 2009. In November five Valley Oak trees were planted at the Highway 221 entrance to the trail with the assistance of a volunteer from CNPS. <u>A new information kiosk was installed at the entrance in December 2008 as part of a Boy Scout project.</u>
Skyline Park Protection	Permanent Protection for Skyline Park	Legislation by Senator Wiggins to authorize sale to the County was vetoed by the Governor. The County is now pursuing development of a park overlay zone to protect public lands such as Skyline Park. New language has been included in the new draft General Plan to allow development of a park overlay zone. Staff is now preparing an amendment to the Zoning Ordinance to accomplish this. Chandler and Chandler was retained in November 2008 to assist with the preparation of a Master Plan for the park; that work is now underway.
Skyline Park Improvements	Partner-sponsored improvement include a second greenhouse and a covered equestrian arena.	The proposals for a second greenhouse and a covered arena improvements were approved by the Department of General Services and by the County Board of Supervisors. The sponsors of these projects are now raising funds for implementation.
South Napa Wetlands Habitat 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. Staff has determined, with City assistance, that there is a legal public pedestrian access easement through the Yacht Club that leads to the property, although the Club has posted a No Trespassing sign at the entrance to the Club which implies the public access does not exist. Staff led a tour of the property on May 22, 2008 in conjunction with the Napa County Watershed Symposium to discuss options and constraints at the site related to public use and environmental education. The District sponsored a workshop with high school science teachers in October to discuss ways to use the site for educational purposes. Park District staff has prepared the first draft of a transfer agreement, which is now under review by the flood district.



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 City Council of the City of Vallejo has officially authorized staff to pursue surplusing of the property. District staff and our partners are continuing to research issues related to the property, including potential public access locations, potential trail alignments, and easements and other encumbrances which affect the property. The State Coastal Conservancy has indicated an interest in assisting with the funding necessary to purchase the property.
Wild Lake Ranch	Possible joint management of trails, camping and picnic areas through agreement between the Land Trust, the District and State Parks	The District is participating in the development of a strategic plan for the property, together with other public lands in the area, that is being led by the Land Trust of Napa County. The advisory committee has met once, and completed a field trip to inspect the property.
<b><u>Completed Projects</u></b>		
Berryessa Vista Acquisition	Purchase of 224 acres from the Land Trust of Napa County for use as a public park.	The purchase is complete. Invoice to the State to obtain Prop 12 reimbursement of the purchase has been submitted.
Connolly Ranch	Construction of patio, restrooms and cooking facilities	The project is complete, and the State has approved Prop 12 reimbursement for project costs.
Linda Falls	Accept conservation easement from Land Trust of Napa County to provide additional protection for this 39 acre property, which is owned by the land trust	Easement acquired in spring of 2008.
Napa River Ecological Reserve	Trash enclosure and removal of graffiti	Project completed.
Napa River Ecological Reserve	Paving the parking area, and control vehicle access through placement of rock barriers	The project is complete, and the State Prop 12 reimbursement has been received.
Napa River Flood Control Easement	Conservation easement held by District to facilitate Flood District project and grant funding	Easement completed.
River to Ridge Trail Enhancements	Installation of animal silhouettes along the entryway fence illustrating the types of birds and mammals that can be found in the area.	Installation completed through an Eagle Scout candidate project.
Skyline Park Improvements Phase I	Prop 12 funding for erosion control work on Lake Marie Road, and paving of campground loop road.	Project is complete, and Prop 12 reimbursement has been received.