



**NAPA COUNTY REGIONAL PARK &
OPEN SPACE DISTRICT**

Karen Bower Turjanis
Director, Ward One

Tony Norris
Director, Ward Two

Brent Randol
Director, Ward Three

Dave Finigan
Director, Ward Four

Barry Christian
Director, Ward Five

AGENDA

BOARD OF DIRECTORS REGULAR MEETING

Monday, July 13, 2020 at 2:00 P.M.

Via Zoom Conference Call

Instructions for Joining Zoom Meeting

Internet access

<https://zoom.us/j/91590876902?pwd=d0hFeUdzUIBzT3BhU2l3S25CVjhUZz09>

Meeting ID: 915 9087 6902

Password: 553550

Or Call In Access

One tap mobile

+14086380968,,91590876902#,,,0#,,553550# US (San Jose)

+16699006833,,91590876902#,,,0#,,553550# US (San Jose)

Dial by your location

+1 408 638 0968 US (San Jose)

+1 669 900 6833 US (San Jose)

+1 253 215 8782 US (Tacoma)

+1 346 248 7799 US (Houston)

+1 312 626 6799 US (Chicago)

+1 646 876 9923 US (New York)

+1 301 715 8592 US (Germantown)

Meeting ID: 915 9087 6902

Password: 553550

Find your local number: <https://zoom.us/u/achaBnLWW1>

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.

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 707.299.1377.

Prior to action on any item, the Board President will ask for comments from any member of the audience. 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 Directors 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 NCRPOSD Office at 1195 Third Street, Suite 210, Napa, California 94559, Monday through Friday, between the hours of 8:00 a.m. and 4:30 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 §§6253.5, 6254, 6254.3, 6254.7, 6254.15, 6254.16, or 6254.22.

1. Call to Order and Roll Call

2. Public Comment

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

3. Set Matters

none

4. Administrative Items

- a. Consideration and potential approval of minutes for Board of Directors meeting of June 8, 2020. (page 4)
- b. Consideration and potential adoption of corrections to budget for FY 20-21. (page 6)
- c. Consideration and potential approval of Resolution calling a governing Board Member election and consolidating it with the November 3, 2020 general election for the purpose of electing three members of the Governing Board. (page 24)
- d. Consideration of fee adjustment for pool use at Bothe-Napa Valley State Park. (page 28)

- e. Consideration and potential approval of updated Local Guidelines for Implementing the California Environmental Quality Act. (page 29)
- f. Consideration and potential approval of Resolution approving grant application to Proposition 68 Per Capita Program. (page 124)
- g. Consideration and potential approval of Resolution 20-01, rescinding Resolution 19-04, of Resolution 20-02, rescinding Resolution 19-05, and actions rescinding approval of certain related contracts and revising the District Personnel Manual. (page 128)
- h. Receipt of report on expenditures, encumbrances, donations, and grants approved by District staff for June 2020. (page 133)
- i. Review of the District Projects Status Report. (page 128)
- j. Receipt of monthly report for Bothe-Napa Valley State Park and the Bale Grist Mill State Historic Park. (page 156)

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. Other than to determine whether and when such matters should be agendaized, no action will be taken by the Board on these items unless specifically noted otherwise.

7. Adjournment



**NAPA COUNTY REGIONAL PARK &
OPEN SPACE DISTRICT**

Karen Bower Turjanis
Director, Ward One

Tony Norris
Director, Ward Two

Brent Randol
Director, Ward Three

Dave Finigan
Director, Ward Four

Barry Christian
Director, Ward Five

DRAFT MINUTES

BOARD OF DIRECTORS REGULAR MEETING

Monday, June 8, 2020 at 2:00 P.M.

Via Zoom Conference Call

1. Call to Order and Roll Call

Directors Present: Karen Bower-Turjanis, Davie Finigan, Tony Norris and Barry Christian.

Staff Present: John Woodbury, Ryan Ayers and Alexandria Quackenbush.

2. Public Comment

None.

3. Set Matters

2:00 pm Public Hearing and Adoption of Budget for FY 2020-21 including Salary and Position Allocation Tables

Directors voted to adopt budget for FY 2020-21 including the Salary and Position Allocation Tables.

DF-KBT-TN-BC-BR

X

4. Administrative Items

- a. Consideration and potential approval of minutes for Board of Directors meeting of May 11, 2020.

Minutes for the May 11, 2020 meeting were approved as presented.

KBT-TN-DF-BC-BR

X

- b. Consideration and potential approval of Amendment No. 1 to Agreement No 19-06 with American Sanitation Services for septic pumping services, and Amendment No. 1 to Agreement No. 18-02 with Napa Valley Support Services for cleaning at the Napa River Ecological Reserve.

Directors voted to approve Amendment No. 1 to Agreement No. 19-06 with American Sanitation Services for septic pumping services, and Amendment No. 1 to Agreement No. 18-02 with Napa Valley Support Services for cleaning at the Napa River Ecological Reserve as presented.

KBT-TN-DF-BC-BR

X

- c. Receipt of report on expenditures, encumbrances, donations, and grants approved by District staff for May 2020.
Report received; no action taken.
- d. Review of the District Projects Status Report.
Report received; no action taken.
- e. Receipt of monthly report for Bothe-Napa Valley State Park and the Bale Grist Mill State Historic Park.
Report received; no action taken.

5. Announcements by Board and Staff

- **Director Finigan and Director Norris discussed the shelter in place order.**
- **Director Christian and Director Finigan commented on being grateful the district was able to keep the properties and trails open for the public during shelter in place.**
- **Director Bower-Turjanis asked about the City of Napa and the future of its Department of Parks & Recreation.**

6. Agenda Planning

- **Director Norris and Director Finigan requested the District consider additional methods of fundraising and revenue generation.**

7. Adjournment

Adjourned to the Regular NOSD Board Meeting July 13, 2020.

SIGNED: _____
Barry Christian, Board President

ATTEST: _____
Alexandria Quackenbush, Acting District Secretary

KEY

Vote: TN = Tony Norris; KBT = Karen Bower-Turjanis; DF = David Finigan; BC = Barry Christian; BR = Brent Randol
The maker of the motion and second are reflected respectively in the order of the recorded vote.



STAFF REPORT

By: Kyra Purvis
Date: July 13, 2020
Item: **4.b**
Subject: Consideration and potential adoption of corrections to budget for FY 20-21

RECOMMENDATION

- (1) Adopt corrected budget for FY 20-21

ENVIRONMENTAL DETERMINATION

The proposed action is not a project as defined by 14 California Code of Regulations 15378 (State CEQA Guidelines) and therefore CEQA is not applicable.

BACKGROUND

Minor errors were discovered in the adopted budget for FY 20-21: the District Salaries and Benefits were excluded from the sums of expenditures for the General Fund and several park units. Note that the total expenditures for the District was and is correct, except for a rounding error.

In addition, at the request of the District auditor, \$14,650 for Workers Compensation premiums have been moved from Account #52700 (Insurance-Premiums) within General Administration to Account #51405 (a Workers Compensation subaccount within District Salaries and Benefits).

Napa County Regional Park and Open Space District
Projected FY 2019-20
Summary FY 2019-20 & FY 2020-21

	Q3 Actual	Projected 2019-20	Draft 2020-21
Revenues			
43790 State Grants	\$ -		\$ -
43910 County of Napa	\$ 916,001	\$ 916,001	\$ 1,036,280
44200 Court Fines	\$ 5,000	\$ 5,000	-
44300 Forfeitures and Penalties	\$ 35,960	\$ 35,960	-
45100 Interest	\$ 32,818	\$ 37,844	\$ 21,000
47150 Other Grants	\$ 29,025	\$ 42,425	-
45300 Rent - Building/Land	\$ 702,487	\$ 614,730	\$ 48,300
45500 Concessions	\$ -	\$ 10,000	\$ 614,620
47400 Insurance Settlement	\$ -	\$ -	-
47500 Donations and Contributions	\$ 21,262	\$ 26,352	\$ 74,000
47900 Miscellaneous	\$ 2,518	2,518	-
Total Revenues	\$ 1,745,071	\$ 1,690,830	\$ 1,794,200
Expenses			
51000 District salaries and benefits	\$ 345,168	\$ 460,224	\$ 592,884
52100 Administration Services	\$ 469,040	\$ 625,387	\$ 684,573
52105 Election Services	\$ -	\$ 117,835	\$ 60,000
52125 Accounting/Auditing Services	\$ 9,025	\$ 13,000	\$ 13,000
52140 Legal Services	\$ 5,062	\$ 10,000	\$ 10,000
52325 Waste Disposal Services	\$ 16,505	\$ 21,765	\$ 20,683
52340 Landscaping Services	\$ -	\$ -	\$ 3,500
52345 Janitorial Services	\$ 22	\$ 22	\$ 22
52360 Construction Services	\$ 1,000	\$ 1,000	\$ 314,000
52490 Other Professional Services	\$ 70,786	\$ 86,769	\$ 41,250
52520 Maintenance-Vehicles	\$ 3,974	\$ 5,299	\$ 5,000
52525 Maintenance-Infrastructure/Lan	\$ 2,433	\$ 3,244	\$ 6,200
52700 Insurance--Liability	\$ 19,825	\$ 19,825	\$ 20,000
52705 Insurance - Premiums	\$ 69,258	\$ 80,301	\$ 15,850
52800 Communications/Telephone	\$ 4,278	\$ 5,731	\$ 6,980
52810 Advertising/Marketing	\$ 345	\$ 660	\$ 700
52820 Printing and Binding	\$ 1,612	\$ 2,069	\$ 3,950
52825 Bank Charges	\$ 1,893	\$ 2,524	\$ 2,500
52830 Publications & Legal Notices	\$ -	\$ -	-
52835 Filing Fees	\$ -	\$ -	-
52840 Permits/License Fees	\$ 904	\$ 904	\$ 11,316
52900 Training/Conference Expenses	\$ 349	\$ 579	\$ 3,500
52905 Business Travel/Mileage	\$ 5,961	\$ 7,933	\$ 7,403
52906 Fleet Charges	\$ 4,828	\$ 6,333	\$ 6,600
53100 Office Supplies	\$ 3,106	\$ 7,020	\$ 6,800
53115 Book, Media,Periodicals, Subscrip	\$ 6,539	\$ 6,539	\$ 6,700
53120 Memberships/Certifications	\$ 5,197	\$ 5,197	\$ 7,732
53205 Utilities - Electric	\$ 13,387	\$ 17,846	\$ 20,200
53210 Utilities - Propane	\$ 351	\$ 468	\$ 650
53250 Fuel	\$ -	\$ -	\$ 100
53300 Clothing and Personal Supplies	\$ 1,215	\$ 1,620	\$ 2,500
53320 Safety Supplies	\$ -	\$ -	\$ 500
53330 Janitorial Supplies	\$ 2,188	\$ 3,017	\$ 3,700
53345 Construction Supplies/Material	\$ 3,646	\$ 11,361	\$ 16,500
53350 Maintenance Supplies	\$ 21,180	\$ 27,947	\$ 25,500
53400 Minor Equipment/Small Tools	\$ 3,797	\$ 4,459	\$ 6,000
53410 Computer Equipment/Accessories	\$ 1,087	\$ 1,300	\$ 1,500
53415 Computer Software/Licensing Fe	\$ 495	\$ 7,030	\$ 8,000
53600 Special Departmental Expense	\$ 15,233	\$ 23,574	\$ 15,300
53680 Goods for Resale	\$ 6,563	\$ 7,000	\$ 7,000
54500 Taxes and Assessments	\$ 426	\$ 426	\$ 1,750
55100 Land	\$ 890,243	\$ 890,243	-
Total Expenditures	\$ 2,006,921	\$ 2,486,451	\$ 1,960,343
Net Surplus (Deficit)	\$ (261,850)	\$ (795,621)	\$ (166,143)

Napa County Regional Park and Open Space District
 Projected FY 2019-20
Summary (w/o State Parks) FY 2019-20 & FY 2020-21

	Q3 Actual	Projected 2019-20	Draft 2020-21
Revenues			
State-Other Funding	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -
43910 County of Napa	\$ 916,001	\$ 916,001	\$ 1,036,280
44200 Court Fines	\$ 5,000	\$ 5,000	\$ -
44300 Forfeitures and Penalties	\$ 35,960	\$ 35,960	\$ -
45100 Interest	\$ 20,856	\$ 21,895	\$ 9,000
45300 Rent - Building/Land	\$ 16,425	\$ 25,625	\$ 21,900
45500 Concessions	\$ 14,730	\$ 14,730	\$ 14,620
47150 Other Grants	\$ -	\$ 10,000	\$ -
47400 Insurance Settlement	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -
47500 Donations and Contributions	\$ 7,352	\$ 7,352	\$ -
47900 Miscellaneous	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -
Total Revenues	\$ 1,016,324	\$ 1,036,563	\$ 1,081,800
Expenses			
51000 District Salaries and Benefits	\$ 117,416	\$ 156,555	\$ 311,943
52100 Administration Services	\$ 262,436	\$ 349,915	\$ 318,487
52105 Election Services	\$ -	\$ 117,835	\$ 60,000
52125 Accounting/Auditing Services	\$ 9,025	\$ 13,000	\$ 13,000
52140 Legal Services	\$ 5,062	\$ 10,000	\$ 10,000
52325 Waste Disposal Services	\$ 6,033	\$ 7,802	\$ 5,683
52340 Landscaping Services	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -
52345 Janitorial Services	\$ 22	\$ 22	\$ 22
52360 Construction Services	\$ 1,000	\$ 1,000	\$ 243,000
52490 Other Professional Services	\$ 56,866	\$ 68,209	\$ 31,250
52520 Maintenance-Vehicles	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -
52525 Maintenance-Infrastructure/Lan	\$ -	\$ -	\$ 3,000
52700 Insurance--Liability	\$ 19,825	\$ 19,825	\$ 20,000
52705 Insurance - Premiums	\$ 57,069	\$ 68,112	\$ 14,350
52800 Communications/Telephone	\$ 260	\$ 374	\$ 480
52810 Advertising/Marketing	\$ -	\$ 200	\$ 200
52820 Printing and Binding	\$ 1,291	\$ 1,641	\$ 2,950
52825 Bank Charges	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -
52830 Publications & Legal Notices	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -
52835 Filing Fees	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -
52840 Permits/License Fees	\$ 904	\$ 904	\$ 10,316
52900 Training/Conference Expenses	\$ 65	\$ 200	\$ 1,000
52905 Business Travel/Mileage	\$ 4,082	\$ 5,428	\$ 4,903
52906 Fleet Charges	\$ 1,578	\$ 2,000	\$ 2,000
53100 Office Supplies	\$ 606	\$ 3,687	\$ 3,500
53115 Book, Media,Periodicals, Subscrip	\$ 6,539	\$ 6,539	\$ 6,700
53120 Memberships/Certifications	\$ 5,197	\$ 5,197	\$ 7,732
53205 Utilities - Electric	\$ 29	\$ 35	\$ 200
53210 Utilities - Propane	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -
53250 Fuel	\$ -	\$ -	\$ 100
53300 Clothing and Personal Supplies	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -
53320 Safety Supplies	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -
53330 Janitorial Supplies	\$ -	\$ 100	\$ 200
53345 Construction Supplies/Material	\$ 1,680	\$ 2,240	\$ 1,500
53350 Maintenance Supplies	\$ 4,690	\$ 5,960	\$ 5,500
53400 Minor Equipment/Small Tools	\$ 1,810	\$ 1,810	\$ 1,000
53410 Computer Equipment/Accessories	\$ 1,087	\$ 1,300	\$ 500
53415 Computer Software/Licensing Fees	\$ 495	\$ 7,030	\$ 7,500
53600 Special Departmental Expense	\$ 408	\$ 3,807	\$ 10,300
53680 Goods for Resale	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -
54500 Taxes and Assessments	\$ -	\$ -	\$ 1,250
55100 Land	\$ 890,243	\$ 890,243	\$ -
Total Expenditures	\$ 1,455,718	\$ 1,750,969	\$ 1,098,565
Net Surplus (Deficit)	\$ (439,394)	\$ (714,407)	\$ (16,765)

Restricted/Unrestricted Fund Balance

	June 2019 actual	6/30/2020 (projected)	6/30/2021 (proposed)
<u>RESTRICTED FUNDS</u>			
Moore Creek	\$ 105,478	\$ 118,966	\$ 132,454
Suscol Headwaters	\$ 258,721	\$ 218,035	\$ 26,655
State Parks	\$ 830,325	\$ 746,593	\$ 597,215
Amy's Grove	\$ 7,686	\$ -	\$ -
Total Restricted Funds without State Parks	\$ 371,885	\$ 337,001	\$ 159,109
with State Parks	\$ 1,202,210	\$ 1,083,594	\$ 756,324
<u>UNRESTRICTED FUNDS</u>	\$ 857,112	\$ 190,601	\$ 365,216
<u>Total Restricted and Unrestricted Funds</u>	\$ 2,059,322	\$ 1,274,195	\$ 1,121,540

Projected FY 2019-20 & Draft FY 2020-21

General Fund--Administration

Subdivision: 8500000 - Parks-Administration

	Q3 Actual	Projected	
		2019-20	Draft 2020-21
Revenues			
43910 County of Napa	\$ 373,793	\$ 373,793	\$ 566,084
44200 Court Fines	\$ 5,000	\$ 5,000	
45100 Interest	\$ 17,740	\$ 17,740	\$ 5,000
47150 Other Grants	\$ -		
47500 Donations and Contributions	\$ 6,970	\$ 6,970	
Total Revenues	\$ 403,503	\$ 403,503	\$ 571,084

Expenses			
51000 District Salaries and Benefits	\$ 9,759	\$ 13,012	\$ 65,729
52100 Administration Services	\$ 118,828	\$ 158,437.33	\$ 177,969
52105 Election Services	\$ -	\$ 117,835	\$ 60,000
52125 Accounting/Auditing Services	\$ 9,025	\$ 13,000	\$ 13,000
52140 Legal Services	\$ 5,062	\$ 10,000	\$ 10,000
52345 Janitorial Services	\$ 22	\$ 22	\$ 22
52490 Other Professional Services	\$ 7,301	\$ 8,500	\$ 8,500
52520 Maintenance-Vehicles (outside service)	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -
52700 Insurance--Liability	\$ 19,825	\$ 19,825	\$ 20,000
52705 Insurance - Premiums	\$ 55,934	\$ 66,977	\$ 13,350
52810 Advertising/Marketing	\$ -	\$ 200	\$ 200
52820 Printing and Binding	\$ 942	\$ 1,200	\$ 1,200
52830 Publications & Legal Notices	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -
52840 Permits/License Fees	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -
52900 Training/Conference Expenses	\$ 65	\$ 200	\$ 1,000
52905 Business Travel/Mileage	\$ 86	\$ 100	\$ 100
52906 Fleet Charges (county service)	\$ 1,578	\$ 2,000	\$ 2,000
53100 Office Supplies	\$ 519	\$ 3,500	\$ 3,500
53115 Book, Media,Periodicals, Subscrip	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -
53120 Memberships/Certifications	\$ 5,065	\$ 5,065	\$ 7,600
53250 Fuel	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -
53350 Maintenance Supplies	\$ 22	\$ 35	\$ 1,000
53400 Minor Equipment/Small Tools	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -
53410 Computer Equipment/Accessories	\$ 1,087	\$ 1,300	\$ 500
53415 Computer Software/Licensing Fe	\$ 465	\$ 7,000	\$ 7,500
53600 Special Departmental Expense	\$ 310	\$ 3,300	\$ 3,300

Total Expenditures	\$ 235,895	\$ 418,496	\$ 396,469
---------------------------	-------------------	-------------------	-------------------

Net Surplus (Deficit)	\$ 167,608	\$ (14,993)	\$ 174,615
------------------------------	-------------------	--------------------	-------------------

33100 - Available Fund Balance	\$ 857,112	\$ 190,601
Net Surplus (Deficit)	\$ (14,993)	\$ 174,615
33100 - Ending Fund Balance	\$ 842,119	\$ 365,216
SWEEP OF FUND BALANCES	\$ (651,517)	

Objectives**General operations****Set up employee deferred compensation program**

Projected FY 2019-20 & Draft FY 2020-21

Moore Creek Park

Subdivision: 8501000 - Parks-Moore Creek

	Q3 Actual	Projected 2019-20	Draft 2020-21
Revenues			
43910 County of Napa	\$ 72,935	\$ 72,935	\$ 58,570
44300 Forfeitures and Penalties	\$ 35,960	\$ 35,960	
45300 Rents-Bldgs and Land	\$ 16,425	\$ 25,625	\$ 21,900
47150 Other Grants	\$ -	\$ 10,000	
47500 Donations and Contributions	\$ 382	\$ 382	
Total Revenues	\$ 125,702	\$ 144,902	\$ 80,470

Expenses			
51000 District Salaries and Benefits	\$ 48,133	\$ 64,177	\$ 35,403
52100 Administration Services	\$ 6,664	\$ 8,885	\$ 24,164
52325 Waste Disposal Services	\$ 1,588	\$ 2,117	\$ 2,100
52360 Construction Services	\$ -	\$ -	\$ 5,000
52490 Other Professional Services	\$ 3,079	\$ 3,827	\$ 4,500
52525 Maintenance-Infrastructure/Lan	\$ -	\$ -	
52705 Insurance - Premiums	\$ 1,135	\$ 1,135	\$ 1,000
52800 Communications/Telephone	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -
52820 Printing and Binding	\$ 308	\$ 400	\$ 250
52840 Permits/License Fees	\$ 229	\$ 229	\$ -
52905 Business Travel/Mileage	\$ 1,315	\$ 1,753	\$ 1,753
53100 Office Supplies	\$ 65	\$ 87	\$ -
53205 Utilities - Electric	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -
53250 Fuel	\$ -	\$ -	\$ 100
53345 Construction Supplies/Materials	\$ 1,680	\$ 2,240	\$ 1,000
53350 Maintenance Supplies	\$ 1,986	\$ 2,648	\$ 2,200
53400 Minor Equipment/Small Tools	\$ 1,810	\$ 1,810	\$ 1,000
53600 Special Departmental Expense	\$ 91	\$ 500	\$ 1,000
54500 Taxes and Assessments	\$ -		\$ 1,000
Total Expenditures	\$ 68,083	\$ 89,809	\$ 80,470
Net Surplus (Deficit)	\$ 57,619	\$ 55,093	\$ -

33100 - Available Fund Balance	\$ 105,478	\$ 118,966
Net Surplus (Deficit)	\$ 55,093	\$ -
unadjusted ending fund balance	\$ 160,571	
draw on capital reserve	\$ -	\$ 118,966
add to capital reserve	\$ 13,488	
year end capital reserve	\$ 118,966	\$ 132,454
return to undesignated reserves	\$ (41,605)	

Objectives Monitor property

Maintain houses

Maintain trails

Continue Madrone Trail construction with volunteers

Update brochure/translate to Spanish

Projected FY 2019-20 & Draft FY 2020-21

Oat Hill Mine Trail

Subdivision: 8501001 - Parks-Oat Hill Mine Trail

	Q3 Actual	Projected 2019-20	Draft 2020-21
Revenues			
43910 County of Napa	\$ 10,076	\$ 10,076	\$ 7,718
Total Revenues	\$ 10,076	\$ 10,076	\$ 7,718

Expenses			
51000 District Salaries and Benefits	\$ 1,629	\$ 2,172	\$ 2,482
52100 Administration Services	\$ 3,143	\$ 4,191	\$ 3,686
52360 Construction Services	\$ -		-
52490 Other Professional Services	\$ -		\$ 250
52820 Printing and Binding	\$ -		\$ 250
52905 Business Travel/Mileage	\$ 712	\$ 949	\$ 950
53100 Office Supplies	\$ -		\$ -
53345 Construction Supplies/Material	\$ -		\$ -
53350 Maintenance Supplies	\$ -		\$ 100
53600 Special Departmental Expense	\$ -		\$ -
55100 Land	\$ -		\$ -

Total Expenditures	\$ 5,484	\$ 7,312	\$ 7,718
---------------------------	-----------------	-----------------	-----------------

Net Surplus (Deficit)	\$ 4,592	\$ 2,764	\$ -
------------------------------	-----------------	-----------------	-------------

33100 - Available Fund Balance	\$ -	\$ -
Net Surplus (Deficit)	\$ 2,764	\$ -
33100 - Ending Fund Balance	\$ 2,764	\$ -
return to undesignated reserve	\$ (2,764)	

Objectives

Monitor property

Continue erosion control

Update brochure/ translate to Spanish

Projected FY 2019-20 & Draft FY 2020-21

Napa River and Bay Trail

Subdivision: 8501002 - Parks-Napa River and Bay Trail

	Q3 Actual	Projected 2019-20	Draft 2020-21
Revenues			
43910 County of Napa	\$ 12,382	\$ 12,382	\$ 6,774
47500 Donations and Contributions	\$ -		
Total Revenues	\$ 12,382	\$ 12,382	\$ 6,774

Expenses			
51000 District Salaries and Benefits	\$ 1,089	\$ 1,452	\$ 1,654
52100 Administration Services	\$ 4,297	\$ 5,729	\$ 4,130
52325 Waste Disposal Services	\$ -		\$ -
52360 Construction Services	\$ -		\$ -
52490 Other Professional Services	\$ 138	\$ -	\$ 500
52820 Printing and Binding	\$ -		\$ 250
52905 Business Travel/Mileage	\$ 106	\$ 141	\$ 140
53345 Construction Supplies/Materials	\$ -		\$ -
53350 Maintenance Supplies	\$ 1,248	\$ 1,400	\$ 100
53600 Special Departmental Expense	\$ -		\$ -

Total Expenditures **\$ 6,878** **\$ 8,723** **\$ 6,774**

Net Surplus (Deficit) **\$ 5,504** **\$ 3,659** **\$ -**

33100 - Available Fund Balance	\$	-	\$	-
Net Surplus (Deficit)	\$	3,659	\$	-
33100 - Ending Fund Balance	\$	3,659	\$	-
return to undesignated reserve	\$	(3,659)		

Objectives

- Monitor property**
- Seek approvals to complete trail**
- Maintain existing trail in Am Can and under Butler Bridge**
- New brochure/translate to Spanish**
- New signage for kiosks**

Projected FY 2019-20 & Draft FY 2020-21
Camp Berryessa

Subdivision: 8501003 - Parks-Camp Berryessa

	Q3 Actual	Projected 2019-20	Draft 2020- 21
Revenues			
43410 State-Coastal Conservancy			
43910 County of Napa	\$ 18,400	\$ 18,400	\$ 41,543
45500 Concessions	\$ 10,110	\$ 10,110	\$ 10,000
Total Revenues	\$ 28,510	\$ 28,510	\$ 51,543

Expenses			
51000 District Salaries and Benefits	\$ 13,696	\$ 18,261	\$ 29,002
52100 Administration Services	\$ 13,647	\$ 18,196	\$ 10,443
52325 Waste Disposal Services	\$ 1,187	\$ 1,583	\$ 1,583
52360 Construction Services		\$ -	\$ -
52490 Other Professional Services	\$ 3,050	\$ 3,300	\$ 500
52525 Maintenance-Infrastructure/Lan	\$ -	\$ -	\$ 3,000
52810 Advertising/Marketing	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -
52820 Printing and Binding	\$ -	\$ -	\$ 250
52840 Permits/License Fees	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -
52905 Business Travel/Mileage	\$ 349	\$ 465	\$ 465
52906 Fleet Charges	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -
53100 Office Supplies	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -
53205 Utilities - Electric	\$ 29	\$ 35	\$ 200
53330 Janitorial Supplies	\$ -	\$ 100	\$ 200
53345 Construction Supplies/Material	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -
53350 Maintenance Supplies	\$ 677	\$ 903	\$ 900
53400 Minor Equipment/Small Tools	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -
53600 Special Departmental Expense	\$ -	\$ -	\$ 5,000

Total Expenditures	\$ 32,635	\$ 42,843	\$ 51,543
---------------------------	------------------	------------------	------------------

Net Surplus (Deficit)	\$ (4,125)	\$ (14,333)	\$ -
------------------------------	-------------------	--------------------	-------------

33100 - Available Fund Balance	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -
Net Surplus (Deficit)	\$ (14,333)	\$ -	\$ -
33100 - Ending Fund Balance	\$ (14,333)	\$ -	\$ -
draw from undesignated reserve	\$ 14,333		

Objectives Monitor property

Increase promotion/usage

Prepare Camp brochure

Projected FY 2019-20 & Draft FY 2020-21

Berryessa Vista

Subdivision: 8501004 - Parks-Berryessa Vista

	Q3 Actual	Projected 2019-20	Draft 2020-21
Revenues			
43910 County of Napa	\$ 9,427	\$ 9,427	\$ 7,358
Total Revenues	\$ 9,427	\$ 9,427	\$ 7,358

Expenses			
51000 District Salaries and Benefits	\$ 1,114	\$ 1,485	\$ 3,309
52100 Administration Services	\$ 1,193	\$ 1,591	\$ 2,799
52490 Other Professional Services	\$ -		\$ 500
52820 Printing and Binding	\$ -		\$ 250
52905 Business Travel/Mileage	\$ -		\$ -
53345 Construction Supplies/Materials	\$ -		\$ 500
53600 Special Departmental Expense	\$ 7	\$ 7	\$ -
55100 Land	\$ -		\$ -
Total Expenditures	\$ 2,314	\$ 3,083	\$ 7,358
Net Surplus (Deficit)	\$ 7,113	\$ 6,344	\$ -

33100 - Available Fund Balance	\$ -	\$ -
Net Surplus (Deficit)	\$ 6,344	\$ -
33100 - Ending Fund Balance	\$ 6,344	\$ -
return to undesignated reserve	\$ (6,344)	

Objectives Monitor property

Improve trail and signage from lake

Prepare brochure for park/translate to Spanish

Projected FY 2019-20 & Draft FY 2020-21
Suscol Headwaters

Subdivision: 8501009 - Parks-Suscol Headwaters Pres

	Q3 Actual	Projected 2019-20	Draft 2020- 21
Revenues			
43790 State-Other Funding	\$ -		
43910 County of Napa	\$ 6,950	\$ 6,950	\$ 53,469
45100 Interest	\$ 3,116	\$ 4,155	\$ 4,000
47150 Other grants	\$ -		
45500 Concessions	\$ 4,620	\$ 4,620	\$ 4,620
47500 Donations and Contributions	\$ -		
Total Revenues	\$ 14,686	\$ 15,725	\$ 62,089

Expenses			
51000 District Salaries and Benefits	\$ 12,806	\$ 17,075	\$ 14,919
52100 Administration Services	\$ 27,803	\$ 37,071	\$ 27,370
52360 Construction Services			\$ 200,000
52490 Other Professional Services	\$ 2,088	\$ 2,088	\$ 5,500
52820 Printing and Binding	\$ -		\$ 250
52840 Permits/License Fees	\$ -		\$ 5,000
52905 Business Travel/Mileage	\$ 133	\$ 177	\$ 180
53345 Construction Supplies/Materials	\$ -		\$ -
53600 Special Departmental Expense	\$ -		\$ -
54500 Taxes and Assessments	\$ -		\$ 250
55100 Land	\$ -		\$ -
Total Expenditures	\$ 42,830	\$ 56,411	\$ 253,469

Net Surplus (Deficit)	\$ (28,144)	\$ (40,686)	\$ (191,380)
------------------------------	--------------------	--------------------	---------------------

33100 - Available Fund Balance	\$ 258,721	\$ 218,035
Net Surplus (Deficit)	\$ (40,686)	\$ (191,380)
33100 - Ending Fund Balance	\$ 218,035	\$ 26,655
draw/return to undesignated	0	

Objectives Monitor property

Secure easement(s) and design staging area

Construct frog pond (funding and costs to be carried over from prior fis

Trail signage

Projected FY 2019-20 & Draft FY 2020-21
Napa River Ecological Reserve

Subdivision: 8501005 - Parks-Napa River Ecological Rs

	Q3 Actual	Projected 2019-20	Draft 2020- 21
Revenues			
43910 County of Napa	\$ 15,909	\$ 15,909	\$ 10,516
Total Revenues	\$ 15,909	\$ 15,909	\$ 10,516

Expenses			
51000 District Salaries and Benefits	\$ 1,368	\$ 1,824	\$ 6,287
52100 Administration Services	\$ 2,705	\$ 3,607	\$ 2,799
52325 Waste Disposal Services	\$ 2,532	\$ 3,376	
52340 Landscaping Services	\$ -		\$ -
52490 Other Professional Services	\$ 4,552	\$ 6,552	\$ 500
52800 Communications/Telephone	\$ 260	\$ 374	\$ 480
52820 Printing and Binding	\$ -		\$ 250
52905 Business Travel/Mileage	\$ 101	\$ 135	\$ -
53350 Maintenance Supplies	\$ 101	\$ 135	\$ 200
53600 Special Departmental Expense	\$ -		\$ -

Total Expenditures **\$ 11,619** **\$ 16,002** **\$ 10,516**

Net Surplus (Deficit) **\$ 4,290** **\$ (93)** **\$ -**

33100 - Available Fund Balance	\$	-	\$	-
Net Surplus (Deficit)	\$	(93)	\$	-
33100 - Ending Fund Balance	\$	(93)	\$	-
draw from undesignated reserve	\$	93		

Objectives Monitor property

Continue portable toilet, weekly maintenance contracts

Projected FY 2019-20 & Draft FY 2020-21

Vine Trail

Subdivision: 8501006 - Parks-Vine Trail

	Q3 Actual	Projected 2019-20	Draft 2020-21
Revenues			
43910 County of Napa	\$ 5,375	\$ 5,375	\$ 2,540
Total Revenues	\$ 5,375	\$ 5,375	\$ 2,540

Expenses			
51000 District Salaries and Benefits	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -
52100 Administration Services	\$ 1,878	\$ 2,504	\$ 2,540
52905 Business Travel/Mileage			\$ -

Total Expenditures	\$ 1,878	\$ 2,504	\$ 2,540
---------------------------	-----------------	-----------------	-----------------

Net Surplus (Deficit)	\$ 3,497	\$ 2,871	\$ -
------------------------------	-----------------	-----------------	-------------

33100 - Available Fund Balance	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -
Net Surplus (Deficit)	\$ 2,871	\$ -	\$ -
33100 - Ending Fund Balance	\$ 2,871	\$ -	\$ -
return to undesignated reserve	\$ (2,871)		

Objectives Monitor property

Coordinate VT/NRBT alignment between Am Can and Soscol Ferry Rd

Support VT alignment affecting State Park

Obtain easement for crossing Syar property

Projected FY 2019-20 & Draft FY 2020-21

Putah Creek

Subdivision: 8501007 - Parks-Putah Creek

	Q3 Actual	Projected 2019-20	Draft 2020- 21
Revenues			
43910 County of Napa	\$ 13,091	\$ 13,091	\$ 5,972
47900 Miscellaneous	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -
Total Revenues	\$ 13,091	\$ 13,091	\$ 5,972

Expenses			
51000 District Salaries and Benefits	\$ 1,102	\$ 1,469	\$ 1,654
52100 Administration Services	\$ 2,439	\$ 3,252	\$ 3,686
52360 Construction Services	\$ -		\$ -
52490 Other Professional Services	\$ 301	\$ 301	\$ -
52840 Permits/License Fees	\$ 316	\$ 316	\$ 316
52905 Business Travel/Mileage	\$ 236	\$ 315	\$ 315
53345 Construction Supplies/Materials	\$ -		
53350 Maintenance Supplies	\$ -		
53600 Special Dept Expense	\$ -		
54500 Taxes and Assessments	\$ -		

Total Expenditures	\$ 4,394	\$ 5,653	\$ 5,972
---------------------------	-----------------	-----------------	-----------------

Net Surplus (Deficit)	\$ 8,697	\$ 7,438	\$ -
------------------------------	-----------------	-----------------	-------------

33100 - Available Fund Balance	\$ -	\$ -
Net Surplus (Deficit)	\$ 7,438	\$ -
33100 - Ending Fund Balance	\$ 7,438	\$ -
return to undesignated reserve	\$ (7,438)	

Objectives Monitor property

Work on R&PP transfer from BLM

Work on access issue for Spanish Valley

Work on conservation easement for Spanish Valley

Seek agreement wih LBEPOA

Projected FY 2019-20 & Draft FY 2020-21 State Parks

Subdivision: 8501008 - Parks-State Parks

	Projected 2019-20	Adopted 2020-21
Revenues		
45100 Interest	\$ 15,949	12,000
45300 Rent - Building/Land	\$ 16,800	26,400
45500 Concessions	600,000	600,000
47500 Donations and Contributions	19,000	74,000
47900 Miscellaneous	2,518	-
Total Revenues	\$ 651,749	\$ 712,400

	Projected 2019-20	Adopted 2020-21
Expenses		
51000 District Salaries and Benefits	\$ 303,669	\$ 280,942
52100 Administration Services	\$ 275,472	\$ 366,086
52325 Waste Disposal Services	\$ 13,963	\$ 15,000
52340 Landscaping Services	-	\$ 3,500
52360 Construction Services	-	\$ 71,000
52490 Other Professional Services	\$ 18,560	\$ 10,000
52520 Maintenance-Vehicles (outside services)	\$ 5,299	\$ 5,000
52525 Maintenance-Infrastructure/Lan	\$ 3,244	\$ 3,200
52705 Insurance - Premiums	12,189	\$ 1,500
52800 Communications/Telephone	5,357	\$ 6,500
52810 Advertising/Marketing	460	\$ 500
52820 Printing and Binding	428	\$ 1,000
52825 Bank Charges	2,524	\$ 2,500
52840 Permits/License Fees	-	\$ 1,000
52900 Training/Conference Expenses	379	\$ 2,500
52905 Business Travel/Mileage	2,505	\$ 2,500
52906 Fleet Charges (county services)	4,333	\$ 4,600
53100 Office Supplies	3,333	\$ 3,300
53205 Utilities - Electric	17,811	\$ 20,000
53210 Utilities - Propane	468	\$ 650
53250 Fuel	-	-
53300 Clothing and Personal Supplies	1,620	\$ 2,500
53320 Safety Supplies	-	\$ 500
53330 Janitorial Supplies	2,917	\$ 3,500
53345 Construction Supplies/Material	9,121	\$ 15,000
53350 Maintenance Supplies	21,987	\$ 20,000
53400 Minor Equipment/Small Tools	2,649	\$ 5,000
53410 Computer Equipment/Accessories	-	\$ 1,000
53415 Computer Software/Licensing Fe	-	\$ 500
53600 Special Departmental Expense	19,767	\$ 5,000
53680 Goods for Resale	7,000	\$ 7,000
54500 Taxes and Assessments	426	\$ 500
Total Expenditures	\$ 735,482	\$ 861,777
Net Surplus (Deficit)	\$ (83,732)	\$ (149,377)

33100 - Available Fund Balance	\$ 830,325	\$ 746,593
Net Surplus (Deficit)	\$ (83,732)	\$ (149,377)
33100 - Ending Fund Balance	\$ 746,593	\$ 597,215

Objectives ongoing maintenance and operations

- obtain PEF to repair cabin behind Wright House**
- repair Palisades Trail, Coyote Peak Trail**
- complete cemetery restoration**
- increase cabin occupancy rate to 50%**
- make repairs to Silverado House/Banditini House**
- assume responsibility for water system including upgrades at Bale Mill**

Projected FY 2019-20 & Draft FY 2020-21

Amy's Grove

Subdivision: 8501010 - Parks-Amy's Grove

	Q3 Actual	Projected	
		2019-20	Draft 2020-21
Revenues			
43790 State-Other funding	\$ (1,929)	\$ 1,929	\$ -
43910 County of Napa	\$ 185,564	\$ 185,564	\$ 78,588
45500 Concessions	\$ -		
47400 Insurance Settlement			
47500 Donations and Contributions	\$ -		
Total Revenues	\$ 185,564	\$ 185,564	\$ 78,588

Expenses			
51000 District Salaries and Benefits	\$ 5,713	\$ 7,617	\$ 13,754
52100 Administration Services	\$ 12,700	\$ 16,933	\$ 12,834
52325 Waste Disposal Services	\$ 726	\$ 726	\$ 2,000
52360 Construction Services	\$ 1,000	\$ 1,000	\$ 37,000
52490 Other Professional Services	\$ 19,098	\$ 25,382	\$ 10,500
52835 Filing Fees	\$ -		\$ -
52840 Permits/License Fees	\$ 359	\$ 359	\$ -
52905 Business Travel/Mileage	\$ 686	\$ 915	\$ 500
52906 Fleet Charges	\$ -		\$ -
53100 Office Supplies	\$ -		\$ -
53250 Fuel	\$ -		\$ -
53345 Construction Supplies/Materials	\$ -		\$ -
53350 Maintenance Supplies	\$ 525	\$ 700	\$ 1,000
53400 Minor Equipment/Small Tools	\$ -		\$ -
53600 Special Department Expense	\$ -		\$ 1,000
54500 Taxes and Assessments	\$ -		\$ -
55100 Land	\$ 890,243	\$ 890,243	\$ -
Total Expenditures	\$ 931,050	\$ 943,875	\$ 78,588

Net Surplus (Deficit)	\$ (745,486)	\$ (758,311)	\$ -
------------------------------	---------------------	---------------------	-------------

33100 - Available Fund Balance	\$ 7,686	\$ -
Net Surplus (Deficit)	\$ (758,311)	\$ -
33100 - Ending Fund Balance	\$ (750,625)	\$ -
draw from undesignated reserve	\$ 750,625	

Objectives

Obtain CLN

Monitor properties

Design new water system for The Cove

Complete fire cleanup: road repair and invasive control

Repair trails

Demo shacks on Chamberlain with volunteers

Projected FY 2019-20 & Draft FY 2020-21
Cedar Roughs/Smittle Creek

Subdivision: 8501011 - Parks-Cedar Roughs

	Q3 Actual	Projected	
		2019-20	Draft 2020-21
Revenues			
43910 County of Napa	\$ 26,038	\$ 26,038	\$ 20,970
47500 Donations and Contributions	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -
Total Revenues	\$ 26,038	\$ 26,038	\$ 20,970

Expenses			
51000 District Salaries and Benefits	\$ 1,976	\$ 2,635	\$ 9,373
52100 Administration Services	\$ 1,638	\$ 2,184	\$ 5,597
52325 Waste Disposal Services	\$ -		\$ -
52360 Construction Services	\$ -		\$ 1,000
52490 Other Professional Services	\$ -	\$ 1,000	\$ -
52840 Permits/License Fees	\$ -		\$ 5,000
52905 Business Travel/Mileage	\$ -		\$ -
53350 Maintenance Supplies	\$ 27	\$ 36	\$ -
53600 Special Departmental Expense	\$ -		\$ -
54500 Taxes and Assessments	\$ -		\$ -
55100 Land	\$ -		\$ -
Total Expenditures	\$ 3,641	\$ 5,855	\$ 20,970
Net Surplus (Deficit)	\$ 22,397	\$ 20,183	\$ -

33100 - Available Fund Balance	\$ -	\$ -
Net Surplus (Deficit)	\$ 20,183	\$ -
33100 - Ending Fund Balance	\$ 20,183	\$ -
return to undesignated reserve	\$ (20,183)	

Objectives

- Monitor property**
- Obtain Use Permit**
- Finalize agreement with BOR**

Projected FY 2019-20 & Draft FY 2020-21

Other Projects

Subdivision: xxxxx - Parks-Other Projects

	Q3 Actual	Projected 2019-20	Draft 2020- 21
Revenues			
43910 County of Napa	\$ 166,061	\$ 166,061	\$ 176,180
47150 Other Grants	\$ -		
47500 Donations and Contributions	\$ -		
Total Revenues	\$ 166,061	\$ 166,061	\$ 176,180

Expenses			
51000 District Salaries and Benefits	\$ 19,031	\$ 25,375	\$ 128,376
52100 Administration Services	\$ 65,501	\$ 87,335	\$ 40,472
52490 Other Professional Services	\$ 17,259	\$ 17,259	\$ -
52800 Communications/Telephone	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -
52810 Advertising/marketing		\$ -	\$ -
52820 Printing and Binding	\$ 41	\$ 41	\$ -
52905 Business Travel/Mileage	\$ 358	\$ 477	\$ 500
53100 Office Supplies	\$ 22	\$ 100	\$ -
53115 Books/Media/Periodicals/Subsc	\$ 6,539	\$ 6,539	\$ 6,700
53120 Memberships/Certifications	\$ 132	\$ 132	\$ 132
53300 Clothng and Personal Supplies		\$ -	\$ -
53350 Maintenance Supplies	\$ 104	\$ 104	\$ -
53415 Computer Software/Licencing Fee	\$ 30	\$ 30	\$ -
53600 Special Departmental Expense	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -
55100 Land	\$ -		\$ -

Total Expenditures \$ 109,017 \$ 137,392 \$ 176,180

Net Surplus (Deficit) \$ 57,044 \$ 28,669 \$ -

33100 - Available Fund Balance	\$ -	\$ -
Net Surplus (Deficit)	\$ 28,669	\$ -
33100 - Ending Fund Balance	\$ 28,669	\$ -
return to undesignated reserve	\$ (28,669)	

Objectives

Investigate/develop new projects

Community outreach and involvement (newsletter, website, social media,

Continue monthly guided walks

Fundraising (fee programs/grants)



STAFF REPORT

By: John Woodbury
Date: July 13, 2020
Item: **4.C**
Subject: Resolution calling for election and consolation with November 2020 General Election

RECOMMENDATION

Adopt the attached resolution

ENVIRONMENTAL DETERMINATION

The proposed action is not a project as defined by 14 California Code of Regulations 15378 (State CEQA Guidelines) and therefore CEQA is not applicable.

BACKGROUND

Terms for three seats on the District Board of Directors are up at the end of this year (Wards 2, 3 and 4). As in the past, the District needs to call for the election for these three seats, and for the sake of efficiency should consolidate this election with the General Election scheduled for this November 3, 2020. The attached resolution accomplishes these two purposes.

If the resolution is adopted, candidates may pull their candidacy papers at the County Registrar of Voters office starting Monday July 13th. Papers need to be filed no later than Friday August 7th, 2020, unless the incumbent does not file, in which case the deadline is extended for others to file up through August 14th. Candidates will need to collect 50 signatures of support from registered voters in Napa County. Candidates who file a candidate statement will need to reimburse the County of Napa Registrar's Office for the cost of those statements. All other County election costs will be reimbursed by the District. If only the incumbent Director files, that person will be appointed by the remaining Directors, and the seat will not appear on the November ballot.

All questions about the election process should be directed to the County of Napa Registrar of Voters, who will conduct the election.

RESOLUTION NO. _____**RESOLUTION OF THE BOARD OF DIRECTORS OF THE NAPA COUNTY REGIONAL PARK AND OPEN SPACE DISTRICT CALLING A GOVERNING BOARD MEMBER ELECTION AND CONSOLIDATING IT WITH THE NOVEMBER 3, 2020 GENERAL ELECTION FOR THE PURPOSE OF ELECTING THREE MEMBERS OF THE GOVERNING BOARD**

WHEREAS, on November 7, 2006 the voters of Napa County established the Napa County Regional Park and Open Space District pursuant to the provisions of Article 3, Chapter 3 of Division 5 of the Public Resources Code (commencing with Section 5500) with responsibility for protecting and stewarding public open space resources and providing outdoor recreational and educational opportunities; and

WHEREAS, Public Resources Code Section 5528 sets forth the manner of nomination and election of District Directors; and

WHEREAS, Public Resources Code Section 5530 sets forth the manner of requesting consolidation of the governing board election with the November 3, 2020 General Election.

NOW, THEREFORE, BE IT RESOLVED that the Governing Board of the Napa County Regional Park and Open Space District pursuant to Elections Code 12001 herewith calls a governing board election for November 3, 2020. The manner of holding the election shall, unless Article 3 of Chapter 3 of Division 5 of the Public Resources Code provides otherwise, be in accordance with the general election laws of the State for a local election which is consolidated with a statewide election.

BE IT FURTHER RESOLVED that the Governing Board of the Napa County Regional Park and Open Space District herewith requests the Napa County Board of Supervisors to consolidate the governing board election with the statewide election to be held on said day, and all precincts established and all election officers appointed for said statewide election shall be the precincts and election officers for said governing board election, and said election officers shall conduct said election and make return thereof according to law.

BE IT FURTHER RESOLVED that the Governing Board of the Napa County Regional Park and Open Space District herewith requests the Napa County Registrar of Voters to conduct the governing board election on behalf of the District with the understanding that the District will reimburse the County of Napa for all costs associated with conducting the election.

BE IT FURTHER RESOLVED that pursuant to Public Resources Code 5532(e) if, by 5 p.m. on the 83rd day prior to the day fixed for the ensuing general election, only one person has been nominated for any elective office to be filled at that election, or no one has been nominated for the office, the board of directors shall make the appointments.

BE IT FURTHER RESOLVED that any person may be nominated for the office of director of the District upon written petition of 50 or more qualified electors of the ward in which the nominee resides.

BE IT FURTHER RESOLVED that a person is not entitled to serve as a director unless he is a resident and elector of the ward and district as provided in Public Resources Code section 5522.

BE IT FURTHER RESOLVED that directors shall be nominated and elected by ward, as provided in Public Resources Code section 5527.

BE IT FURTHER RESOLVED that the Registrar of Voters is hereby authorized and ordered to set and collect fees for the filing of candidate statements, as authorized by Elections Code section 13307.

BE IT FURTHER RESOLVED that the election, including the nomination and election of directors of the District shall be held and conducted and the result ascertained, determined and declared as provided by law.

BE IT FURTHER RESOLVED that the Board hereby delegates to the Registrar of Voters the task of canvassing the votes cast on the proposition and canvassing the returns of the election with respect to the persons voted for as directors.

BE IT FURTHER RESOLVED that Public Resources Code section 5532 and relevant sections of the Elections Code shall apply to the election of directors, nomination papers, certification of candidates, and oaths of office.

BE IT FURTHER RESOLVED that for election of directors, the persons receiving the highest number of votes for each ward, respectively, shall be elected directors of the district to hold office until their successors are elected and qualified, or as otherwise provided by law. In the case of a tie vote, the provisions of Elections Code 15651(a) shall apply and the winner will be determined by lot.

BE IT FURTHER RESOLVED that the election, including the nomination and election of directors and all matters not otherwise provided for by Article 3 of Chapter 3 of Division 5 of the Public Resources Code beginning with sections 5500 et seq., shall be held and conducted and the result ascertained, determined, and declared in accordance with the general election laws of the State, as nearly as may be.

BE IT FURTHER RESOLVED that pursuant to Public Resources Code section 5529 the Registrar of Voters shall give notice of the election stating the governing board wards that shall

be filled at the election.

THE FOREGOING RESOLUTION WAS DULY AND REGULARLY ADOPTED
by the Governing Board of the Napa County Regional Park and Open Space District at a regular meeting of the Board held on the 13th day of July, 2020, by the following vote:

AYES: DIRECTORS _____

NOES: DIRECTORS _____

ABSENT: DIRECTORS _____

ATTEST:
District Secretary

By: _____

APPROVED AS TO FORM
Office of County Counsel
By: *Chris R.Y. Apallas*
Date: June 23, 2020

**APPROVED BY THE NAPA COUNTY
REGIONAL PARK AND OPEN SPACE
DISTRICT**
Date: _____
Processed by: _____
District Secretary



STAFF REPORT

By: John Woodbury
Date: July 13, 2020
Item: **4.d**
Subject: Fee adjustment for Swimming Pool at Bothe-Napa Valley State Park

RECOMMENDATION

1. Open public hearing, take comment, and close the public hearing.
2. Approve modifying the fee for use of the swimming pool at Bothe-Napa Valley State Park as recommended.

ENVIRONMENTAL DETERMINATION

The proposed action is not a project as defined by 14 California Code of Regulations 15378 (State CEQA Guidelines) and therefore CEQA is not applicable.

BACKGROUND

When the District began operation of Bothe-Napa Valley State Park in 2012, the fee for use of the swimming pool was kept unchanged from what State Parks had charged. That fee was \$5 per person, but free for all children under 6 years of age.

The public health orders addressing the current COVID-19 pandemic have required significant changes to how the pool is operated. Key among these is the need to accurately control the number of people who are allowed to use the pool at any given time. The most effective way to do this is to require all pool users (except babies under 6 months old) to purchase a pool pass when checking in at the kiosk.

In addition, the modified pool operation protocols required by the current health orders have significantly increased the cost of operating the pool while also significantly reducing revenues.

Staff therefore requests the Board approve amending the fee for use of the swimming pool to be \$5 per person for all people 6 months or older. The Board's action is subject to State Parks not objecting to the change. State Parks was notified of the proposed change on July 7, and has 10 days upon receiving notice of the proposed change to object.



STAFF REPORT

By: Kyra Purvis
Date: July 13, 2020
Item: 4.e
Subject: Consideration and potential approval of the updated *Local Procedures for Implementing the California Environmental Quality Act* and adoption of the associated Negative Declaration.

RECOMMENDATION

- (1) Open public hearing and take comments on the proposed Negative Declaration.
- (2) Close public hearing and adopt the project Negative Declaration based on recommended findings 1-5, below.
- (3) Approve the proposed updated *Local Procedures for Implementing the California Environmental Quality Act*.

ENVIRONMENTAL DETERMINATION

Negative Declaration Prepared. According to the proposed Negative Declaration, the update would not have any potentially significant effects on the environment. The project site is not on any of the lists of hazardous waste sites enumerated under Government Code §65962.5.

BACKGROUND

The Napa County Regional Park and Open Space District (District) is proposing to update its *Local Procedures for Implementing the California Environmental Quality Act* (Local CEQA Guidelines). Changes are generally minor and clerical in nature. More substantive changes are as follows:

- References to project applicants and sponsors have been deleted, as the District only completes CEQA on its own projects (Sections 401, 506, 601, 604, 700, 802, 803, and 804).
- It has been clarified that speculative future phases of projects shall not be analyzed as part of a project that otherwise has independent utility and logical termini (Section 402).
- Procedures for public notice and review of environmental documents have been clarified (Section 603).
- The following additions have been made to Appendix B, Additional Categorically Exempt Projects for the District:
 - Class 3 (New Construction or Conversion of Small Structures) has been revised to include installation or construction of works of art or craft on a temporary or permanent basis.
 - Class 4 (Minor Alterations to Land) has been revised to include:
 - Vegetation management such as grazing, prescribed fire, and vegetation thinning to reduce wildfire hazard, and

- New trails of natural pervious surface that would not: be located in the vicinity of any candidate, sensitive, or special status species; be located within riparian habitat or other sensitive natural community; have an adverse effect on state or federally protected wetlands; be located in the vicinity of any known cultural resources as shown in Napa County sensitivity mapping; be located or result in unstable soils such that there is a potential for damaging ground failure, landslide, or collapse; or substantially alter existing drainage patterns in a manner that would result in substantial erosion or siltation, increase surface runoff, or impede or redirect flows.
 - Class 23 (Normal Operations of Facilities for Public Gatherings) has been revised to include:
 - Normal operations of developed and undeveloped campgrounds;
 - Dispersed camping (at least 100 feet from any stream or water source and at least 150 feet from any roadway) where allowed by District regulation; and
 - Public gatherings for nature appreciation, sport, science, or public education of a scale and type normally to be expected at a regional park or open space.
- Appendix C, Initial Study Checklist, has been updated to correspond to current *State CEQA Guidelines*.

On June 12, 2020 the District issued a Notice of Intent to Adopt a Negative Declaration pursuant to the California Environmental Quality Act. Public comments must be received in writing by 4:45 pm on July 5, 2020, or submitted to the District Board as part of the public hearing for this item. No comments have been received as of the time of this writing; if additional comments are received at or prior to the hearing we will respond either with an addendum to this staff report or verbally at the hearing.

RECOMMENDED FINDINGS

The Board of Directors has received and reviewed the proposed **Negative Declaration** pursuant to the provisions of CEQA and of the District's Local Procedures for Implementing CEQA, and makes the following findings. That:

1. Prior to taking action on the Negative Declaration and the proposed project, the Board read and considered said Declaration.
2. The Negative Declaration is based on independent judgment exercised by the Board.
3. The Negative Declaration was prepared and considered in accordance with the requirements of the California Environmental Quality Act.
4. Considering the record as whole, there is no substantial evidence that the project will have a significant effect on the environment.
5. The Secretary of the Napa County Regional Park and Open Space District is the custodian of the records of the proceedings on which this decision is based. Records are located at the offices of the Napa County Regional Park and Open Space District, 1125 Third Street, Second Floor, Napa, Calif.



NAPA COUNTY REGIONAL PARK &
OPEN SPACE DISTRICT

LOCAL PROCEDURES
FOR IMPLEMENTING THE
CALIFORNIA ENVIRONMENTAL QUALITY ACT

Adopted July 13, 2020
Revised June 12, 2020

TABLE OF CONTENTS

CHAPTER 1. INTENT AND GENERAL PROVISIONS	1
Section 100. Intent	1
Section 101. Applicability.....	1
Section 102. Compliance Required Prior to Project Approval.	1
Section 103. Public Records.....	1
Section 104. Use of Consultants.....	2
Section 105. Notice Generally.	2
CHAPTER 2. DEFINITIONS.....	3
Section 200. General.....	3
CHAPTER 3. RESPONSIBILITIES	3
Section 300. Board of Directors.....	4
Section 301. reserved.....	4
Section 302. District Official.....	4
Section 303. General Manager.....	4
Section 304. County Clerk/Recorder.	5
CHAPTER 4. INITIAL ENVIRONMENTAL REVIEW	5
Section 400. reserved.....	5
Section 401. Project Completeness and Acceptance for Filing.	5
Section 402. Project Segmenting.	5
Section 403. Project Revisions.....	5
Section 404. Early Consultation.	5
Section 405. Preliminary Environmental Evaluation.....	6
Section 406. Initial Study Preparation.	6
Section 407. Reserved.	6
Section 408. Previous Prepared District Environmental Document.	6
CHAPTER 5. EXEMPT PROJECTS	7
Section 500. General.....	7
Section 501. Ministerial Projects.....	7
Section 502. General Rule.....	7
Section 503. Statutory Exemptions.	7
Section 504. Categorical Exemptions.	7
Section 505. Categorical Exemption Use Limitations.	7
Section 506. Denial of Projects.	7
CHAPTER 6. NEGATIVE/MITIGATED NEGATIVE DECLARATION PROCESS.....	8
Section 600. Negative Declaration.	8
Section 601. Mitigated Negative Declaration.	8
Section 602. Contents.....	8
Section 603. Public Notice and Review.....	8
Section 604. Notice of Determination.....	8
CHAPTER 7. ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACT REPORT (EIR) PROCESS.....	9

Section 700. EIR Preparation..... 9

Section 701. Contents of an EIR..... 9

Section 702. Notice of Preparation (NOP)..... 9

Section 702.1 Scoping..... 9

Section 702.2 Preparation of Administrative Draft EIR..... 9

Section 702.3 Public Review of Draft EIR..... 10

Section 702.4 Final EIR..... 10

Section 702.5 Notice of Determination (NOD)..... 10

CHAPTER 8. MITIGATION MONITORING AND REPORTING PROGRAM (MMRP)10

Section 800. General..... 10

Section 801. Adoption..... 10

Section 802. Contents..... 11

Section 803. Compliance Assurance Responsibilities..... 11

Section 804. Fees..... 11

CHAPTER 9. NAPA COUNTY REGIONAL PARK AND OPEN SPACE DISTRICT AS A RESPONSIBLE AGENCY..... 11

Section 900. Commenting on a Lead Agency’s Environmental Document..... 11

Section 901. Failure of Lead Agency to Consult With District or Adequately Respond to Comments Provided..... 12

Section 902. Approval of Project By District Acting as a Responsible Agency..... 12

Section 903. Limitations on the Power of District as a Responsible Agency to Require Changes in Project.....13

Section 904. Certified Equivalent Program: Use of Environmental Document Prepared In Lieu of a Negative/Mitigated Negative Declaration or EIR.....13

CHAPTER 10. APPEALS.....13

Section 1000. Appeals Permitted.....13

APPENDICES

.....
 .14

- A. Ministerially Exempt Projects for the District
- B. Additional Categorically Exempt Projects for the District
- C. Initial Study Checklist

Napa County Regional Park and Open Space District

LOCAL PROCEDURES FOR IMPLEMENTING THE CALIFORNIA ENVIRONMENTAL QUALITY ACT

State CEQA Guidelines Section 15022(a) requires that each public agency issue local procedures for implementing the *State CEQA Guidelines* in order to ensure the orderly evaluation and preparation of environmental documents. Such procedures shall be revised when needed to be kept current with changes to the *State CEQA Guidelines*; however, *State CEQA Guidelines* shall take precedence even if the local procedures are not updated.

CHAPTER I. INTENT AND GENERAL PROVISIONS

Section 100. Intent.

These local *District CEQA Guidelines* are established, adopted, and intended to meet the requirements of Section 15022(a) of the *State CEQA Guidelines* and to provide the public with information on the procedures used by the District in the environmental review process.

Section 101. Applicability. [*State CEQA Guidelines* §15022(b)]

The procedures established in these guidelines are applicable to both public and private projects under the jurisdiction of the District

Section 102. Compliance Required Prior to Project Approval. [*State CEQA Guidelines* §15004]

No project or permit shall be approved nor shall any permit be issued or approval given by any District official or body until all procedures required by the *State* and *District CEQA Guidelines* have been completed, including, if required, the preparation and certification of a Final Environmental Impact Report (FEIR) by the District. Compliance with CEQA shall be included in the planning process as early as possible in order to allow incorporation of environmental considerations into the design of the project.

Section 103. Public Records. [*Public Records Act*]

- (a) All final documents prepared pursuant to these procedures shall be available for public inspection by prior appointment at the official office for the District, which is the Planning, Building, and Environmental Services Department of the County of Napa, 1195 Third Street, Room 210, Napa, California. Drafts and working papers shall not be considered final documents.
- (b) All reports and documents submitted other than proprietary reports, confidential archaeological and special status species location studies, and other confidential information shall be available for public inspection by prior appointment at the official office for the District.

Section 104. Use of Consultants. *[Authorized by State CEQA Guidelines §§15045, 15074, 15090, 15356, implemented via local procedure below]*

- (a) The District may from time to time use consultants to fulfill its obligations under CEQA including, but not limited to, the preparation of Initial Studies, Negative/Mitigated Negative Declarations, and EIRs.
- (b) All consultant-prepared environmental documents utilized shall be prepared under contract with the District using the most current version of the District's Professional Services Agreement.
- (c) For projects not sponsored by the District, the project sponsor shall pay the full costs of draft and final document preparation including both consultant and District oversight and review costs. A deposit to cover District oversight and review costs shall be paid at the time of application. The deposit shall be made prior to the District contracting with a consultant and prior to commencement of document preparation and in no case later than thirty (30) days after issuance of the letter from the General Manager indicating the estimated cost to produce the document(s) involved.
- (d) When the General Manager determines that it is necessary to contract with a consultant to prepare an environmental document or document(s) for a public project, the choice of consultant shall be made by the General Manager or, for contracts over \$25,000, the District Board of Directors:
- (e) No firm or person having a financial interest in a project shall be employed to prepare environmental documents on that project, except that the General Manager may authorize non-profit organizations and their employees or agents to prepare draft environmental documents for their projects for use by the District.

Section 105. Notice Generally. *[State CEQA Guidelines §§15072 and 15087]*

- (a) The General Manager should make a concerted effort to provide early notice and solicit comments on environmental documents from the public and interested organizations so that a broad range of interests and opinions are available to decision-makers regarding the impacts of projects.
- (b) Any required notice shall be deemed given on the date of mailing, the date of posting, or the first day of publication, whichever is later.
- (c) Errors, irregularities, or neglect in the preparation of any required notice shall not in any way affect the validity or legality of the adoption or certification of environmental documents or approval or disapproval of a project unless such error, irregularity, or neglect is clearly substantial and prejudicial and that by reason of such error, irregularity, or neglect the party complaining suffered substantial injury and that a different result would have been probable if such error, irregularity, or neglect had not occurred.

CHAPTER 2. DEFINITIONS

Section 200. General.

The following definitions, which are specific to the District, are intended to supplement the definitions found in Article 20 of the *State CEQA Guidelines*:

“**Baseline Data Report**” (BDR) refers to the comprehensive inventory of the environmental and resource conditions completed by Napa County in 2005 and updated as needed to describe the baseline for analysis of environmental impacts in a given area of the County. Information from the BDR may be incorporated by reference into future environmental documents consistent with *State CEQA Guidelines* Section 15150.

“**Board**” means the Board of Directors of the Napa County Regional Park and Open Space District

“**County**” means the County of Napa.

“**Days**” means business days, Saturdays, Sundays, and County-recognized holidays, unless otherwise stated.

“**Decision-Making Body**” means the Board or District Official that has the ultimate responsibility for approving the project or permit under consideration.

“**District Official**” means the General Manager or other District staff member responsible for approving the project or permit under consideration.

“**Environmental Resource Mapping System**” means a set of hardcopy and electronic maps and related information maintained by the County Planning, Building, and Environmental Services Department delineating, among other things, environmental resources and hazards within the County.

“**Environmentally Sensitive Area**” means an area containing one or more environmental resources or hazards that may affect or be affected by the specific project involved.

“**General Rule Finding**” means a finding that it can be seen with certainty that there is no possibility the proposed action may have a significant effect on the environment and therefore CEQA is not applicable. [*State CEQA Guidelines* §15061(b)(3)]

“**Groundwater Deficient Area**” means the area shown on Map 13-1 (as may be amended), in Chapter 13.15 of the Napa County Code as well as any additional area formally identified by an ordinance adopted by the Board of Supervisors.

“**General Manager**” means the employee or contractor appointed by the Board as the General Manager of the District, or their designee.

“**Permit**” means any permit, lease, license, certificate, approval, or other entitlement for use.

CHAPTER 3. RESPONSIBILITIES

The responsibilities for implementation of CEQA for the District are as follows:

Section 300. Board of Directors.

When the Board of Directors is the decision-making body on a project, the Board is responsible for certifying the Final EIR, adopting a Negative/Mitigated Negative Declaration, or determining that the project is exempt from environmental review; considering the environmental document prepared prior to taking action on the project; and making the findings required by *State CEQA Guidelines* Sections 15091 (Findings) and 15093 (Statement of Overriding Considerations).

The Board of Directors shall also act as the appeal board for District Official actions on environmental determinations, Negative/Mitigated Negative Declaration adoptions, determinations that an EIR is required, and Final EIR certifications. In addition, the Board shall set the procedures for implementing CEQA in the District by adopting these *District CEQA Guidelines*, and shall be responsible for adopting any thresholds of significance pursuant to *State CEQA Guidelines* Section 15064.7, if desired.

Section 301. *reserved*

Section 302. District Official.

When a District Official is the decision-making body on a project, he/she is responsible for certifying the Final EIR, adopting a Negative/Mitigated Negative Declaration, or determining that the project is exempt from environmental review; considering the environmental document prepared prior to taking action on the project; and making the findings required by *State CEQA Guidelines* Sections 15091 (Findings) and 15093 (Statement of Overriding Considerations).

Section 303. General Manager.

The General Manager or their designee is responsible for:

- (a) carrying out all environmental reviews undertaken by the District;
- (b) obtaining comments from other agencies on the expected environmental effects of a project;
- (c) identifying appropriate measures to reduce the potentially significant effects of a project to non-significant levels;
- (d) preparing and processing all environmental documents prepared by the District;
- (e) preparing Mitigation Monitoring and Reporting Programs where required;
- (f) reviewing and commenting on environmental documents submitted to the District by other public agencies;
- (g) preparing, distributing, and filing applicable environmental notices, including a Notice of Intent, Notice of Preparation, and Notice of Completion, and those Notices of Exemption and Notices of Determination for projects approved by the Board or District Official;
- (h) developing, coordinating, and implementing the District's environmental review procedures consistent with policy direction provided by the Board of Directors;

- (i) establishing informal working thresholds of significance and proposing formal thresholds.

Section 304. County Clerk/Recorder.

The Napa County Clerk/Recorder is responsible for filing and posting all Notices of Intent, Completion, Exemption, and Determination for projects approved by the District. In addition, the Clerk/Recorder receives all Fish and Game fees collected and distributes them to the State.

CHAPTER 4. INITIAL ENVIRONMENTAL REVIEW

Section 400. *reserved*

Section 401. *reserved*

Section 402. Project Segmenting. *[State CEQA Guidelines §15378]*

A project is defined as the “whole of an action” and may not be segmented nor divided into smaller parts in an attempt to avoid full consideration of its environmental impacts. Thus, all of the separate permits and approvals for a particular project shall be considered together (along with the underlying activity itself) when determining the project’s environmental effects. The environmental review of a project must include an analysis of the environmental effects of future expansion or other action if: (a) such future expansion or other action is a reasonably foreseeable consequence of the initial project; and (b) the future expansion or action will be significant in that it will likely change the scope or nature of the initial project or its environmental effects. When actions are remote or speculative, so that meaningful information regarding their impacts is unavailable, they are not reasonably foreseeable parts of a particular project and therefore need not be considered at the same time. Speculative future phases of a project need not be analyzed provided the project under consideration has independent utility and logical termini.

Section 403. Project Revisions.

Any revised or amended project shall be treated as a new project for purposes of determining the time period within which CEQA processing must be completed and the project approved or denied unless the revision is found by the General Manager or their designee to be minor and/or technical.

Section 404. Early Consultation. *[State CEQA Guidelines §15063(g)]*

The General Manager or their designee shall distribute a request for comments on the expected environmental effects of the project to all responsible agencies, trustee agencies, and other agencies and organizations that in the opinion of the General Manager have an interest in the project or applicable special expertise. The request may be combined with the request for comments on the project itself. At a minimum such

requests shall include a request to identify potential impacts, possible mitigation measures, including needed project revisions, and comments on the type of environmental document that should be prepared.

Section 405. Preliminary Environmental Evaluation. *[State CEQA Guidelines §§15060 and 15061]*

The General Manager is responsible for conducting a preliminary evaluation to decide whether or not an Initial Study is required, or whether the project is excluded or exempt from review under CEQA.

A list of non-discretionary (ministerial) projects for the District is contained in Appendix A. The District projects that are typically categorically exempt are identified in Appendix B.

If the General Manager determines that a proposal is excluded or exempt from review under CEQA, no further environmental review is required and the General Manager shall document this finding in the record. The General Manager may also prepare and file a Notice of Exemption.

Section 406. Initial Study Preparation. *[State CEQA Guidelines §§15063 and 15064]*

If a proposed project is not excluded or exempt from CEQA, the General Manager or their designee shall prepare an Initial Study to determine whether a Negative/Mitigated Negative Declaration or an EIR is required for the proposed project. If it is clear that the project may have an unavoidable significant effect on the environment, the General Manager may proceed with preparation of an EIR without preparing an Initial Study. A standard Initial Study checklist form is contained in Appendix C.

If the Initial Study determines, based on substantial evidence in light of the whole record, that the project has no potential to have a significant effect on the environment, then a Negative Declaration shall be prepared (see Chapter 6). If the project may have one or more significant impacts on the environment, then preparation of an EIR (see Chapter 7) is required. However, if revisions or mitigation measures can be applied to the project that would clearly reduce all impacts to a level of insignificance then a Mitigated Negative Declaration may be prepared (see Chapter 6).

Section 407. *reserved*

Section 408. Previously Prepared District Environmental Document. *[State CEQA Guidelines §15162(a)]*

- (a) If a previous EIR or Negative/Mitigated Negative Declaration has been certified/adopted by the District and the General Manager determines that none of the circumstances requiring the preparation of a subsequent environmental document exists, the General Manager shall document that determination in the record, and the decision-making body may utilize the earlier document. Documentation of the General Manager's determination may take the form of a memorandum, and may be based on preparation of an Initial Study if desired.

CHAPTER 5. EXEMPT PROJECTS

Section 500. General.

Projects that are ministerial in nature, meet General Rule findings, are statutorily exempt, are categorically exempt, or are denied do not require the preparation of an Initial Study, a Negative/Mitigated Negative Declaration, or an EIR.

Section 501. Ministerial Projects. *[State CEQA Guidelines §15268]*

Appendix A contains the list of projects that the Board has found to be ministerial in nature. However, when a project involves elements, some of which are ministerial in nature and some of which are discretionary, the overall project will be deemed discretionary and subject to CEQA review.

Section 502. General Rule. *[State CEQA Guidelines §15061(b)(3)]*

CEQA does not apply to a project where it can be seen with certainty that there is no possibility that the activity may have a significant effect on the environment.

Section 503. Statutory Exemptions. *[State CEQA Guidelines §15260]*

Those exemptions granted by the State legislature are listed in *State CEQA Guidelines* Sections 15260 through 15285 as they may be amended.

Section 504. Categorical Exemptions. *[State CEQA Guidelines §15301-15332]*

In addition to those specific projects listed above, the Board has found several other kinds of projects that typically do not have a significant impact on the environment. Therefore, pursuant to Section 15300.4 of the *State CEQA Guidelines*, the District hereby adds the activities and permits listed in Appendix B to the list of activities that are categorically exempt for the District.

Section 505. Categorical Exemption Use Limitations. *[State CEQA Guidelines §15300.2(a)-(f) and local ordinance (g)]*

A categorical exemption shall not be used if the conditions in *State CEQA Guidelines* Section 15300.2 apply.

Section 506. Denial of Projects. *[State CEQA Guidelines §15061(b)(4)]*

Projects that the District rejects or disapproves are not subject to CEQA.

CHAPTER 6. NEGATIVE/MITIGATED NEGATIVE DECLARATION PROCESS

The following provisions are added as procedural clarifications of *State CEQA Guidelines* Sections 15070 - 15075 with respect to Negative/Mitigated Negative Declarations for the District.

Section 600. Negative Declaration. *[State CEQA Guidelines §15070]*

If the General Manager finds, based on the Initial Study, that there is no substantial evidence, in light of the whole record, that the project may have a significant effect on the environment, the General Manager or their designee shall prepare a Negative Declaration for consideration by the decision-making body for the project(s) or permit(s) involved.

Section 601. Mitigated Negative Declaration. *[State CEQA Guidelines §15070]*

If the General Manager finds, based on the Initial Study, that the proposed project may have possible adverse significant impacts on the environment, but through revisions to the project or imposition of mitigation measures, such impacts would be mitigated or avoided so that no significant impacts remain, AND there is no substantial evidence in the record as a whole that significant impacts would result from the revised project; then the General Manager shall prepare a Mitigated Negative Declaration for public review and consideration by the decision-making body for the project(s) or permit(s) involved.

Section 602. Contents. *[State CEQA Guidelines §15071]*

The Negative/Mitigated Negative Declaration must contain all items required by *State CEQA Guidelines* Section 15071.

Section 603. Public Notice and Review. *[State CEQA Guidelines §15072 and 15073]*

A Notice of Intent to Adopt a Negative/Mitigated Negative Declaration shall be provided to the public, trustee agencies, and the county clerk in accordance with *State CEQA Guidelines* Section 15072. To allow the public the review period provided under *State CEQA Guidelines* Section 15105, a direct mailing to the owners and occupants of property contiguous to the project shall occur. Owners of such property shall be identified as shown on the latest equalized assessment roll. If a comment is not received during the public review period from an agency or person, it shall be assumed, absent a request for a specific extension of time, that said agency or person has no comment to make.

Section 604. Notice of Determination. *[State CEQA Guidelines §15075]*

- (a) Whenever the Board or a District Official approves a permit or authorizes a project for which a Negative/Mitigated Negative Declaration has been prepared, the General Manager or their designee shall file within 5 **working** days of their action a Notice of Determination with the County Clerk/Recorder.
- (b) In instances where multiple approval actions by the District are required, the Notice of Determination shall be filed after the final decision to approve a project.
- (c) If the project requires discretionary approvals from one or more state agencies, the Notice of Determination shall also be filed with the State Office of Planning and Research within this same 5-day period

CHAPTER 7. ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACT REPORT (EIR) PROCESS

The following provisions are added as procedural clarifications of *State CEQA Guidelines* Sections 15080–15097, 15120–15132, and 15140–15154 with respect to the preparation and processing of EIRs for the District.

Section 700. EIR Preparation. *[State CEQA Guidelines §§15081 and 15081.5]*

If the General Manager finds during preliminary review or based on an Initial Study that there is substantial evidence in the record as a whole that a project may have a significant adverse effect on the environment, or if an EIR is required by statute, the General Manager shall direct that an EIR be prepared.

Section 701. Contents of an EIR. *[State CEQA Guidelines §15120-15132]*

An EIR produced by/for the District must contain all items required by *State CEQA Guidelines* Sections 15120–15132, 15140–15152, and 15154.

Section 702. Notice of Preparation (NOP). *[State CEQA Guidelines §15082]*

A Notice of Preparation notifying responsible and interested agencies about the project and soliciting their comments on the scope and content of the EIR shall be prepared by the General Manager or their designee. This notice shall be sent by certified mail to all responsible and trustee agencies, the county clerk, and all federal agencies involved in approving or funding the project. If State agencies are involved, then the NOP shall also be sent to the State Clearinghouse. A copy of the NOP shall also be delivered to the County Clerk/Recorder for posting for thirty (30) days.

Section 702.1 Scoping. *[State CEQA Guidelines §15083]*

The scope of the EIR prepared is determined using the following sources: the Initial Study, if one is produced, previous environmental documents, responses to the NOP, consultation with other agencies, and public scoping meetings, if held. A public scoping meeting may be incorporated into the NOP process and is typically held by the consultant preparing the EIR with assistance from the General Manager or their designee.

Section 702.2 Preparation of Administrative Draft EIR.

The pre-circulation draft of an EIR is referred to as the administrative draft. This draft is considered a working document to be circulated among District staff, agents, contractors and other experts as needed for their comment on its accuracy and adequacy. It is not available for public review and copies of the administrative draft EIR shall be destroyed upon release of the Draft EIR.

Section 702.3 Public Review of Draft EIR. *[State CEQA Guidelines §§15085, 15087, 15105]*

- (a) The General Manager shall provide public notice of the availability of the Draft EIR for review and comment in the same manner as specified in Section 603 for a Negative Declaration. In addition, a copy of the Draft EIR shall be sent to the nearest branch of the Napa City/County Library at the same time a Notice of Completion is sent to the State Office of Planning and Research. The contents of the public notice shall be as specified in *State CEQA Guidelines* Section 15087(c).
- (b) The normal public review period for a Draft EIR in the District shall be 45 days unless a shorter period of not less than 30 days is approved by the State Clearinghouse. *[State CEQA Guidelines §15105]* The General Manager may set a public review period of up to 60 days when circumstances indicate that a longer than normal review period is appropriate.
- (c) A public hearing on a Draft EIR is not required under CEQA and is not typically held by the District when the decision-making body is the General Manager or their designee. When the decision-making body is the Board, a public hearing shall be held during the public review period to solicit public comments.

Section 702.4 Final EIR. *[State CEQA Guidelines §15132]*

The Final EIR consists of the text of the Draft EIR revised as necessary to reflect those comments received that require text changes, all comments received on the Draft EIR, the District's responses to said comments, a list of all persons and agencies that were asked to comment or commented on the Draft EIR, and any other information added by the District.

Section 702.5 Notice of Determination (NOD). *[State CEQA Guidelines §15094]*

After certification of the final EIR and approval of the project, the General Manager or their designee shall prepare and file a Notice of Determination with the County Clerk/Recorder following the same procedure and with the same restrictions as specified in Section 604.

CHAPTER 8. MITIGATION MONITORING AND REPORTING PROGRAM (MMRP)

Section 800. General. *[State CEQA Guidelines §15097]*

Pursuant to Public Resources Code Section 21081.6, all jurisdictions must have a method for monitoring compliance and implementation of adopted mitigation measures. The District Mitigation Monitoring and Reporting programs (i.e., MMRPs) shall be in conformance with *State CEQA Guidelines* Section 15097 as augmented by the provisions listed below.

Section 801. Adoption. *[State CEQA Guidelines §15097]*

- (a) At the time the District makes the required CEQA findings regarding the Mitigated Negative Declaration or EIR being used, the decision-making body shall adopt a program for monitoring and reporting on the mitigation measures as

part of the project. Conformance with this program shall be a condition of project approval.

- (b) The resultant adopted MMRP shall be distributed to all agencies, departments, and parties with monitoring or review responsibility thereunder.

Section 802. Contents.

MMRPs shall include at a minimum the following information for each mitigation measure:

- (a) identification of the individual, department, agency, or other entity responsible for performing the mitigation measure;
- (b) identification of the timing for implementation of the mitigation measure;
- (c) identification of the specific results or performance standards that the mitigation is intended to accomplish if not clearly stated in the mitigation measure;
- (d) identification of the individual, department, agency, or other entity responsible for ensuring implementation of the mitigation measure;
- (e) identification of the frequency of inspections or other monitoring activities;
- (f) identification of when compliance is completed;

Section 803. Compliance Assurance Responsibilities.

- (a) Overall compliance shall be coordinated by the General Manager or their designee unless otherwise indicated in the adopted MMRP.
- (b) The General Manager or their designee may hire an outside consultant where mitigation measure compliance where monitoring requires specialized expertise or when District staff is unavailable to do the necessary work
- (c) Other agencies shall monitor the mitigation measures that they request or that are within their area of expertise. The General Manager or their designee shall notify these agencies of the mitigation monitoring required. These agencies shall inform the District in writing when each of their mitigation measures has been complied with completely.

Section 804. reserved

CHAPTER 9. NAPA COUNTY REGIONAL PARK AND OPEN SPACE DISTRICT AS A RESPONSIBLE AGENCY

[State CEQA Guidelines §§15096 and 15253]

The following provisions are added as procedural clarifications of *State CEQA Guidelines* Sections 15096 and 15253 with respect to the responsible agency process for the District.

Section 900. Commenting on a Lead Agency's Environmental Document. *[State CEQA Guidelines §15096]*

- (a) The General Manager or their designee shall make every effort to provide written comments on the draft Negative/Mitigated Negative Declaration, Notice of

Preparation, and/or Draft EIR prepared by the Lead Agency within the time frames specified in the *State CEQA Guidelines*.

- (b) The comments provided shall be limited to activities within the District's area of expertise or jurisdiction. They shall at a minimum identify District standards, permit requirements, potentially significant impacts, alternatives to be analyzed, and any mitigation measures to be considered. In addition, a recommendation as to whether a Negative/Mitigated Negative Declaration, or EIR is the appropriate document for the Lead Agency to prepare may be provided. The focus of the comments shall be to assist the Lead Agency in producing a defensible environmental document that meets the District's needs.

Section 901. Failure of Lead Agency to Consult With District or Adequately Respond to Comments Provided. [*State CEQA Guidelines §15096*]

- (a) If the Lead Agency fails to consult with the District prior to adopting a Negative/Mitigated Negative Declaration or certifying an EIR for a project over which the District has discretionary authority, the District will review the document prepared. If the General Manager finds based on the review done that the document is adequate for District purposes, the District shall follow the procedures specified in Sections 903 and 904 below. However, if the General Manager finds that the document is inadequate for District purposes, then the District may take over the role of Lead Agency. The General Manager or their designee shall in that case follow the procedures specified in Chapters 4, 5, and 6 to prepare and process the environmental document needed.
- (b) If the Lead Agency fails in the opinion of the General Manager to adequately respond to the comments provided, the General Manager shall consult with District Counsel and jointly recommend a course of action pursuant to CEQA guidelines Section 15096(e)

Section 902. Approval of Project By District Acting as a Responsible Agency. [*State CEQA Guidelines §15096*]

- (a) In issuing approvals or taking any other discretionary action on a project for which the District is a responsible agency, the District shall certify that it has reviewed and considered the environmental effects of the project as shown in the Negative/Mitigated Negative Declaration or EIR prepared by the Lead Agency.
- (b) If an EIR has been produced, the District decision-making body shall adopt findings as set forth in *State CEQA Guidelines* Sections 15091 and 15093, if necessary.
- (c) Where the District decision-making body requires the implementation of mitigation measures or other project changes to substantially lessen or avoid significant environmental effects of activities under its statutory control, an MMRP consistent with Chapter 8 of these guidelines covering those changes and measures shall be adopted at the time of project approval.

Section 903. Limitations on the Power of District as a Responsible Agency to Require Changes in Project.

- (a) When the District acts as a responsible agency for a project, it may only require those changes in a project that lessen or avoid the effects, either direct or indirect, of that part of the project that the District will be called upon to carry out or approve.
- (b) When the District acts as a responsible agency, it may refuse to approve a project only in order to avoid direct or indirect adverse environmental effects of that part of the project that the District must carry out or approve.

Section 904. Certified Equivalent Program: Use of Environmental Document Prepared In Lieu of a Negative/Mitigated Negative Declaration or EIR.
[State CEQA Guidelines §§15250-15253]

An environmental analysis document prepared for a project pursuant to a certified equivalent program shall be used by the District as a substitute for Negative Declaration/Mitigated Negative Declaration or EIR and no additional environmental document shall be required if the conditions in *State CEQA Guidelines* Section 15253(b) are met.

CHAPTER 10. APPEALS

Section 1000. Appeals Permitted. *[Local Procedure]*

- (a) Any interested person may appeal to the Board the determination of the General Manager that a project is/is not exempt from review, or that an EIR is required, subject to the payment of all District costs associated with processing the appeal.
- (b) Any decision by the General Manager to adopt a Negative Declaration, to adopt a Mitigate Negative Declaration, or to certify a Final EIR may also be appealed to the Board, subject to the payment of all District costs associated with processing the appeal.
- (c) Any appeal filed pursuant to this Section will suspend any further consideration of the project until a decision on the appeal is made by the Board.
- (d) Appeals must be filed in writing with the District Secretary within ten (10) working days of the decision being appealed. The appeal must contain a detailed statement supported by substantial evidence for each cause of appeal. Arguments and/or evidence not included in the written appeal shall not be considered by the Board. The appeal must also be accompanied by an appeal fee, which shall be reasonably related to the expected full cost to the District of processing the appeal, as determined by the General Manager. Upon conclusion of the appeal process, if the actual cost to the District is less than the amount of the fee collected, the excess amount shall be returned to the appellant.

APPENDICES

- A. Ministerially Exempt Projects for the District
- B. Additional Categorically Exempt Projects for the District
- C. Initial Study Checklist

APPENDIX A

MINISTERIALLY EXEMPT PROJECTS FOR THE DISTRICT

Pursuant to Sections 15022 and 15268 of the *State CEQA Guidelines* issuance/approval of the following permits by the District shall be conclusively presumed to be ministerially exempt from the requirements of CEQA and thus preparation of an environmental document is not required. However, where a project involves an approval that contains elements of both a ministerial action and a discretionary action, the project will be deemed discretionary and will be subject to the requirements of CEQA.

No permits meeting this criteria have been identified at this time.

APPENDIX B

ADDITIONAL CATEGORICALLY EXEMPT PROJECTS FOR THE DISTRICT

In addition to the exemptions contained in the *State CEQA Guidelines* pursuant to Sections 15022(a)(1)(C) and 15300.4, the Board has found that the following types of projects typically do not have a significant effect on the environment and therefore qualify for a categorical exemption under the class of categorical exemptions listed below. Listing here does not guarantee a project is exempt if due to location or other unique circumstances the project would have a significant impact on the environment. The *State CEQA Guidelines* provide many examples of when an otherwise exempt project may no longer be exempt. The following list should therefore be read in conjunction with the *State CEQA Guidelines*.

Class I: Existing Facilities [*State CEQA Guidelines* §15301]

- I. Repair, maintenance, reconstruction, replacement, and minor expansion of existing roads, streets, highways, bicycle and pedestrian paths and trails, and appurtenant facilities, including, but not limited to:
 - (a) reconstructing, resurfacing, and/or seal coating of existing roads and trails;
 - (b) paving existing unpaved road shoulders;
 - (c) widening existing roads and/or trails by less than 10 feet of paved or unpaved surface and 4 feet of unpaved shoulders;
 - (d) adding short auxiliary lanes when required for localized purposes such as weaving, turning, climbing, lane changing, or accelerating or decelerating;
 - (e) adding non-motorized trails and walkways parallel to the existing roadway to separate such non-motorized uses from motorized traffic;
 - (f) installing landscaping in and around existing buildings, roads, and trails that involves minimal earth disturbing activities;
 - (g) working on clear-span bridge structures, reconstructing existing stream crossings and making minor operational improvements to drainage facilities, provided that the construction of temporary stream bypasses is not involved;
 - (h) modifying to improve existing roadside or trailside safety features such as curbs, pikes, headwalls, slopes, and ditches, adding or replacing devices such as fencing, guardrails, safety barriers, guideposts, and markers, or installing, removing, or modifying regulatory, warning, or informational signs;
 - (i) adding, removing, and/or replacing distinctive roadway markings such as painted stripes, raised pavement markers, thermoplastic, tape, or raised bars;
 - (j) minor rerouting of roads or trails to correct erosion problems, reduce impacts to environmentally sensitive features, and/or improve safety;

- (k) paving of existing unpaved roads and trails, provided water runoff is not concentrated in such a way as to cause downstream erosion and/or water quality impacts; or
 - (l) construction of water bars, drain dips, swales, and other minor water management and erosion control features on roads and trails, provided water runoff is not concentrated in such a way as to cause downstream erosion and/or water quality impacts.
2. Applications for minor modifications of existing use permits
 3. Operation and Maintenance Activities, including but not limited to:
 - (a) Cleaning, painting and repair of existing structures and facilities; or
 - (b) On-going rental, lease, or use of existing facilities by District staff, contractors, agents, and/or volunteers.

Class 3: New Construction or Conversion of Small Structures [State CEQA Guidelines §15303]

1. Installation and/or operation of water wells in accordance with County of Napa Environmental Health Division requirements.
2. New fencing to protect resources, limit trespass, control grazing, improve safety, or restrict public access, provided the fencing is of a variety and in locations where it will not significantly impede wildlife movement.
3. Installation of solar panels on or adjacent to existing structures.
4. Repair, upgrading, and extension of utilities.
5. Installation or construction of works of art or craft on a temporary or permanent basis.

Class 4: Minor Alterations to Land [State CEQA Guidelines §15304]

1. New access roads and driveways that would:
 - (a) not disturb more than 2 acres of land;
 - (b) not move more than 2,000 cubic yards of soil;
 - (c) not traverse slopes that are steeper than 29.9%; and
 - (d) not discharge concentrated runoff within a stream setback area.
2. Mechanical or chemical control of invasive plants that is consistent with best management practices.
3. Routine vegetation management including but not limited to pruning, fuel load reduction and fuel clearance around structures, to reduce wildfire hazard that is consistent with the recommendations of the County of Napa Fire Marshall.
4. Vegetation management such as grazing, prescribed fire, and vegetation thinning to reduce wildfire hazard.
5. Minor temporary use of land having negligible or no permanent effects on the environments, including volunteer work parties, meetings, educational tours and activities, etc.
6. New trails of natural pervious surface that would not:
 - (a) Be located in the vicinity of any candidate, sensitive, or special status species;
 - (b) Be located within riparian habitat or other sensitive natural community;

- (c) Have an adverse effect on state or federally protected wetlands;
- (d) Be located in the vicinity of any known cultural resources as shown in Napa County sensitivity mapping;
- (e) Be located or result in unstable soils such that there is a potential for damaging ground failure, landslide, or collapse.; or
- (f) Substantially alter existing drainage patterns in a manner that would result in substantial erosion or siltation, increase surface runoff, or impede or redirect flows.

Class 5: Minor Alterations in Land Use Limitations [State CEQA Guidelines §15305]

1. Acceptance or granting of easements or other land use agreements which protect natural resources and viewsheds.
2. Acceptance of interests in property, including easements, leases, etc.
3. Lot line adjustments and parcel mergers or divisions that do not create new development rights.
4. Applications for variances or exceptions to standards for permitted projects.

Class 23: Normal Operations of Facilities for Public Gatherings [State CEQA Guidelines §15323]

1. Normal operations of developed and undeveloped campgrounds.
2. Dispersed camping (at least 100 feet from any stream or water source and at least 150 feet from any roadway) where allowed by District regulation.
3. Public gatherings for nature appreciation, sport, science, or public education of a scale and type normally to be expected at a regional park or open space.

APPENDIX C
INITIAL STUDY CHECKLIST FORM

NAPA COUNTY REGIONAL PARK AND OPEN SPACE DISTRICT

1195 3rd Street, Suite 210
 Napa, Calif. 94559
 707.253.4417

Initial Study Checklist

1. **Project Title:**
2. **Property Owner:**
3. **Contact person, phone number and email:**
4. **Project location and APN:**
5. **Project Sponsor's Name and Address:**
6. **General Plan Description:**
7. **Current Zoning:**
8. **Project Description:**
9. **Environmental Setting and Surrounding Land Uses:**
10. **Other agencies whose approval is required:** (e.g., permits, financing approval, or participation agreement).
11. **California Native American tribal consultation:** Have tribes traditionally and culturally affiliated with the project area requested consultation pursuant to Public Resources Code section 21080.3.1? If so, is there a plan for consultation that includes, for example, the determination of significance of impacts to tribal cultural resources, procedures regarding confidentiality, etc.?

ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACTS AND BASIS OF CONCLUSIONS:

The conclusions and recommendations contained herein are professional opinions derived in accordance with current standards of professional practice. They are based on a review of the Napa County Environmental Resource Maps, other sources of information listed in the file, and the comments received, conversations with knowledgeable individuals, the preparer's personal knowledge of the area, and where necessary visits to the site and surrounding areas. For further information see the environmental background information contained in the permanent file on this project.

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.

[Project Title]

- 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 only analyze only the effects that remain to be addressed.
- I find that although the proposed project could have a significant effect on the environment, because all potentially significant effects (a) have been analyzed adequately in an earlier EIR or NEGATIVE DECLARATION pursuant to applicable standards, and (b) have been avoided or mitigated pursuant to that earlier EIR or NEGATIVE DECLARATION, including revisions or mitigation measures that are imposed upon the proposed project, nothing further is required.

Signature

Date

Print Name and Title

	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporation	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
I. AESTHETICS. Except as provided in Public Resources Code Section 21099, would the project:				
a) Have a substantial adverse effect on a scenic vista?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input 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 type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
c) In non-urbanized areas, substantially degrade the existing visual character or quality of public views of the site and its surroundings (public views are those that are experienced from a publicly accessible vantage point). If the project is in an urbanized area, would the project conflict with applicable zoning and other regulations governing scenic quality?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input 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 type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>

Discussion:

	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporation	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
II. AGRICULTURE AND FOREST RESOURCES.				
a) Convert Prime Farmland, Unique Farmland, or Farmland of Statewide Important (Farmland) as shown on the maps prepared pursuant to the Farmland Mapping and Monitoring Program of the California Resources Agency, to non-agricultural use?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
b) Conflict with existing zoning for agricultural use, or a Williamson Act contract?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
c) Conflict with existing zoning for, or cause rezoning of, forest land as defined in Public Resources Code Section 12220(g), timberland as defined in Public Resources Code Section 4526, or timberland zoned Timberland Production as defined in Government Code Section 51104(g)?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
d) Result in the loss of forest land or conversion of forest land to non-forest use in a manner that will significantly affect timber, aesthetics, fish and wildlife, biodiversity, water quality, recreation, or other public benefits?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
e) Involve other changes in the existing environment which, due to their location or nature, could result in conversion of Farmland to non-agricultural use?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>

	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporation	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
d) Interfere substantially with the movement of any native resident or migratory fish or wildlife species or with established native resident or migratory wildlife corridors, or impede the use of native wildlife nursery sites?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
e) Conflict with any local policies or ordinances protecting biological resources, such as a tree preservation policy or ordinance?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input 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 type="checkbox"/>

Discussion:

	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporation	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
V. CULTURAL RESOURCES. Would the project:				
a) Cause a substantial adverse change in the significance of a historical resource pursuant to CEQA Guidelines §15064.5?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input 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 type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
c) Disturb any human remains, including those interred outside of formal cemeteries?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>

Discussion:

	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporation	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
VI. ENERGY. Would the project:				
a) Result in a potentially significant environmental impact due to wasteful, inefficient, or unnecessary consumption of energy resources, during project construction or operation?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
b) Conflict with or obstruct a state or local plan for renewable energy or energy efficiency?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>

Discussion:

	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporation	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
VII. GEOLOGY and SOILS. Would the project:				
a) Directly or indirectly cause potential substantial adverse effects, including the risk of loss, injury, or death involving:				
i) Rupture of a known earthquake fault, as delineated on the most recent Alquist-Priolo Earthquake Fault Zoning Map issued by the State Geologist for the area or based on other substantial evidence of a known fault? Refer to Division of Mines and Geology Special Publication 42.	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
ii) Strong seismic ground shaking?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
iii) Seismic-related ground failure, including liquefaction?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
iv) Landslides?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
b) Result in substantial soil erosion or the loss of topsoil?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input 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 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 direct or indirect risks to life or property?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
e) Have soils incapable of adequately supporting the use of septic tanks or alternative waste water disposal systems where sewers are not available for the disposal of waste water?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
f) Directly or indirectly destroy a unique paleontological resource or site or unique geologic feature?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>

Discussion:

	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporation	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
VIII. GREENHOUSE GAS EMISSIONS. Would the project:				
a) Generate a net increase in greenhouse gas emissions in excess of applicable thresholds adopted by the Bay Area Air Quality Management District or the California Air Resources Board which may have a significant impact on the environment?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>

- b) Conflict with a county-adopted climate action plan or another applicable plan, policy or regulation adopted for the purpose of reducing the emissions of greenhouse gases?

Discussion:

		Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporation	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
IX.	HAZARDS AND HAZARDOUS MATERIALS. Would the project:				
a)	Create a significant hazard to the public or the environment through the routine transport, use, or disposal of hazardous materials?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
b)	Create a significant hazard to the public or the environment through reasonable foreseeable upset and accident conditions involving the release of hazardous materials into the environment?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
c)	Emit hazardous emissions or handle hazardous or acutely hazardous materials, substances, or waste within one-quarter mile of an existing or proposed school?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
d)	Be located on a site which is included on a list of hazardous materials sites compiled pursuant to Government Code Section 65962.5 and, as a result, would it create a significant hazard to the public or the environment?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
e)	For a project located within an airport land use plan or, where such a plan has not been adopted, within two miles of a public airport or public use airport, would the project result in a safety hazard or excessive noise for people residing or working in the project area?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
f)	Impair implementation of or physically interfere with an adopted emergency response plan or emergency evacuation plan?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
g)	Expose people or structures, either directly or indirectly, to a significant risk of loss, injury or death involving wild-land fires?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>

Discussion:

	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporation	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
X. HYDROLOGY AND WATER QUALITY. Would the project:				
a) Violate any water quality standards or waste discharge requirements or otherwise substantially degrade surface or ground water quality?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
b) Substantially decrease groundwater supplies or interfere substantially with groundwater recharge such that the project may impede sustainable groundwater management of the basin?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input 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 or through the addition of impervious surfaces, in a manner which would:				
i) result in substantial erosion or siltation on- or off-site;	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
ii) substantially increase the rate or amount of surface runoff in a manner which would result in flooding on- or off-site;	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
iii) 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; or	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
iv) impede or redirect flood flows?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
d) In flood hazard, tsunami, or seiche zones, risk release of pollutants due to project inundation?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
e) Conflict with or obstruct implementation of a water quality control plan or sustainable groundwater management plan?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>

Discussion:

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

	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporation	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
b) Cause a significant environmental impact due to a conflict with any land use plan, policy, or regulation adopted for the purpose of avoiding or mitigating an environmental effect?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>

Discussion:

	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporation	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
XII. MINERAL RESOURCES. Would the project:				
a) Result in the loss of availability of a known mineral resource that would be of value to the region and the residents of the state?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input 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 type="checkbox"/>

Discussion:

	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporation	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
XIII. NOISE. Would the project result in:				
a) Generation of a substantial temporary or permanent increase in ambient noise levels in the vicinity of the project in excess of standards established in the local general plan or noise ordinance, or applicable standards of other agencies?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
b) Generation of excessive ground-borne vibration or ground-borne noise levels?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
c) For a project located within the vicinity of a private airstrip or an airport land use plan or, where such a plan has not been adopted, within two miles of a public airport or public use airport, would the project expose people residing or working in the project area to excessive noise levels?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>

Discussion:

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

Discussion:

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

Discussion:

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

Discussion:

	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporation	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
XVII. TRANSPORTATION. 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 and/or conflict with General Plan Policy CIR-38, which seeks to maintain an adequate Level of Service (LOS) at signalized and unsignalized intersections, or reduce the effectiveness of existing transit services or pedestrian/bicycle facilities?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
b) Conflict with a program, plan, ordinance, or policy addressing the circulation system, including transit, roadway, bicycle, and pedestrian facilities?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
c) Conflict with or be inconsistent with CEQA Guidelines §15064.3(b)	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
d) Substantially increase hazards due to a geometric design feature, (e.g., sharp curves or dangerous intersections) or incompatible uses (e.g., farm equipment)?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
e) Result in inadequate emergency access?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
f) Conflict with General Plan Policy CIR-14, which requires new uses to meet their anticipated parking demand, but to avoid providing excess parking which could stimulate unnecessary vehicle trips or activity exceeding the site's capacity?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>

Discussion:

	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant Impact With Mitigation Incorporated	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
XVIII. TRIBAL CULTURAL RESOURCES. Would the project:				
Cause a substantial adverse change in the significance of a tribal cultural resource, defined in Public Resources Code section 21074 as either a site, feature, place, cultural landscape that is geographically defined in terms of the size and scope of the landscape, sacred place, or object with cultural value to a California Native American tribe, and that is:				
a) Listed or eligible for listing in the California Register of Historical Resources, or in a local register of historical resources as defined in Public Resources Code section 5020.1(k), or	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
a) A resource determined by the lead agency, in its discretion and supported by substantial evidence, to be significant pursuant to criteria set forth in subdivision (c) of Public Resources Code Section 5024.1. In applying the criteria set forth in subdivision (c) of Public Resources Code Section 5024.1, the lead agency shall consider the significance of the resource to a California Native American tribe.	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>

Discussion:

	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporation	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
XIX. UTILITIES AND SERVICE SYSTEMS. Would the project:				
a) Require or result in the relocation or construction of a new or expanded water, wastewater treatment, or storm water drainage, electric power, natural gas, or telecommunication facilities, the construction or relocation of which could cause significant environmental effects?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
b) Have sufficient water supplies available to serve the project and reasonably foreseeable future development during normal, dry, and multiple dry years?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
c) Result in a determination by the wastewater treatment provider which serves or may serve the project that it has adequate capacity to serve the project's projected demand in addition to the provider's existing commitments?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
d) Generate solid waste in excess of State or local standards, or in excess of the capacity of local infrastructure, or otherwise impair the attainment of solid waste reduction goals?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
e) Comply with federal, state, and local management and reduction statutes and regulations related to solid waste?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>

Discussion:

	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporation	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
XX. WILDFIRE. If located in or near state responsibility areas or lands classified as very high fire severity zones, would the project:				
a) Substantially impair an adopted emergency response plan or emergency evacuation plan?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
b) Due to slope, prevailing winds and other factors, exacerbate wildfire risks and thereby expose project occupants to pollutant concentrations from a wildfire or the uncontrolled spread of a wildfire?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
c) Require the installation or maintenance of associated infrastructure (such as roads, fuel breaks, emergency water sources, power lines or other utilities) that may exacerbate fire risk or that may result in temporary or ongoing impacts to the environment?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
d) Expose people or structures to significant risks, including downslope or downstream flooding or landslides, as a result of runoff, post-fire slope instability, or drainage changes?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>

Discussion:

	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporation	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
XXI. MANDATORY FINDINGS OF SIGNIFICANCE				
a) Does the project have the potential to degrade the quality of the environment, substantially reduce the habitat of a fish or wildlife species, cause a fish or wildlife population to drop below self-sustaining levels, threaten to eliminate a plant or animal community, reduce the number or restrict the range of a rare or endangered plant or animal or eliminate important examples of the major periods of California history or prehistory?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
b) Does the project have impacts that are individually limited, but cumulatively considerable? ("Cumulatively considerable" means that the incremental effects of a project are considerable when viewed in connection with the effects of past projects, the effects of other current projects, and the effects of probable future projects)?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
c) Does the project have environmental effects that will cause substantial adverse effects on human beings, either directly or indirectly?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>

Discussion:

Summary of Mitigation Measures:

NAPA COUNTY REGIONAL PARK AND OPEN SPACE DISTRICT

1195 3rd Street, Suite 210
 Napa, Calif. 94559
 707.253.4417

Initial Study Checklist

12. **Project Title:** Local CEQA Guidelines Update
13. **Property Owner:** N/A
14. **Contact person, phone number and email:** Kyra Purvis, Park and Open Space Planner, (707) 299-1788, kpurvis@ncrposd.org
15. **Project location and APN:** N/A
16. **Project Sponsor's Name and Address:** Napa County Regional Park and Open Space District, 1195 Third Street, Second Floor, Napa, CA 94559
17. **General Plan Description:** N/A
18. **Current Zoning:** N/A
19. **Project Description:** The Napa County Regional Park and Open Space District (District) is proposing to update its *Local Procedures for Implementing the California Environmental Quality Act* (Local CEQA Guidelines). Complete changes are shown in the attached redlined version of the Local CEQA Guidelines (Attachment 1), and are generally minor and clerical in nature. More substantive changes are as follows:
- References to project applicants and sponsors have been deleted, as the District only completes CEQA on its own projects (Sections 401, 506, 601, 604, 700, 802, 803, and 804).
 - It has been clarified that speculative future phases of projects shall not be analyzed as part of a project that otherwise has independent utility and logical termini (Section 402).
 - Procedures for public notice and review of environmental documents have been clarified (Section 603).
 - The following additions have been made to Appendix B, Additional Categorically Exempt Projects for the District:
 - Class 3 (New Construction or Conversion of Small Structures) has been revised to include installation or construction of works of art or craft on a temporary or permanent basis.
 - Class 4 (Minor Alterations to Land) has been revised to include:
 - Vegetation management such as grazing, prescribed fire, and vegetation thinning to reduce wildfire hazard, and
 - New trails of natural pervious surface that would not be located in the vicinity of any candidate, sensitive, or special status species; be located within riparian habitat or other sensitive natural community; have an adverse effect on state or federally protected wetlands; be located in the vicinity of any known cultural resources as shown in Napa County sensitivity mapping; be located or result in unstable soils such that there is a potential for damaging ground failure, landslide, or collapse; or substantially alter existing drainage patterns in a manner that would result in substantial erosion or siltation, increase surface runoff, or impede or redirect flows.
 - Class 23 (Normal Operations of Facilities for Public Gatherings) has been revised to include:
 - Normal operations of developed and undeveloped campgrounds;
 - Dispersed camping (at least 100 feet from any stream or water source and at least 150 feet from any roadway) where allowed by District regulation; and

- Public gatherings for nature appreciation, sport, science, or public education of a scale and type normally to be expected at a regional park or open space.
- Appendix C, Initial Study Checklist, has been updated to correspond to current *State CEQA Guidelines*.

20. **Environmental Setting and Surrounding Land Uses:** N/A

21. **Other agencies whose approval is required:** (e.g., permits, financing approval, or participation agreement).
None.

22. **California Native American tribal consultation:** Have tribes traditionally and culturally affiliated with the project area requested consultation pursuant to Public Resources Code section 21080.3.1? If so, is there a plan for consultation that includes, for example, the determination of significance of impacts to tribal cultural resources, procedures regarding confidentiality, etc.? No tribes have requested consultation.

ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACTS AND BASIS OF CONCLUSIONS:

The conclusions and recommendations contained herein are professional opinions derived in accordance with current standards of professional practice. They are based on a review of the Napa County Environmental Resource Maps, other sources of information listed in the file, and the comments received, conversations with knowledgeable individuals, the preparer's personal knowledge of the area, and where necessary visits to the site and surrounding areas. For further information see the environmental background information contained in the permanent file on this project.

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 only 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

June 12, 2020

Date

Kyra Purvis, Park and Open Space Planner

Print Name and Title

	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporation	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
I. AESTHETICS. Except as provided in Public Resources Code Section 21099, would the project:				
a) Have a substantial adverse effect on a scenic vista?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
b) Substantially damage scenic resources, including, but not limited to, trees, rock outcroppings, and historic buildings within a state scenic highway?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
c) In non-urbanized areas, substantially degrade the existing visual character or quality of public views of the site and its surroundings (public views are those that are experienced from a publicly accessible vantage point). If the project is in an urbanized area, would the project conflict with applicable zoning and other regulations governing scenic quality?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
d) Create a new source of substantial light or glare which would adversely affect day or nighttime views in the area?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>

Discussion:

- a. – d. Updates to the Local CEQA Guidelines do not include any changes that would result in impacts to aesthetics. Vegetation management and trail building will be in keeping with the existing visual character of the surroundings, will avoid damage to scenic resources, and will not include the use of nighttime lighting.

	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporation	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
II. AGRICULTURE AND FOREST RESOURCES.				
a) Convert Prime Farmland, Unique Farmland, or Farmland of Statewide Important (Farmland) as shown on the maps prepared pursuant to the Farmland Mapping and Monitoring Program of the California Resources Agency, to non-agricultural use?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
b) Conflict with existing zoning for agricultural use, or a Williamson Act contract?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
c) Conflict with existing zoning for, or cause rezoning of, forest land as defined in Public Resources Code Section 12220(g), timberland as defined in Public Resources Code Section 4526, or timberland zoned Timberland Production as defined in Government Code Section 51104(g)?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
d) Result in the loss of forest land or conversion of forest land to non-forest use in a manner that will significantly affect timber, aesthetics, fish and wildlife, biodiversity, water quality, recreation, or other public benefits?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
e) Involve other changes in the existing environment which, due to their location or nature, could result in conversion of Farmland to non-agricultural use?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>

Discussion:

- a. – e. Updates to the Local CEQA Guidelines do not include any changes that would result in impacts to agriculture and forest resources. Vegetation management and trail building do not conflict with agricultural or forestry uses and will therefore not result in the conversion of or conflict with the zoning of farmland or forestland.

	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporation	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
III. AIR QUALITY. Where available, the significance criteria established by the applicable air quality management district 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) 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?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
c) Expose sensitive receptors to substantial pollutant concentrations?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
d) Result in other emissions (such as those leading to odors) adversely affecting a substantial number of people?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>

Discussion:

- a. – d. Updates to the Local CEQA Guidelines do not include any changes that would result in significant impacts to air quality. Vegetation management and trail building are generally conducted with small crews using hand tools or small equipment. Emissions associated with these activities would be negligible. Unusually large vegetation management or trail building projects would not qualify for the use of a categorical exemption in accordance with *State CEQA Guidelines* Section 15300.2(c), which disallows the use of a categorical exemption for any project that may have a significant effect on the environment due to unusual circumstances.

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

	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporation	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
c) Have a substantial adverse effect on state or federally protected wetlands (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 type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
e) Conflict with any local policies or ordinances protecting biological resources, such as a tree preservation policy or ordinance?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
f) Conflict with the provisions of an adopted Habitat Conservation Plan, Natural Community Conservation Plan, or other approved local, regional, or state habitat conservation plan?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>

Discussion:

- a. – c. Updates to the Local CEQA Guidelines do not include any changes that would result in significant impacts to biological resources. Vegetation management and trail building are generally conducted with small crews using hand tools or small equipment, resulting in minimal disturbance. Trail building is required to avoid sensitive species, wetlands, and special habitats in order to qualify for the new proposed categorical exemption.
- d. – f. Vegetation management and trail building do not interfere with the movement of wildlife or use of nursery sites; these activities do not create barriers that wildlife could not cross or otherwise impede movement or habitat use. The project will not conflict with the provisions of any adopted Habitat Conservation Plan, Natural Community Conservation Plan or other approved local, regional or state habitat conservation plan, because no such plans have been adopted that include the project area.

	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporation	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
V. CULTURAL RESOURCES. Would the project:				
a) Cause a substantial adverse change in the significance of a historical resource pursuant to CEQA Guidelines §15064.5?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
b) Cause a substantial adverse change in the significance of an archaeological resource pursuant to CEQA Guidelines §15064.5?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
c) 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:

a. – c. Updates to the Local CEQA Guidelines do not include any changes that would result in significant impacts to cultural resources. Vegetation management and trail building are generally conducted with small crews using hand tools or small equipment, resulting in minimal disturbance. Trail building is required to avoid known cultural resources in order to qualify for the new proposed categorical exemption.

	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporation	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
VI. ENERGY. Would the project:				
a) Result in a potentially significant environmental impact due to wasteful, inefficient, or unnecessary consumption of energy resources, during project construction or operation?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
b) Conflict with or obstruct a state or local plan for renewable energy or energy efficiency?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>

Discussion:

a. – b. Updates to the Local CEQA Guidelines do not include any changes that would result in impacts to energy resources. Vegetation management and trail building result in minimal, almost negligible, consumption of energy resources, and would have no impact on renewable energy or energy efficiency plans.

	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporation	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
VII. GEOLOGY and SOILS. Would the project:				
a) Directly or indirectly cause potential substantial adverse effects, including the risk of loss, injury, or death involving:				
i) Rupture of a known earthquake fault, as delineated on the most recent Alquist-Priolo Earthquake Fault Zoning Map issued by the State Geologist for the area or based on other substantial evidence of a known fault? Refer to Division of Mines and Geology Special Publication 42.	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>

	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporation	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
ii) Strong seismic ground shaking?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
iii) Seismic-related ground failure, including liquefaction?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
iv) Landslides?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
b) Result in substantial soil erosion or the loss of topsoil?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input 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 direct or indirect risks to life or property?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
e) Have soils incapable of adequately supporting the use of septic tanks or alternative waste water disposal systems where sewers are not available for the disposal of waste water?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
f) Directly or indirectly destroy a unique paleontological resource or site or unique geologic feature?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>

Discussion:

- a. – c. Updates to the Local CEQA Guidelines do not include any changes that would result in significant impacts associated with geology and soils. Vegetation management and trail building are generally conducted with small crews using hand tools or small equipment. Trail building is required to avoid unstable soils that could result in ground failure, landslide, or collapse in order to qualify for the new proposed categorical exemption.
- d. – f. Vegetation management and trail building do not include the construction of structures, septic tanks, or wastewater disposal systems. Expansive soils pose little risk to trails. Therefore, there would be no impacts associated with expansive soils or with regard to soils supporting septic tanks or alternative wastewater disposal systems.

	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporation	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
i) GREENHOUSE GAS EMISSIONS. Would the project:				
a) Generate a net increase in greenhouse gas emissions in excess of applicable thresholds adopted by the Bay Area Air Quality Management District or the California Air Resources Board which may have a significant impact on the environment?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
b) Conflict with a county-adopted climate action plan or another applicable plan, policy or regulation adopted for the purpose of reducing the emissions of greenhouse gases?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>

Discussion:

a. – b. Updates to the Local CEQA Guidelines do not include any changes that would result in significant greenhouse gas impacts. Vegetation management and trail building are generally conducted with small crews using hand tools or small equipment. Emissions associated with these activities will be negligible. Unusually large vegetation management or trail building projects would not qualify for the use of a categorical exemption in accordance with *State CEQA Guidelines* Section 15300.2(c), which disallows the use of a categorical exemption for any project that may have a significant effect on the environment due to unusual circumstances.

	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporation	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
IX. HAZARDS AND HAZARDOUS MATERIALS. Would the project:				
a) Create a significant hazard to the public or the environment through the routine transport, use, or disposal of hazardous materials?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
b) Create a significant hazard to the public or the environment through reasonable foreseeable upset and accident conditions involving the release of hazardous materials into the environment?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
c) Emit hazardous emissions or handle hazardous or acutely hazardous materials, substances, or waste within one-quarter mile of an existing or proposed school?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
d) Be located on a site which is included on a list of hazardous materials sites compiled pursuant to Government Code Section 65962.5 and, as a result, would it create a significant hazard to the public or the environment?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
e) For a project located within an airport land use plan or, where such a plan has not been adopted, within two miles of a public airport or public use airport, would the project result in a safety hazard or excessive noise for people residing or working in the project area?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
f) Impair implementation of or physically interfere with an adopted emergency response plan or emergency evacuation plan?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
g) Expose people or structures, either directly or indirectly, to a significant risk of loss, injury or death involving wild-land fires?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>

Discussion:

a. – g. Updates to the Local CEQA Guidelines do not include any changes that would result in significant impacts associated with hazards and hazardous materials. Vegetation management and trail building are generally conducted with small crews using hand tools or small equipment, which use a very small amount of fuel. These activities are also temporary in nature, and therefore do not place workers in any location, such as within two miles of an airport, for any extended period of time. Vegetation management and trail building generally have no impact on, or improve, emergency response and evacuation. Parks are closed during high fire risk, limiting exposure of future trail users to risks associated with wildland fire.

	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporation	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
X. HYDROLOGY AND WATER QUALITY. Would the project:				
a) Violate any water quality standards or waste discharge requirements or otherwise substantially degrade surface or ground water quality?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
b) Substantially decrease groundwater supplies or interfere substantially with groundwater recharge such that the project may impede sustainable groundwater management of the basin?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" 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 or through the addition of impervious surfaces, in a manner which would:				
i) result in substantial erosion or siltation on- or off-site;	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
ii) substantially increase the rate or amount of surface runoff in a manner which would result in flooding on- or off-site;	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
iii) 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; or	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
iv) impede or redirect flood flows?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
d) In flood hazard, tsunami, or seiche zones, risk release of pollutants due to project inundation?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
e) Conflict with or obstruct implementation of a water quality control plan or sustainable groundwater management plan?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>

Discussion:

a. – e. Updates to the Local CEQA Guidelines do not include any changes that would result in significant impacts to hydrology or water quality. In order to qualify for the new proposed categorical exemption, trail building is required to avoid substantially altering existing drainage patterns in a manner that would result in substantial erosion or siltation, increase surface runoff, or impede or redirect flows. Vegetation management and trail building do not add impervious surfaces, use any significant water resources, or involve pollutants that could be released with inundation.

	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporation	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
XI. LAND USE AND PLANNING. Would the project:				
a) Physically divide an established community?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
b) Cause a significant environmental impact due to a conflict with any land use plan, policy, or regulation adopted for the purpose of avoiding or mitigating an environmental effect?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>

Discussion:

a. – b. Updates to the Local CEQA Guidelines do not include any changes that would result in impacts associated with land use and planning. Vegetation management and trail building would not physically divide a community. These activities are consistent with and help implement many policies in the Napa County General Plan that call for reducing fuel loads to address wildland fire and expanding nature-based public recreational opportunities.

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

Discussion:

a. – b. Updates to the Local CEQA Guidelines do not include any changes that would result in impacts to mineral resources. Vegetation management and trail building would not change availability of any mineral resources.

	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporation	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
XIII. NOISE. Would the project result in:				
a) Generation of a substantial temporary or permanent increase in ambient noise levels in the vicinity of the project in excess of standards established in the local general plan or noise ordinance, or applicable standards of other agencies?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
b) Generation of excessive ground-borne vibration or ground-borne noise levels?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>

	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporation	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
c) For a project located within the vicinity of a private airstrip or an airport land use plan or, where such a plan has not been adopted, within two miles of a public airport or public use airport, would the project expose people residing or working in the project area to excessive noise levels?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>

Discussion:

a. – c. Updates to the Local CEQA Guidelines do not include any changes that would result in noise impacts. Vegetation management and trail building are generally conducted with small crews using hand tools or small equipment, which result in small and brief increases in noise levels. These activities are also temporary in nature, and therefore do not place workers in any location, such as within two miles of an airport, for any extended period of time. Unusually large vegetation management or trail building projects would not qualify for the use of a categorical exemption in accordance with *State CEQA Guidelines* Section 15300.2(c), which disallows the use of a categorical exemption for any project that may have a significant effect on the environment due to unusual circumstances.

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

Discussion:

a. – b. Updates to the Local CEQA Guidelines do not include any changes that would result in impacts to population and housing. Vegetation management and trail building would not induce growth or displace people or housing.

	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporation	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
XV. PUBLIC SERVICES. Would the project result in:				
a) Substantial adverse physical impacts associated with the provision of new or physically altered governmental facilities, need for new or physically altered governmental facilities, the construction of which could cause significant environmental impacts, in order to maintain acceptable service ratios, response times or other performance objectives for any of the public services:				

	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporation	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
i) Fire protection?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
ii) Police protection?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
iii) Schools?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
iv) Parks?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
v) Other public facilities?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>

Discussion:

- a. Updates to the Local CEQA Guidelines do not include any changes that would result in impacts to public services. Vegetation management and trail building would not result in increased need for fire or police protection, or new schools, parks, or other public facilities.

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

Discussion:

- a. – b. Updates to the Local CEQA Guidelines do not include any changes that would result in significant impacts to recreational resources. Vegetation management would not increase use of existing parks or other recreational facilities, and neither vegetation management nor trail building includes the construction or expansion of any recreational facilities. Projects that include recreational facilities, or in any way go beyond trail building, would not be eligible for the new proposed categorical exemption. While new trails have the potential to increase the use of existing parks, the increased usage would be commensurate with the increased capacity added by the new trails, resulting in less than significant impacts.

	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporation	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
XVII. TRANSPORTATION. 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 and/or conflict with General Plan Policy CIR-38, which seeks to maintain an adequate Level of Service (LOS) at signalized and unsignalized intersections, or reduce the effectiveness of existing transit services or pedestrian/bicycle facilities?	<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) Conflict with a program, plan, ordinance, or policy addressing the circulation system, including transit, roadway, bicycle, and pedestrian facilities?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
c) Conflict with or be inconsistent with CEQA Guidelines §15064.3(b)	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
d) Substantially increase hazards due to a geometric design feature, (e.g., sharp curves or dangerous intersections) or incompatible uses (e.g., farm equipment)?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
e) Result in inadequate emergency access?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
f) Conflict with General Plan Policy CIR-14, which requires new uses to meet their anticipated parking demand, but to avoid providing excess parking which could stimulate unnecessary vehicle trips or activity exceeding the site's capacity?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>

Discussion:

a. – f. Updates to the Local CEQA Guidelines do not include any changes that would result in significant impacts to transportation. Vegetation management would cause only temporary and minimal increases in traffic associated with the vegetation management crews. While new trails have the potential to increase the use of existing parks, the additional traffic resulting from increased park usage would be minimal. The new proposed categorical exemption would not be used for new parks, only the construction of new trails. Unusually large vegetation management or trail building projects would not qualify for the use of a categorical exemption in accordance with *State CEQA Guidelines* Section 15300.2(c), which disallows the use of a categorical exemption for any project that may have a significant effect on the environment due to unusual circumstances.

	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant Impact With Mitigation Incorporated	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
XVIII. TRIBAL CULTURAL RESOURCES. Would the project:				
Cause a substantial adverse change in the significance of a tribal cultural resource, defined in Public Resources Code section 21074 as either a site, feature, place, cultural landscape that is geographically defined in terms of the size and scope of the landscape, sacred place, or object with cultural value to a California Native American tribe, and that is:				
a) Listed or eligible for listing in the California Register of Historical Resources, or in a local register of historical resources as defined in Public Resources Code section 5020.1(k), or	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
b) A resource determined by the lead agency, in its discretion and supported by substantial evidence, to be significant pursuant to criteria set forth in subdivision (c) of Public Resources Code Section 5024.1. In applying the criteria set forth in subdivision (c) of Public Resources Code Section 5024.1, the lead agency shall consider the significance of the resource to a California Native American tribe.	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>

Discussion:

a. – b. Updates to the Local CEQA Guidelines do not include any changes that would result in significant impacts to tribal cultural resources. Vegetation management and trail building are generally conducted with small crews using hand tools or small equipment, resulting in minimal disturbance. Trail building is required to avoid known cultural resources in order to qualify for the new proposed categorical exemption.

	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporation	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
XIX. UTILITIES AND SERVICE SYSTEMS. Would the project:				
a) Require or result in the relocation or construction of a new or expanded water, wastewater treatment, or storm water drainage, electric power, natural gas, or telecommunication facilities, the construction or relocation of which could cause significant environmental effects?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
b) Have sufficient water supplies available to serve the project and reasonably foreseeable future development during normal, dry, and multiple dry years?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
c) Result in a determination by the wastewater treatment provider which serves or may serve the project that it has adequate capacity to serve the project's projected demand in addition to the provider's existing commitments?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
d) Generate solid waste in excess of State or local standards, or in excess of the capacity of local infrastructure, or otherwise impair the attainment of solid waste reduction goals?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
e) Comply with federal, state, and local management and reduction statutes and regulations related to solid waste?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>

Discussion:

a. – e. Updates to the Local CEQA Guidelines do not include any changes that would result in impacts to utilities and service systems. Vegetation management and trail building do not involve the use or expansion of any utilities or water supplies, nor do they generate solid waste.

	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporation	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
XX. WILDFIRE. If located in or near state responsibility areas or lands classified as very high fire severity zones, would the project:				
a) Substantially impair an adopted emergency response plan or emergency evacuation plan?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
b) Due to slope, prevailing winds and other factors, exacerbate wildfire risks and thereby expose project occupants to pollutant concentrations from a wildfire or the uncontrolled spread of a wildfire?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>

	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporation	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
c) Require the installation or maintenance of associated infrastructure (such as roads, fuel breaks, emergency water sources, power lines or other utilities) that may exacerbate fire risk or that may result in temporary or ongoing impacts to the environment?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
d) Expose people or structures to significant risks, including downslope or downstream flooding or landslides, as a result of runoff, post-fire slope instability, or drainage changes?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>

Discussion:

a. – d. Updates to the Local CEQA Guidelines do not include any changes that would result in significant wildfire impacts. Vegetation management and trail building do not involve any changes that would increase risks associated with wildfire or impair response to wildfire. Vegetation management has the goal of decreasing wildfire risk.

	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporation	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
XXI. MANDATORY FINDINGS OF SIGNIFICANCE				
a) Does the project have the potential to degrade the quality of the environment, substantially reduce the habitat of a fish or wildlife species, cause a fish or wildlife population to drop below self-sustaining levels, threaten to eliminate a plant or animal community, reduce the number or restrict the range of a rare or endangered plant or animal or eliminate important examples of the major periods of California history or prehistory?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
b) Does the project have impacts that are individually limited, but cumulatively considerable? (“Cumulatively considerable” means that the incremental effects of a project are considerable when viewed in connection with the effects of past projects, the effects of other current projects, and the effects of probable future projects)?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
c) Does the project have environmental effects that will cause substantial adverse effects on human beings, either directly or indirectly?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>

Discussion:

- a. Updates to the Local CEQA Guidelines will have a less than significant adverse impact on wildlife resources. Vegetation management and trail building would not result in a significant loss of native trees, native vegetation, or important examples of California’s history or pre-history. These activities are generally conducted with small crews using hand tools or small equipment, resulting in minimal disturbance.
- b. The proposed project does not have impacts that are individually limited but cumulatively considerable.

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



NAPA COUNTY REGIONAL PARK &
OPEN SPACE DISTRICT

LOCAL PROCEDURES
FOR IMPLEMENTING THE
CALIFORNIA ENVIRONMENTAL QUALITY ACT

Adopted [Insert Date] ~~January 8, 2007~~
Revised ~~December 13, 2010~~ June 12, 2020

TABLE OF CONTENTS

CHAPTER 1. INTENT AND GENERAL PROVISIONS	1
Section 100. Intent	1
Section 101. Applicability.....	1
Section 102. Compliance Required Prior to Project Approval.	1
Section 103. Public Records.....	1
Section 104. Use of Consultants.....	2
Section 105. Notice Generally.....	2
CHAPTER 2. DEFINITIONS.....	32
Section 200. General.....	3
CHAPTER 3. RESPONSIBILITIES	43
Section 300. Board of Directors.....	4
Section 301. reserved.....	4
Section 302. District Official.....	4
Section 303. General Manager.....	4
Section 304. County Clerk/Recorder.....	5
CHAPTER 4. INITIAL ENVIRONMENTAL REVIEW	5
Section 400. reserved.....	5
Section 401. Project Completeness and Acceptance for Filing.	5
Section 402. Project Segmenting.	6
Section 403. Project Revisions.....	6
Section 404. Early Consultation.	6
Section 405. Preliminary Environmental Evaluation.....	76
Section 406. Initial Study Preparation.	7
Section 407. Reserved.....	7
Section 408. Previous Prepared District Environmental Document.	7
CHAPTER 5. EXEMPT PROJECTS	8
Section 500. General.....	8
Section 501. Ministerial Projects.....	8
Section 502. General Rule.....	8
Section 503. Statutory Exemptions.	8
Section 504. Categorical Exemptions.	8
Section 505. Categorical Exemption Use Limitations.	8
Section 506. Denial of Projects.	8
CHAPTER 6. NEGATIVE/MITIGATED NEGATIVE DECLARATION PROCESS.....	9
Section 600. Negative Declaration.....	9
Section 601. Mitigated Negative Declaration.	9
Section 602. Contents.....	9
Section 603. Public Notice and Review.....	9
Section 604. Notice of Determination.....	9
CHAPTER 7. ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACT REPORT (EIR) PROCESS.....	10

Section 700.	EIR Preparation.....	10
Section 701.	Contents of an EIR.....	10
Section 702.	Notice of Preparation (NOP).....	10
Section 702.1	Scoping.....	10
Section 702.2	Preparation of Administrative Draft EIR.....	11
Section 702.3	Public Review of Draft EIR.....	11
Section 702.4	Final EIR.....	11
Section 702.5	Notice of Determination (NOD).....	11
CHAPTER 8.	MITIGATION MONITORING AND REPORTING PROGRAM (MMRP)	12 ¹¹
Section 800.	General.....	12 ¹¹
Section 801.	Adoption.....	12
Section 802.	Contents.....	12
Section 803.	Compliance Assurance Responsibilities.....	12
Section 804.	Fees.....	13
CHAPTER 9.	NAPA COUNTY REGIONAL PARK AND OPEN SPACE DISTRICT AS A RESPONSIBLE AGENCY.....	13
Section 900.	Commenting on a Lead Agency's Environmental Document.....	13
Section 901.	Failure of Lead Agency to Consult With District or Adequately Respond to Comments Provided.....	14 ¹³
Section 902.	Approval of Project By District Acting as a Responsible Agency.....	14
Section 903.	Limitations on the Power of District as a Responsible Agency to Require Changes in Project.....	14
Section 904.	Certified Equivalent Program: Use of Environmental Document Prepared In Lieu of a Negative/Mitigated Negative Declaration or EIR.....	15 ¹⁴
CHAPTER 10.	APPEALS.....	15
Section 1000.	Appeals Permitted.....	15
APPENDICES	15
A.	Ministerially Exempt Projects for the District	
B.	Additional Categorically Exempt Projects for the District	
C.	Initial Study Checklist	

Napa County Regional Park and Open Space District

LOCAL PROCEDURES FOR IMPLEMENTING THE CALIFORNIA ENVIRONMENTAL QUALITY ACT

(*State CEQA Guidelines* Section 15022(a) requires that each public agency issue local procedures for implementing the *State CEQA Guidelines* in order to ensure the orderly evaluation and preparation of environmental documents. Such procedures shall be revised when needed to be kept current with changes to the *State CEQA Guidelines*; however, *State CEQA Guidelines* shall take precedence even if the local procedures are not updated).

CHAPTER I. INTENT AND GENERAL PROVISIONS

Section 100. Intent.

These local *District CEQA Guidelines* are established, adopted, and intended to meet the requirements of Section 15022(a) ~~the~~ of the *State CEQA Guidelines* and to provide the public with information on the procedures used by the District in the environmental review process.

Section 101. Applicability. [*State CEQA Guidelines* §15022(b)]

The procedures established in these guidelines are applicable to both public and private projects under the jurisdiction of the District

Section 102. Compliance Required Prior to Project Approval. [*State CEQA Guidelines* §15004]

No project or permit shall be approved nor shall any permit be issued or approval given by any District official or body until all procedures required by the *State* and *District CEQA Guidelines* have been completed, including, if required, the preparation and certification of a Final Environmental Impact Report (FEIR) by the District. Compliance with CEQA shall be included in the planning process as early as possible in order to allow incorporation of environmental considerations into the design of the project.

Section 103. Public Records. [*Public Records Act*]

- (a) All final documents prepared pursuant to these procedures shall be available for public inspection by prior appointment at the official office for the District, which is the ~~Conservation, Development and Planning, Building, and Environmental Services~~ Department of the County of Napa, 1195 Third Street, Room 210, Napa, California. Drafts and working papers shall not be considered final documents.
- (b) All reports and documents submitted other than proprietary reports, confidential archaeological and special status species location studies, and other confidential

information shall be available for public inspection by prior appointment at the official office for the District.

Section 104. Use of Consultants. *[Authorized by State CEQA Guidelines §§15045, 15074, 15090, 15356, implemented via local procedure below]*

- (a) The District may from time to time use consultants to fulfill its obligations under CEQA including, but not limited to, the preparation of Initial Studies, Negative/Mitigated Negative Declarations, and EIRs.
- (b) All consultant-prepared environmental documents utilized shall be prepared under contract with the District using the most current version of the District's Professional Services Agreement.
- (c) For projects not sponsored by the District, the project sponsor shall pay the full costs of draft and final document preparation including both consultant and District oversight and review costs. A deposit to cover District oversight and review costs shall be paid at the time of application. The deposit shall be made prior to the District contracting with a consultant and prior to commencement of document preparation and in no case later than thirty (30) days after issuance of the letter from the General Manager indicating the estimated cost to produce the document(s) involved.
- (d) When the General Manager determines that it is necessary to contract with a consultant to prepare an environmental document or document(s) for a public project, the ~~final~~ choice of consultant shall be made by the General Manager or, for contracts over \$~~1025~~,000, the District Board of Directors:
- (e) No firm or person having a financial interest in a project shall be employed to prepare environmental documents on that project, except that the General Manager may authorize non-profit organizations and their employees or agents to prepare draft environmental documents for their projects for use by the District.

Section 105. Notice Generally. *[State CEQA Guidelines §§15072 and 15087]*

- (a) The General Manager should make a concerted effort to provide early notice and solicit comments on environmental documents from the public and interested organizations so that a broad range of interests and opinions are available to decision-makers regarding the impacts of projects.
- (b) Any required notice shall be deemed given on the date of mailing, the date of posting, or the first day of publication, whichever is later.
- (c) Errors, irregularities, or neglect in the preparation of any required notice shall not in any way affect the validity or legality of the adoption or certification of environmental documents or approval or disapproval of a project unless such error, irregularity, or neglect is clearly substantial and prejudicial and that by reason of such error, irregularity, or neglect the party complaining suffered substantial injury and that a different result would have been probable if such error, irregularity, or neglect had not occurred.

CHAPTER 2. DEFINITIONS

Section 200. General.

The following definitions, which are specific to the District, are intended to supplement the definitions found in Article 20 of the *State CEQA Guidelines*:

“**Baseline Data Report**” (BDR) refers to the comprehensive inventory of the environmental and resource conditions completed by Napa County in 2005 and updated as needed to describe the baseline for analysis of environmental impacts in a given area of the County. Information from the BDR may be incorporated by reference into future environmental documents consistent with *State CEQA Guidelines Section 15150*.

“**Board**” means the Board of Directors of the Napa County Regional Park and Open Space District

“**County**” means the County of Napa.

“**Days**” means business days, Saturdays, Sundays, and County-recognized holidays, unless otherwise stated.

“**Decision-Making Body**” means the Board or District Official that has the ultimate responsibility for approving the project or permit under consideration.

“**District Official**” means the General Manager or other District staff member responsible for approving the project or permit under consideration.

“**Environmental Resource Mapping System**” means a set of hardcopy and electronic maps and related information maintained by the County Planning, Building, and Environmental Services Department delineating, among other things, environmental resources and hazards within the County.

“**Environmentally Sensitive Area**” means an area containing one or more environmental resources or hazards that may affect or be affected by the specific project involved.

“**General Rule Finding**” means a finding that it can be seen with certainty that there is no possibility the proposed action may have a significant effect on the environment and therefore CEQA is not applicable. [*State CEQA Guidelines §15061(b)(3)*]

“**Groundwater Deficient Area**” means the area shown on Map 13-1 (as may be amended), in Chapter 13.15 of the Napa County Code as well as any additional area formally identified by an ordinance adopted by the Board of Supervisors.

~~“**Permit**” means any permit, lease, license, certificate, approval, or other entitlement for use.~~

“**General Manager**” means the employee or contractor appointed by the Board as the General Manager of the District, or his/herttheir designee.

“**Permit**” means any permit, lease, license, certificate, approval, or other entitlement for use.

CHAPTER 3. RESPONSIBILITIES

The responsibilities for implementation of CEQA for the District are as follows:

Section 300. Board of Directors.

When the Board of Directors is the decision-making body on a project, the Board is responsible for certifying the Final EIR, adopting a Negative/Mitigated Negative Declaration, or determining that the project is exempt from environmental review; considering the environmental document prepared prior to taking action on the project; and ~~for~~ making the findings required by *State CEQA Guidelines* Sections 15091 (Findings) and 15093 (Statement of Overriding Considerations).

The Board of Directors shall also act as the appeal board for District Official actions on environmental determinations, Negative/Mitigated Negative Declaration adoptions, determinations that an EIR is required, and Final EIR certifications. In addition, the Board shall set the procedures for implementing CEQA in the District by adopting these *District CEQA Guidelines*, and shall be responsible for adopting any thresholds of significance pursuant to *State CEQA Guidelines* Section 15064.7, if desired.

Section 301. reserved

Section 302. District Official.

When a District Official is the decision-making body on a project, he/she is responsible for certifying the Final EIR, adopting a Negative/Mitigated Negative Declaration, or determining that the project is exempt from environmental review; considering the environmental document prepared prior to taking action on the project; and ~~for~~ making the findings required by *State CEQA Guidelines* Sections 15091 (Findings) and 15093 (Statement of Overriding Considerations).

Section 303. General Manager.

The General Manager or his/her/their designee is responsible for:

- (a) carrying out all environmental reviews undertaken by the District;
- (b) obtaining comments from other agencies on the expected environmental effects of a project;
- (c) identifying appropriate measures to reduce the potentially significant effects of a project to non-significant levels;
- (d) preparing and processing all environmental documents prepared by the District;
- (e) preparing Mitigation Monitoring and Reporting Programs where required;
- (f) reviewing and commenting on environmental documents submitted to the District by other public agencies;
- (g) preparing, distributing, and filing applicable environmental notices, including a Notice of Intent, Notice of Preparation, and Notice of Completion, and those

Notices of Exemption and Notices of Determination for projects approved by the Board or District Official;

- (h) developing, coordinating, and implementing the District's environmental review procedures consistent with policy direction provided by the Board of Directors;
- (i) establishing informal working thresholds of significance and proposing formal thresholds.

Section 304. County Clerk/Recorder.

The Napa County Clerk/Recorder is responsible for filing and posting all Notices of Intent, Completion, Exemption, and Determination for projects approved by the District. In addition, the Clerk/Recorder receives all Fish and Game fees collected and; distributes them to the State.

CHAPTER 4. INITIAL ENVIRONMENTAL REVIEW

Section 400. *reserved*

Section 401. ~~*reserved* Project Completeness and Acceptance for Filing. [State CEQA Guidelines §§15101 and 15111]~~

- ~~(a) No application for a permit shall be deemed complete until:~~
 - ~~(1) all information required by the General Manager to complete an Initial Study or make a determination that the underlying project is categorically exempt has been received, OR~~
 - ~~(2) the General Manager has determined pursuant to these and the State CEQA Guidelines that the underlying project is not a project under CEQA, is ministerial rather than discretionary in nature, clearly has no potential to have a significant effect on the environment, or is statutorily exempt from environmental review.~~
- ~~(b) If the General Manager determines that adequate information has not been submitted to complete a preliminary environmental review and, if necessary, an Initial Study, the project sponsor shall be notified in writing within thirty (30) days of application receipt that the application is incomplete. Any such notification shall state what additional information including fees must be submitted before the application can be considered complete.~~
 - ~~(1) This preliminary determination of incompleteness may be challenged by the project sponsor in writing within ten (10) working days and appealed to the Board if re-confirmed by the General Manager.~~
 - ~~(2) Failure to provide the required information within one hundred twenty (120) days of issuance of a Completeness Determination or thirty (30) days of issuance of a Request For Deposit Submission shall cause the application to be deemed "abandoned" without further notice or action~~

~~unless the General Manager gives a written extension to the deadline involved. Once an application is deemed abandoned, no further work shall be done on the project without submission of a new application and payment of new fees.~~

- ~~(c) Notwithstanding subsection (a), accepting an application as complete does not limit the District's authority to require the applicant to submit additional information needed for environmental evaluation of the project if the project sponsor makes changes to the project or if there are changes in circumstances that could not be anticipated during the initial review. Failure to provide this information within one hundred twenty (120) days of issuance of a Request For Additional Environmental Information or a Request For Additional Deposit Submission shall be treated in the same manner as failure to provide the information requested in a Completeness Determination (see Section 401(b)(2) above).~~

Section 402. Project Segmenting. [State CEQA Guidelines §15378]

A project is defined as the "whole of an action" and may not be segmented nor divided into smaller parts in an attempt to avoid full consideration of its environmental impacts. Thus, all of the separate permits and approvals for a particular project shall be considered together (along with the underlying activity itself) when determining the project's environmental effects. The environmental review of a project must include an analysis of the environmental effects of future expansion or other action if: (a) such future expansion or other action is a reasonably foreseeable consequence of the initial project; and (b) the future expansion or action will be significant in that it will likely change the scope or nature of the initial project or its environmental effects. When actions are remote or speculative, so that meaningful information regarding their impacts is unavailable, they are not reasonably foreseeable parts of a particular project and therefore need not be considered at the same time. Speculative future phases of a project need not be analyzed provided the project under consideration has independent utility and logical termini.

Section 403. Project Revisions.

Any revised or amended project shall be treated as a new project for purposes of determining the time period within which CEQA processing must be completed and the project approved or denied unless the revision is found by the Planning Director, General Manager or their designee to be minor and/or technical.

Section 404. Early Consultation. [State CEQA Guidelines §15063(g)]

The General Manager or his/her/their designee shall distribute a request for comments on the expected environmental effects of the project to all responsible agencies, trustee agencies, and other agencies and organizations that in the opinion of the General Manager have an interest in the project or applicable special expertise. ~~The request may occur before or after an application is deemed complete, and~~ may be combined with the request for comments on the project itself. At a minimum such requests shall include a request to identify potential impacts, possible mitigation measures, including needed

project revisions, and comments on the type of environmental document that should be prepared.

Section 405. Preliminary Environmental Evaluation. *[State CEQA Guidelines §§15060 and 15061]*

The General Manager is responsible for conducting a preliminary evaluation to decide whether or not an Initial Study is required, or whether the project is excluded or exempt from review under CEQA.

A list of non-discretionary (ministerial) projects for the District is contained in Appendix A. The District projects that are typically categorically exempt are identified in Appendix B.

If the General Manager determines that a proposal is excluded or exempt from review under CEQA, no further environmental review is required and the General Manager shall document this finding in the record. -The General Manager may also prepare and file a Notice of Exemption.

Section 406. Initial Study Preparation. *[State CEQA Guidelines §§15063 and 15064]*

If a proposed project is not excluded or exempt from CEQA, the General Manager or ~~his/her~~their designee shall prepare an Initial Study to determine whether a Negative/Mitigated Negative Declaration or an EIR is required for the proposed project. If it is clear that the project may have an unavoidable significant effect on the environment, the General Manager may proceed with preparation of an EIR without preparing an Initial Study. ~~—~~A standard Initial Study checklist form is contained in Appendix C.

If the Initial Study determines, based on substantial evidence in light of the whole record, that the project has no potential to have a significant effect on the environment, then a ~~N~~egative ~~D~~eclaration ~~must~~shall be prepared (see Chapter 6). -If the project may have one or more significant impacts on the environment, then preparation of an EIR (see Chapter 7) is required. -However, if revisions or mitigation measures can be applied to the project that would clearly reduce all impacts to a level of insignificance, ~~AND the project sponsor agrees to these in writing,~~ then a ~~M~~itigated ~~N~~egative ~~D~~eclaration may be prepared (see Chapter 6).

Section 407. *reserved*

Section 408. Previously Prepared District Environmental Document. *[State CEQA Guidelines §15162(a)]*

- (a) If a previous EIR or Negative/Mitigated Negative Declaration has been certified/adopted by the District and the General Manager determines that none of the circumstances requiring the preparation of a subsequent environmental document exists, the General Manager shall document that determination in the record, and the decision-making body may utilize the earlier document.

Documentation of the General Manager's determination may take the form of a memorandum, and may be based on preparation of an Initial Study if desired.

CHAPTER 5. EXEMPT PROJECTS

Section 500. General.

Projects that are ministerial in nature, meet General Rule findings, are statutorily exempt, are categorically exempt, or are denied do not require the preparation of an Initial Study, ~~an EIR or~~ a Negative/Mitigated Negative Declaration, or an EIR.

Section 501. Ministerial Projects. *[State CEQA Guidelines §15268]*

Appendix A contains the list of projects that the Board has found to be ministerial in nature. -However, when a project involves elements, some of which are ministerial in nature and some of which are discretionary, the overall project will be deemed discretionary and subject to CEQA review.

Section 502. General Rule. *[State CEQA Guidelines §15061(b)(3)]*

CEQA does not apply to a project where it can be seen with certainty that there is no possibility that the activity may have a significant effect on the environment.

Section 503. Statutory Exemptions. *[State CEQA Guidelines §15260]*

Those exemptions granted by the State legislature are listed in *State CEQA Guidelines* Ssections 15260 through 15285; ~~and~~ as they may be amended.

Section 504. Categorical Exemptions. *[State CEQA Guidelines §15301-15332]*

In addition to those specific projects listed above, the Board has found several other kinds of projects that typically do not have a significant impact on the environment. Therefore, pursuant to Section 15300.4 of the *State CEQA Guidelines*, the District hereby adds the activities and permits listed in Appendix B to the list of Class Numbers 1, 3, 4, ~~and 5~~ activities that are categorically exempt for the District.

Section 505. Categorical Exemption Use Limitations. *[State CEQA Guidelines §15300.2(a)-(f) and local ordinance (g)]*

A categorical exemption shall not be used if the conditions in *State CEQA Guidelines* Section 15300.2 apply.:

Section 506. Denial of Projects. *[State CEQA Guidelines §15061(b)(4)]*

Projects that the District rejects or disapproves are not subject to CEQA. ~~This provision, however, does not relieve a project sponsor from paying the costs for an EIR, Negative/Mitigated Negative Declaration, Initial Study, or preliminary environmental evaluation if prepared.~~

CHAPTER 6. NEGATIVE/MITIGATED NEGATIVE DECLARATION PROCESS

The following provisions are added as procedural clarifications of *State CEQA Guidelines* Sections 15070 - 15075 with respect to Negative/Mitigated Negative Declarations for the District.

Section 600. Negative Declaration. *[State CEQA Guidelines §15070]*

If the General Manager finds, based on the Initial Study, that there is no substantial evidence, in light of the whole record, that the project may have a significant effect on the environment, the General Manager or ~~his/her~~their designee shall prepare a Negative Declaration for consideration by the decision-making body for the project(s) or permit(s) involved.

Section 601. Mitigated Negative Declaration. *[State CEQA Guidelines §15070]*

If the General Manager finds, based on the Initial Study, that the proposed project may have possible adverse significant impacts on the environment, but through revisions to the project or imposition of mitigation measures, such impacts would be mitigated or avoided so that no significant impacts remain, AND there is no substantial evidence in the record as a whole that significant impacts would result from the revised project; then the General Manager ~~shall notify the project sponsor(s) and provide them with a copy of the list of proposed mitigation measures that the project could incorporate to avoid all potentially significant effects. If the project sponsor agrees in writing to these or functionally equivalent revisions/mitigation, the General Manager will then shall~~ prepare a Mitigated Negative Declaration for public review and consideration by the decision-making body ~~on~~for the project(s) or permit(s) involved.

Section 602. Contents. *[State CEQA Guidelines §15071]*

The Negative/Mitigated Negative Declaration must contain all items required by *State CEQA Guidelines* Section 15071.

Section 603. Public Notice and Review. *[State CEQA Guidelines §15072 and 15073]*

A Notice of Intent to Adopt a Negative/Mitigated Negative Declaration shall be provided to the public, trustee agencies, and the county clerk in accordance with *State CEQA Guidelines* Section 15072. To allow the public the review period provided under *State CEQA Guidelines* Section 15105, a direct mailing to the owners and occupants of property contiguous to the project shall occur. Owners of such property shall be identified as shown on the latest equalized assessment roll. If a comment is not received during the public review period from an agency or person, it shall be assumed, absent a request for a specific extension of time, that said agency or person has no comment to make.

Section 604. Notice of Determination. *[State CEQA Guidelines §15075]*

- (a) Whenever the Board or a District Official approves a permit or authorizes a project for which a Negative/Mitigated Negative Declaration has been prepared,

- the General Manager or his/herttheir designee shall file within 5 **working** days of their action a Notice of Determination with the County Clerk/Recorder.
- (b) In instances where multiple approval actions by the District are required, the Notice of Determination shall be filed after the final decision to approve a project.
- (c) If the project requires discretionary approvals from one or more state agencies, the Notice of Determination shall also be filed with the State Office of Planning and Research within this same 5-day period. ~~Payment of any Fish and Game fees due to the State at the time a Notice of Determination is filed is the responsibility of the project sponsor. When the project sponsor is not the District, the project sponsor must submit the fee to the District before the District holds a hearing on or decides on the adequacy of the Negative/Mitigated Negative Declaration prepared.~~

CHAPTER 7. ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACT REPORT (EIR) PROCESS

The following provisions are added as procedural clarifications of *State CEQA Guidelines* Sections 15080 ~~-~~15097, 15120 ~~-~~15132, and 15140 ~~-~~15154 with respect to the preparation and processing of EIRs for the District.

Section 700. EIR Preparation. *[State CEQA Guidelines §§15081 and 15081.5]*

If the General Manager finds during preliminary review or based on an Initial Study that there is substantial evidence in the record as a whole that a project may have a significant adverse effect on the environment, or if an EIR is required by statute, the General Manager shall ~~notify the project sponsor in writing within thirty (30) days that an EIR must be prepared. The decision of the General Manager's decision may be appealed to the District Board of Directors direct that an EIR be prepared.~~

Section 701. Contents of an EIR. *[State CEQA Guidelines §15120-15132]*

An EIR produced by/for the District must contain all items required by *State CEQA Guidelines* Sections 15120 ~~-~~ 15132. ~~In addition, it must meet the requirements of State CEQA Guidelines Sections, 15140-15152, and 15154.~~

Section 702. Notice of Preparation (NOP). *[State CEQA Guidelines §15082]*

A Notice of Preparation notifying responsible and interested agencies about the project and soliciting their comments on the scope and content of the EIR shall be prepared by the General Manager or his/herttheir designee. ~~This notice shall be sent by certified mail to the project sponsor, all responsible and trustee agencies, the county clerk, and all federal agencies involved in approving or funding the project. If State agencies are involved, then the NOP shall also be sent to the State Clearinghouse. A copy of the NOP shall also be delivered to the County Clerk/Recorder for posting for thirty (30) days.~~

Section 702.1 Scoping. *[State CEQA Guidelines §15083]*

The scope of the EIR prepared is determined using the following sources: the Initial Study, if one is produced, previous environmental documents, responses to the NOP,

consultation with other agencies, and public scoping meetings, if held. -A public scoping meeting may be incorporated into the NOP process and is typically held by the consultant preparing the EIR with assistance from the General Manager or his/her/their designee.

Section 702.2 Preparation of Administrative Draft EIR.

The pre-circulation draft of an EIR is referred to as the administrative draft. -This draft is considered a working document to be circulated among District staff, agents, contractors and other experts as needed for their comment on its accuracy and adequacy. -It is not available for public review and copies of the administrative draft EIR shall be destroyed upon release of the Draft EIR.

Section 702.3 Public Review of Draft EIR. *[State CEQA Guidelines §§15085, 15087, 15105]*

- (a) The General Manager shall provide public notice of the availability of the Draft EIR for review and comment in the same manner as specified in Section 603 for a Negative Declaration. -In addition, a copy of the Draft EIR shall be sent to the nearest branch of the Napa City/County Library at the same time a Notice of Completion is sent to the State Office of Planning and Research. -The contents of the public notice shall be as specified in *State CEQA Guidelines* Section 15087(c).
- (b) The normal public review period for a Draft EIR in the District shall be 45 days unless a shorter period of not less than 30 days is approved by the State Clearinghouse. *[State CEQA Guidelines §15105]* The General Manager may set a public review period of up to 60 days when circumstances indicate that a longer than normal review period is appropriate.
- (c) A public hearing on a Draft EIR is not required under CEQA and is not typically held by the District when the decision-making body is the General Manager or his/her/their designee. When the decision-making body is the Board, a public hearing ~~should~~shall be held during the public review period to solicit public comments.

Section 702.4 Final EIR. *[State CEQA Guidelines §15132]*

The Final EIR consists of the text of the Draft EIR revised as necessary to reflect those comments received that require text changes, all comments received on the Draft EIR, the District's responses to said comments, -a list of all persons and agencies that were asked to comment or commented on the Draft EIR, and any other information added by the District.

Section 702.5 Notice of Determination (NOD). *[State CEQA Guidelines §15094]*

After certification of the final EIR and approval of the project, the General Manager or his/her/their designee shall prepare and file a Notice of Determination with the County Clerk/Recorder following the same procedure and with the same restrictions as specified in Section 604.

CHAPTER 8. MITIGATION MONITORING AND REPORTING PROGRAM (MMRP)

Section 800. General. *[State CEQA Guidelines §15097]*

Pursuant to Public Resources Code Section 21081.6, all jurisdictions must have a method for monitoring compliance and implementation of adopted mitigation measures. The District Mitigation Monitoring and Reporting programs (i.e., MMRPs) shall be in conformance with *State CEQA Guidelines* Section 15097 as augmented by the provisions listed below.

Section 801. Adoption. *[State CEQA Guidelines §15097]*

- (a) At the time the District makes the required CEQA findings regarding the Mitigated Negative Declaration or EIR being used, the decision-making body shall adopt a program for monitoring and reporting on the mitigation measures as part of the project. Conformance with this program shall be a condition of project approval.
- (b) The resultant adopted MMRP shall be distributed to all agencies, departments, and parties with monitoring or review responsibility thereunder.

Section 802. Contents.

MMRPs shall include at a minimum the following information for each mitigation measure:

- (a) identification of the individual, department, agency, or other entity responsible for performing the mitigation measure;
- (b) identification of the timing for implementation of the mitigation measure;
- (c) identification of the specific results or performance standards that the mitigation is intended to accomplish if not clearly stated in the mitigation measure;
- (d) identification of the individual, department, agency, or other entity responsible for ensuring implementation of the mitigation measure;
- (e) identification of the frequency of inspections or other monitoring activities;
- (f) identification of when compliance is completed;
- (g) ~~a statement that the project sponsor shall pay all monitoring costs including but not limited to those included by the District; AND~~
- ~~(h) a signature block for the project sponsor and the property owner.~~

Section 803. Compliance Assurance Responsibilities.

- (a) Overall compliance shall be coordinated by the General Manager or his/herttheir designee unless otherwise indicated in the adopted MMRP.
- (b) The General Manager or his/herttheir designee may hire an outside consultant where mitigation measure compliance ~~cannot be verified through the planning clearance process,~~ where monitoring requires specialized expertise; or when District staff is unavailable to do the necessary work. ~~The cost of said consultant shall be paid by the project sponsor.~~
- (c) Other agencies shall monitor the mitigation measures that they request or that are within their area of expertise. ~~The General Manager or his/herttheir designee~~

shall notify these agencies of the mitigation monitoring required. -These agencies shall inform the District in writing when each of their mitigation measures has been complied with completely.

Section 804. ~~reserved Fees. [State CEQA Guidelines §15045]~~

- ~~(a) The District shall charge and collect from the project sponsor a fee in an amount equal to the actual costs to the District of implementing the adopted MMRP. This includes the costs associated with use of an outside consultant where the General Manager finds said use to be either necessary and/or convenient.~~
- ~~(b) An initial deposit in an amount equal to the District's total estimated costs of implementing the adopted MMRP for the first three (3) years shall be submitted to the General Manager or his/her/their designee prior to issuance of the first building permit needed to commence work on the project. Any unused portion of this initial deposit that is not needed to pay for permanent or long term monitoring will be refunded to the project sponsor upon fulfillment of all those MMRP provisions that do not involve such monitoring.~~
- ~~(c) The project sponsor shall replenish the initial deposit every two (2) years so that the balance is high enough to pay for the estimated costs of monitoring compliance for three (3) years for those measures that require long term or ongoing monitoring.~~

CHAPTER 9. NAPA COUNTY REGIONAL PARK AND OPEN SPACE DISTRICT AS A RESPONSIBLE AGENCY

[State CEQA Guidelines §§15096 and 15253]

The following provisions are added as procedural clarifications of *State CEQA Guidelines* Sections 15096 and 15253 with respect to the responsible agency process for the District.

Section 900. Commenting on a Lead Agency's Environmental Document. [State CEQA Guidelines §15096]

- (a) The General Manager or his/her/their designee shall make every effort to provide written comments on the draft Negative/Mitigated Negative Declaration, Notice of Preparation, and/or Draft EIR prepared by the Lead Agency within the time frames specified in the *State CEQA Guidelines*.
- (b) The comments provided shall be limited to activities within the District's area of expertise or jurisdiction. -They shall at a minimum identify District standards, permit requirements, potentially significant impacts, alternatives to be analyzed, and any mitigation measures to be considered. -In addition, a recommendation as to whether a Negative/Mitigated Negative Declaration, or EIR is the appropriate document for the Lead Agency to prepare may be provided. -The focus of the comments shall be to assist the Lead Agency in producing a defensible environmental document that meets the District's needs.

Section 901. Failure of Lead Agency to Consult With District or Adequately Respond to Comments Provided. *[State CEQA Guidelines §15096]*

- (a) If the Lead Agency fails to consult with the District prior to adopting a Negative/Mitigated Negative Declaration or certifying an EIR for a project over which the District has ~~discretionary permit~~ authority, the ~~Planning Department~~District will review the document prepared. If the General Manager finds based on the review done that the document is adequate for District purposes, the District shall follow the procedures specified in Sections 903 and 904 below. However, if the General Manager finds that the document is inadequate for District purposes, then the District may take over the role of Lead Agency. The General Manager or ~~his/her~~their designee shall in that case follow the procedures specified ~~herein~~ in Chapters 4, 5, and 6 to prepare and process the environmental document needed.
- (b) If the Lead Agency fails in the opinion of the General Manager to adequately respond to the comments provided, the General Manager shall consult with District Counsel and jointly recommend a course of action pursuant to CEQA guidelines Section 15096(e)

Section 902. Approval of Project By District Acting as a Responsible Agency. *[State CEQA Guidelines §15096]*

- (a) In issuing approvals or taking any other discretionary action on a project for which the District is a responsible agency, the District shall certify that it has reviewed and considered the environmental effects of the project as shown in the Negative/Mitigated Negative Declaration or EIR prepared by the Lead Agency.
- (b) If an EIR has been produced, the District decision-making body shall adopt findings as set forth in *State CEQA Guidelines* Sections 15091 and 15093, if necessary.
- (c) Where the District decision-making body requires the implementation of mitigation measures or other project changes to substantially lessen or avoid significant environmental effects of activities under its statutory control, an MMRP consistent with Chapter 8 of these guidelines covering those changes and measures shall be adopted at the time of project approval.

Section 903. Limitations on the Power of District as a Responsible Agency to Require Changes in Project.

- (a) When the District acts as a responsible agency for a project, it may only require those changes in a project that lessen or avoid the effects, either direct or indirect, of that part of the project that the District will be called upon to carry out or approve.
- (b) When the District acts as a responsible agency, it may refuse to approve a project only in order to avoid direct or indirect adverse environmental effects of that part of the project ~~that~~ the District must carry out or approve.

Section 904. Certified Equivalent Program: -Use of Environmental Document Prepared In Lieu of a Negative/Mitigated Negative Declaration or EIR.

[State CEQA Guidelines §§15250-15253]

An environmental analysis document prepared for a project pursuant to a certified equivalent program shall be used by the District as a substitute for ~~an EIR or~~ Negative Declaration/Mitigated Negative Declaration ~~or EIR~~ and no additional environmental document shall be required if the conditions in *State CEQA Guidelines* Section 15253(b) are met.

CHAPTER 10. APPEALS

Section 1000. Appeals Permitted. *[Local Procedure]*

- (a) Any interested person may appeal to the Board the determination of the General Manager that a project is/is not exempt from review, or that an EIR is required, subject to the payment of all District costs associated with processing the appeal.
- (b) Any decision by the General Manager to adopt a ~~N~~egative ~~D~~eclaration, to adopt a ~~M~~itigate ~~N~~egative ~~D~~eclaration, or to certify a Final EIR may also be appealed to the Board, subject to the payment of all District costs associated with processing the appeal.
- (c) Any appeal filed pursuant to this Section will suspend any further consideration of the project until a decision on the appeal is made by the Board.
- (d) Appeals must be filed in writing with the District Secretary within ten (10) working days of the decision being appealed. ~~The appeal must contain a detailed statement supported by substantial evidence for each cause of appeal. Arguments and/or evidence not included in the written appeal shall not be considered by the Board. The appeal must also be accompanied by an appeal fee, which shall be reasonably related to the expected full cost to the District of processing the appeal, as determined by the General Manager. Upon conclusion of the appeal process, if the actual cost to the District is less than the amount of the fee collected, the excess amount shall be returned to the appellant.~~

APPENDICES

- A. Ministerially Exempt Projects for the District
- B. Additional Categorically Exempt Projects for the District
- C. Initial Study Checklist

APPENDIX A

MINISTERIALLY EXEMPT PROJECTS FOR THE DISTRICT

Pursuant to Sections 15022 and 15268 of the *State CEQA Guidelines* issuance/approval of the following permits by the District shall be conclusively presumed to be ministerially exempt from the requirements of CEQA and thus preparation of an environmental document is not required. However, where a project involves an approval that contains elements of both a ministerial action and a discretionary action, the project will be deemed discretionary and will be subject to the requirements of CEQA.

No permits meeting this criteria have been identified at this time.

APPENDIX B

ADDITIONAL CATEGORICALLY EXEMPT PROJECTS FOR THE DISTRICT

In addition to the exemptions contained in the *State CEQA Guidelines*, pursuant to Sections 15022(a)(1)(C) and 15300.4, ~~of the *State CEQA Guidelines*~~ the Board has found that the following types of projects typically do not have a significant effect on the environment and therefore qualify for a categorical exemption under the class of categorical exemptions listed below. Listing here does not guarantee a project is exempt if due to location or other unique circumstances the project would have a significant impact on the environment. The *State CEQA Guidelines* provide many examples of when an otherwise exempt project may no longer be exempt. The following list should therefore be read in conjunction with the *State CEQA Guidelines*.

Class I: Existing Facilities [*State CEQA Guidelines* §15301]

- I. ~~1.~~ Repair, maintenance, reconstruction, replacement, and minor expansion of existing roads, streets, highways, bicycle and pedestrian paths and trails, and appurtenant facilities, including, but not limited to:
 - (a) reconstructing, resurfacing, and/or seal coating of existing roads and trails;
 - (b) paving existing unpaved road shoulders;
 - (c) widening existing roads and/or trails by less than ~~8-10~~ feet of paved or unpaved surface and 4 feet of unpaved shoulders;
 - (d) adding short auxiliary lanes when required for localized purposes such as weaving, turning, climbing, lane changing, or accelerating or decelerating;
 - (e) adding non-motorized trails and walkways parallel to the existing roadway to separate such non-motorized uses from motorized traffic;
 - (f) installing landscaping in and around existing buildings, roads, and trails that involves minimal earth disturbing activities;
 - (g) working on clear-span bridge structures, reconstructing existing stream crossings and making minor operational improvements to drainage facilities, provided that the construction of temporary stream bypasses is not involved;
 - (h) modifying to improve existing roadside or trailside safety features such as curbs, pikes, headwalls, slopes, and ditches, adding or replacing devices such as fencing, guardrails, safety barriers, guideposts, and markers, or installing, removing, or modifying regulatory, warning, or informational signs;
 - (i) adding, removing, and/or replacing distinctive roadway markings such as painted stripes, raised pavement markers, thermoplastic, tape, or raised bars; ~~OR~~
 - (j) minor rerouting of roads or trails to correct erosion problems, reduce impacts to environmentally sensitive features, and/or improve safety;

- (k) paving of existing unpaved roads and trails, provided water runoff is not concentrated in such a way as to cause downstream erosion and/or water quality impacts; or

~~2.~~ OR

- ~~2.~~ (l) construction of water bars, drain dips, swales, and other minor water management and erosion control features on roads and trails, provided water runoff is not concentrated in such a way as to cause downstream erosion and/or water quality impacts.

~~2.~~ 2. Applications for minor modifications of existing use permits

3. Operation and Maintenance Activities, including but not limited to:

- (a) ~~a.~~ Cleaning, painting and repair of existing structures and facilities; OR or
- (b) ~~b.~~ On-going rental, lease, or use of existing facilities by District staff, contractors, agents, and/or volunteers.

Class 3: New Construction or Conversion of Small Structures [State CEQA Guidelines §15303]

1. ~~1.~~ Installation and/or operation of water wells in accordance with County of Napa ~~Department of Environmental Management Health Division~~ requirements .
2. ~~2.~~ New fencing to protect resources, limit trespass, control grazing, improve safety, and/or restrict public access, provided the fencing is of a variety and in locations where it will not significantly impede wildlife movement.
3. ~~3.~~ Installation of solar panels on or adjacent to existing structures.
- ~~4.~~ 4. Repair, upgrading, and extension of utilities.
- ~~4.5.~~ Installation or construction of works of art or craft on a temporary or permanent basis.

Class 4: Minor Alterations to Land [State CEQA Guidelines §15304]

1. ~~1.~~ New access roads and driveways that would:
- (a) ~~(a)~~ not disturb more than 2 acres of land;
- (b) ~~(b)~~ not move more than 2,000 cubic yards of soil;
- (c) ~~(c)~~ not traverse slopes that are steeper than 29.9%; AND and
- (d) ~~(d)~~ not discharge concentrated runoff within a stream setback area.
2. ~~2.~~ Mechanical or chemical control of invasive plants that is consistent with best management practices.
- ~~3.~~ 3. Routine vegetation management including but not limited to pruning, fuel load reduction, and fuel clearance around structures, to reduce wildfire hazard that is consistent with the recommendations of the County of Napa Fire Marshall.
- ~~3.4.~~ Vegetation management such as grazing, prescribed fire, and vegetation thinning to reduce wildfire hazard.
- ~~5.~~ 4. Minor temporary use of land having negligible or no permanent effects on the environments, including volunteer work parties, meetings, educational tours and activities, etc.

6. New trails of natural pervious surface that would not:

- (a) Be located in the vicinity of any candidate, sensitive, or special status species;
- (b) Be located within riparian habitat or other sensitive natural community;
- (c) Have an adverse effect on state or federally protected wetlands;
- (d) Be located in the vicinity of any known cultural resources as shown in Napa County sensitivity mapping;
- (e) Be located or result in unstable soils such that there is a potential for damaging ground failure, landslide, or collapse.; or
- (f) Substantially alter existing drainage patterns in a manner that would result in substantial erosion or siltation, increase surface runoff, or impede or redirect flows.

Class 5: Minor Alterations in Land Use Limitations [State CEQA Guidelines §15305]

- ~~1.~~ 1. — Acceptance or granting of easements or other land use agreements which protect natural resources and viewsheds.
- ~~1.2.~~ 2. — Acceptance of interests in property, including easements, leases, etc.
- ~~2.3.~~ 3. — Lot line adjustments and parcel mergers or divisions ~~which~~ that do not create new development rights.
- ~~3.4.~~ 4. — Applications for variances or exceptions to standards for permitted projects.

Class 23: Normal Operations of Facilities for Public Gatherings [State CEQA Guidelines §15323]

- 1. Normal operations of developed and undeveloped campgrounds.
- 2. Dispersed camping (at least 100 feet from any stream or water source and at least 150 feet from any roadway) where allowed by District regulation.
- 3. Public gatherings for nature appreciation, sport, science, or public education of a scale and type normally to be expected at a regional park or open space.

APPENDIX C
INITIAL STUDY CHECKLIST FORM

NAPA COUNTY REGIONAL PARK AND OPEN SPACE DISTRICT

1195 3rd Street, Suite 210
Napa, Calif. 94559
707.253.4417

Initial Study Checklist

1. **Project Title:**
2. **Property Owner:**
3. **Contact person, phone number and email:**
4. **Project location and APN:**
5. **Project Sponsor's Name and Address:**
6. **General Plan Description:**
7. **Current Zoning:**
8. **Project Description:**
9. **Environmental Setting and Surrounding Land Uses:**
10. ~~10.~~ **Other agencies whose approval is required:** (e.g., permits, financing approval, or participation agreement).
- ~~10.~~11. **California Native American tribal consultation:** Have tribes traditionally and culturally affiliated with the project area requested consultation pursuant to Public Resources Code section 21080.3.1? If so, is there a plan for consultation that includes, for example, the determination of significance of impacts to tribal cultural resources, procedures regarding confidentiality, etc.?

ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACTS AND BASIS OF CONCLUSIONS:

The conclusions and recommendations contained herein are professional opinions derived in accordance with current standards of professional practice. They are based on a review of the Napa County Environmental Resource Maps, other sources of information listed in the file, and the comments received, conversations with knowledgeable individuals, the preparer's personal knowledge of the area, and where necessary visits to the site and surrounding areas. For further information see the environmental background information contained in the permanent file on this project.

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.

[Type text Project Title]

- 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 only analyze only the effects that remain to be addressed.
- I find that although the proposed project could have a significant effect on the environment, because all potentially significant effects (a) have been analyzed adequately in an earlier EIR or NEGATIVE DECLARATION pursuant to applicable standards, and (b) have been avoided or mitigated pursuant to that earlier EIR or NEGATIVE DECLARATION, including revisions or mitigation measures that are imposed upon the proposed project, nothing further is required.

Signature

Date

Print Name and Title

	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporation	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
I. AESTHETICS. <u>Except as provided in Public Resources Code Section 21099, would the project:</u>				
a) Have a substantial adverse effect on a scenic vista?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input 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 type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
c) <u>In non-urbanized areas, substantially degrade the existing visual character or quality of public views of the site and its surroundings (public views are those that are experienced from a publicly accessible vantage point). If the project is in an urbanized area, would the project conflict with applicable zoning and other regulations governing scenic quality?</u>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input 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 type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>

Discussion:

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

- b) ~~b)~~—Conflict with existing zoning for agricultural use, or a Williamson Act contract?
- c) Conflict with existing zoning for, or cause rezoning of, forest land as defined in Public Resources Code Section 12220(g), timberland as defined in Public Resources Code Section 4526, or timberland zoned Timberland Production as defined in Government Code Section 51104(g)?
- d) Result in the loss of forest land or conversion of forest land to non-forest use in a manner that will significantly affect timber, aesthetics, fish and wildlife, biodiversity, water quality, recreation, or other public benefits?
- e) Involve other changes in the existing environment which, due to their location or nature, could result in conversion of Farmland to non-agricultural use?

~~Discussion:~~

Discussion:

		Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporation	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
III.	AIR QUALITY. Where available, the significance criteria established by the applicable air quality management <u>district</u> 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 type="checkbox"/>
	b) Violate any air quality standard or contribute substantially to an existing or projected air quality violation?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
	m)b) Result in a cumulatively considerable net increase of any criteria pollutant for which the project region is non-attainment under an applicable federal or state ambient air quality standard (including releasing emissions which exceed quantitative thresholds for ozone precursors)?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
	n)c) Expose sensitive receptors to substantial pollutant concentrations?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
	o)d) Create objectionableResult in other emissions (such as those leading to odors) adversely affecting a substantial number of people?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>

Discussion:

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

Discussion:

	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporation	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
V. CULTURAL RESOURCES. Would the project:				
a) Cause a substantial adverse change in the significance of a historical resource as defined in <u>pursuant to</u> CEQA Guidelines §15064.5?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>

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

Discussion:

	<u>Potentially Significant Impact</u>	<u>Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporation</u>	<u>Less Than Significant Impact</u>	<u>No Impact</u>
<u>VI. ENERGY. Would the project:</u>				
a) <u>Result in a potentially significant environmental impact due to wasteful, inefficient, or unnecessary consumption of energy resources, during project construction or operation?</u>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
b) <u>Conflict with or obstruct a state or local plan for renewable energy or energy efficiency?</u>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>

Discussion:

	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporation	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
<u>VII. GEOLOGY and SOILS. Would the project:</u>				
a) Expose people or structures to <u>Directly or indirectly cause potential substantial adverse effects, including the risk of loss, injury, or death involving:</u>				
i) Rupture of a known earthquake fault, as delineated on the most recent Alquist-Priolo Earthquake Fault Zoning Map issued by the State Geologist for the area or based on other substantial evidence of a known fault? Refer to Division of Mines and Geology Special Publication 42.	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
ii) Strong seismic ground shaking?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
iii) Seismic-related ground failure, including liquefaction?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
iv) Landslides?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>

	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporation	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
b) Result in substantial soil erosion or the loss of topsoil?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input 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 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 direct or indirect risks to life or property?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
e) Have soils incapable of adequately supporting the use of septic tanks or alternative waste water disposal systems where sewers are not available for the disposal of waste water?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
f) Directly or indirectly destroy a unique paleontological resource or site or unique geologic feature?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>

Discussion:

	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporation	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
i) GREENHOUSE GAS EMISSIONS. Would the project:				
a) Generate a net increase in greenhouse gas emissions in excess of applicable thresholds adopted by the Bay Area Air Quality Management District or the California Air Resources Board which may have a significant impact on the environment?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
b) Conflict with a county-adopted climate action plan or another applicable plan, policy or regulation adopted for the purpose of reducing the emissions of greenhouse gases?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>

Discussion:

	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporation	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
VIII.X. HAZARDS AND HAZARDOUS MATERIALS. Would the project:				
a) Create a significant hazard to the public or the environment through the routine transport, use, or disposal of hazardous materials?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
b) Create a significant hazard to the public or the environment through reasonable foreseeable upset and accident conditions involving the release of hazardous materials into the environment?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
c) Emit hazardous emissions or handle hazardous or acutely hazardous materials, substances, or waste within one-quarter mile of an existing or proposed school?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
d) Be located on a site which is included on a list of hazardous materials sites compiled pursuant to Government Code Section 65962.5 and, as a result, would it create a significant hazard to the public or the environment?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
e) For a project located within an airport land use plan or, where such a plan has not been adopted, within two miles of a public airport or public use airport, would the project result in a safety hazard <u>or excessive noise</u> for people residing or working in the project area?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
— For a project within the vicinity of a private airstrip, or, where such a plan has not been adopted, within two miles of a public airport or public use airport, would the project result in a safety hazard for people residing or working in the project area?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
f) Impair implementation of or physically interfere with an adopted emergency response plan or emergency evacuation plan?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
g) Expose people or structures, <u>either directly or indirectly</u> , 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 type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>

Discussion:

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

IX. HYDROLOGY AND WATER QUALITY. Would the project:

a) Violate any water quality standards or waste discharge requirements or otherwise substantially degrade surface or ground water quality?

b) ~~b) Substantially deplete-decrease groundwater supplies or interfere substantially with groundwater recharge such that the project may impede sustainable groundwater management of the basin there would be a net deficit in aquifer volume or a lowering of the local groundwater table level (e.g., the production rate of pre-existing nearby wells would drop to a level which would not support existing land uses or planned uses for which permits have been granted)?~~

~~c) e) Substantially alter the existing drainage pattern of the site or area, including through the alteration of the course of a stream or river or through the addition of impervious surfaces, in a manner which would: result in substantial erosion or siltation on- or off-site?~~

~~i) result in substantial erosion or siltation on- or off-site;~~

~~ii) d) Substantially increase the rate or amount of surface runoff in a manner which would result in flooding on- or off-site; 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?~~

~~iii) 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?; or~~

~~iii) Otherwise substantially degrade water quality?~~ ~~i)~~ ~~i)~~ ~~i)~~ ~~i)~~

~~x) 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?~~ ~~i)~~ ~~i)~~ ~~i)~~ ~~i)~~

~~i) ~~xxv) iv) h) Place within a 100-year flood hazard area structures which would impede or redirect flood flows?~~~~

~~i) Expose people or structures to a significant risk of loss, injury or death involving flooding, including flooding as a result of the failure of a levee or dam?~~

	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporation	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
s)d) Inundation by In flood hazard, tsunami, or seiche, tsunami, or mudflow zones, risk release of pollutants due to project inundation?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
e) <u>Conflict with or obstruct implementation of a water quality control plan or sustainable groundwater management plan?</u>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>

Discussion:

	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporation	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
XI. LAND USE AND PLANNING. Would the project:				
a) Physically divide an established community?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
b) <u>Cause a significant environmental impact due to a 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?</u>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
c) Conflict with any applicable habitat conservation plan or natural community conservation plan?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>

Discussion:

	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporation	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
XII. MINERAL RESOURCES. Would the project:				
a) Result in the loss of availability of a known mineral resource that would be of value to the region and the residents of the state?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input 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 type="checkbox"/>

Discussion:

	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporation	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
XIII. NOISE. Would the project result in:				
a) Exposure of persons to or g Generation of a <u>substantial temporary or permanent increase in ambient noise levels in the vicinity of the project</u> in excess of standards established in the local general plan or noise ordinance, or applicable standards of other agencies?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
b) Exposure of persons to or g Generation of excessive ground-borne vibration or ground-borne noise levels?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input 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 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 type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
e) For a project located within <u>the vicinity of a private airstrip or 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</u> , 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 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 type="checkbox"/>

Discussion:

	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporation	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
XIV. POPULATION and HOUSING. Would the project:				
a) Induce substantial <u>unplanned</u> population growth in an area, either directly (for example, by proposing new homes and businesses) or indirectly (for example, through extension of roads or other infrastructure)?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
b) Displace substantial numbers of existing <u>people or housing</u> , necessitating the construction of replacement housing elsewhere?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input 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 type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>

Discussion:

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

Discussion:

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

Discussion:

	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporation	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
XVII. TRANSPORTATION/TRAFFIC. Would the project:				

	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporation	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
a) Cause an increase in traffic which is substantial in relation to the existing traffic load and capacity of the street system and/or conflict with General Plan Policy CIR-1638, which seeks to maintain an adequate Level of Service (LOS) at signalized and unsignalized intersections, or reduce the effectiveness of existing transit services or pedestrian/bicycle facilities?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
b) Conflict with an applicable congestion management program, plan, ordinance, or policy addressing the circulation system, including, but not limited to level of service standards and travel demand measures, or other standards established by the Napa County Transportation and Planning Agency for designated roads or highways transit, roadway, bicycle, and pedestrian facilities?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input 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 <u>Conflict with or be inconsistent with CEQA Guidelines §15064.3(b)?</u>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
d) Substantially increase hazards due to a <u>geometric</u> design feature, (e.g., sharp curves or dangerous intersections) or incompatible uses (e.g., farm equipment)?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
e) Result in inadequate emergency access?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
f) Conflict with General Plan Policy CIR-2314, which requires new uses to meet their anticipated parking demand, but to avoid providing excess parking which could stimulate unnecessary vehicle trips or activity exceeding the site's capacity?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>

~~f)~~

Discussion:

	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant Impact With Mitigation Incorporated	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
<u>XVIII. TRIBAL CULTURAL RESOURCES. Would the project:</u>				
<u>Cause a substantial adverse change in the significance of a tribal cultural resource, defined in Public Resources Code section 21074 as either a site, feature, place, cultural landscape that is geographically defined in terms of the size and scope of the landscape, sacred place, or object with cultural value to a California Native American tribe, and that is:</u>				
a) <u>Listed or eligible for listing in the California Register of</u>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>

Historical Resources, or in a local register of historical resources as defined in Public Resources Code section 5020.1(k), or

a) A resource determined by the lead agency, in its discretion and supported by substantial evidence, to be significant pursuant to criteria set forth in subdivision (c) of Public Resources Code Section 5024.1. In applying the criteria set forth in subdivision (c) of Public Resources Code Section 5024.1, the lead agency shall consider the significance of the resource to a California Native American tribe.

Discussion:

	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporation	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
XIXVII. UTILITIES AND SERVICE SYSTEMS. Would the project:				
a) Exceed wastewater treatment requirements of the applicable Regional Water Quality Control Board?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
l)a) b) Require or result in the relocation or construction of a new or expanded water, or wastewater treatment, or storm water drainage, electric power, natural gas, or telecommunication facilities or expansion of existing facilities, the construction or relocation of which could cause significant environmental effects?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
m) c) Require or result in the construction of a new storm water drainage facilities or expansion of existing facilities, the construction of which could cause significant environmental effects?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
*b) d) Have sufficient water supplies available to serve the project and reasonably foreseeable future development during normal, dry, and multiple dry years from existing entitlements and resources, or are new or expanded entitlements needed?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
y)c) e) Result in a determination by the wastewater treatment provider which serves or may serve the project that it has adequate capacity to serve the project's projected demand in addition to the provider's existing commitments?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
z)d) f) Be served by a landfill with sufficient permitted capacity to accommodate the project's solid waste disposal needs. Generate solid waste in excess of State or local standards, or in excess of the capacity of local infrastructure, or otherwise impair the attainment of solid waste reduction goals?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
aa)e) g) Comply with federal, state, and local management and reduction statutes and regulations related to solid waste?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>

Discussion:

	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporation	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
<u>XX. WILDFIRE. If located in or near state responsibility areas or lands classified as very high fire severity zones, would the project:</u>				
<u>a) Substantially impair an adopted emergency response plan or emergency evacuation plan?</u>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
<u>b) Due to slope, prevailing winds and other factors, exacerbate wildfire risks and thereby expose project occupants to pollutant concentrations from a wildfire or the uncontrolled spread of a wildfire?</u>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
<u>c) Require the installation or maintenance of associated infrastructure (such as roads, fuel breaks, emergency water sources, power lines or other utilities) that may exacerbate fire risk or that may result in temporary or ongoing impacts to the environment?</u>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
<u>d) Expose people or structures to significant risks, including downslope or downstream flooding or landslides, as a result of runoff, post-fire slope instability, or drainage changes?</u>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>

Discussion:

	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporation	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
<u>XVII. MANDATORY FINDINGS OF SIGNIFICANCE</u>				
<u>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?</u>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
<u>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)?</u>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
<u>c) Does the project have environmental effects that will cause substantial adverse effects on human beings, either directly or indirectly?</u>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>

Discussion:

Summary of Mitigation Measures:



STAFF REPORT

By: Kyra Purvis
Date: July 13, 2020
Item: **4.f**
Subject: Consideration and potential approval of Resolution approving grant application to Proposition 68 Per Capita Program

RECOMMENDATION

- (1) Adopt Resolution 20-XX, approving of the filing of project application for the State Department of Parks and Recreation Per Capita Program grant funds.

ENVIRONMENTAL DETERMINATION

The proposed action is not a project as defined by 14 California Code of Regulations 15378 (State CEQA Guidelines) and therefore CEQA is not applicable.

BACKGROUND

This program originates from Proposition 68, which allocated funds for local park rehabilitation, creation, and improvement grants to local governments on a per capita basis, and was approved by voters on June 5, 2018. Forty percent (40%) of the General Per Capita funds are allocated to Counties, Regional park districts, regional park and open space districts, and regional open space districts based on population. The minimum allocation is \$400,000, which is the amount the District will receive.

The program offers both development and acquisition grants, and allows funds to be used for past projects completed within the grant period. The District is applying for \$400,000 to cover a portion of the Chamberlain acquisition, which was finalized in December, 2019.

RESOLUTION NO. _____**RESOLUTION OF THE BOARD OF DIRECTORS OF THE NAPA COUNTY REGIONAL PARK AND OPEN SPACE DISTRICT APPROVING APPLICATION(S) FOR PER CAPITA GRANT FUNDS**

WHEREAS, the State Department of Parks and Recreation has been delegated the responsibility by the Legislature of the State of California for the administration of the Per Capita Grant Program, setting up necessary procedures governing application(s); and

WHEREAS, said procedures established by the State Department of Parks and Recreation require the grantee's Governing Body to certify by resolution the approval of project application(s) before submission of said applications to the State; and

WHEREAS, the grantee will enter into a contract(s) with the State of California to complete project(s);

NOW, THEREFORE, BE IT RESOLVED that the Governing Board of the Napa County Regional Park and Open Space District (District) hereby:

1. Approves the filing of project application(s) for Per Capita program grant project(s); and
2. Certifies that said grantee has or will have available, prior to commencement of project work utilizing Per Capita funding, sufficient funds to complete the project(s); and
3. Certifies that the grantee has or will have sufficient funds to operate and maintain the project(s), and
4. Certifies that all projects proposed will be consistent with the park and recreation element of the District's general or recreation plan (the District Master Plan adopted in January 2009 and subsequently updated in 2011 and 2019) (PRC §80063(a)), and
5. Certifies that these funds will be used to supplement, not supplant, local revenues in existence as of June 5, 2018 (PRC §80062(d)), and
6. Certifies that it will comply with the provisions of §1771.5 of the State Labor Code, and
7. (PRC §80001(b)(8)(A-G)) To the extent practicable, as identified in the "Presidential Memorandum—Promoting Diversity and Inclusion in Our National Parks, National Forests, and Other Public Lands and Waters," dated January 12, 2017, the Napa County Regional Park and Open Space District will consider a range of actions that include, but are not limited to, the following:
 - a. Conducting active outreach to diverse populations, particularly minority, low-income, and disabled populations and tribal communities, to increase awareness within those communities and the public generally about specific programs and opportunities.
 - b. Mentoring new environmental, outdoor recreation, and conservation leaders to increase diverse representation across these areas.
 - c. Creating new partnerships with state, local, tribal, private, and nonprofit organizations to expand access for diverse populations.

- d. Identifying and implementing improvements to existing programs to increase visitation and access by diverse populations, particularly minority, low-income, and disabled populations and tribal communities.
 - e. Expanding the use of multilingual and culturally appropriate materials in public communications and educational strategies, including through social media strategies, as appropriate, that target diverse populations.
 - f. Developing or expanding coordinated efforts to promote youth engagement and empowerment, including fostering new partnerships with diversity-serving and youth-serving organizations, urban areas, and programs.
 - g. Identifying possible staff liaisons to diverse populations.
8. Agrees that to the extent practicable, the project(s) will provide workforce education and training, contractor and job opportunities for disadvantaged communities (PRC §80001(b)(5)).
 9. Certifies that the grantee shall not reduce the amount of funding otherwise available to be spent on parks or other projects eligible for funds under this division in its jurisdiction. A one-time allocation of other funding that has been expended for parks or other projects, but which is not available on an ongoing basis, shall not be considered when calculating a recipient’s annual expenditures. (PRC §80062(d)).
 10. Certifies that the grantee has reviewed, understands, and agrees to the General Provisions contained in the contract shown in the Procedural Guide; and
 11. Delegates the authority to the District General Manager or designee to conduct all negotiations, sign and submit all documents, including, but not limited to applications, agreements, amendments, and payment requests, which may be necessary for the completion of the grant scope(s); and
 12. Agrees to comply with all applicable federal, state and local laws, ordinances, rules, regulations and guidelines.

THE FOREGOING RESOLUTION WAS DULY AND REGULARLY ADOPTED by the Governing Board of the Napa County Regional Park and Open Space District at a regular meeting of the Board held on the ___th day of ____, 2020, by the following vote:

AYES:	DIRECTORS	_____

NOES:	DIRECTORS	_____
ABSENT:	DIRECTORS	_____

ATTEST:
District Secretary

By: _____

<p>APPROVED BY THE NAPA COUNTY REGIONAL PARK AND OPEN SPACE DISTRICT</p> <p>Date: _____</p> <p>Processed by: _____</p> <p>District Secretary</p>



STAFF REPORT

By: Chris Cahill
Date: July 13, 2020
Item: **4.g**
Subject: Consideration and potential approval of Resolution 20-01, rescinding Resolution 19-04, of Resolution 20-02, rescinding Resolution 19-05, and actions rescinding approval of certain related contracts and revising the District Personnel Manual.

RECOMMENDATION

- (1) Adopt Resolution 20-01, rescinding Resolution 19-04, which enabled a 401(a) employee profit sharing plan that was never ultimately created.
- (2) Adopt Resolution 20-02, rescinding Resolution 19-05, which enabled a 457(b) employee deferred compensation plan that was never ultimately created.
- (3) Rescind approval for associated contracts with Silver Leaf Financial Management and Insurance Services and Bidwell Consulting, both of which were never executed by the General Manager.
- (4) Revise the District Personnel Manual as proposed by staff.

ENVIRONMENTAL DETERMINATION

The proposed action is not a project as defined by 14 California Code of Regulations 15378 (State CEQA Guidelines) and therefore CEQA is not applicable.

BACKGROUND

On November 4, 2019 the Board of Directors took a series of actions (specifically, adopting two resolutions and approving two contracts as outlined at Recommendation, above) designed to implement defined contribution retirement benefits for regular District employees who were not covered by the County of Napa's CalPERS retirement contract. As was disclosed to the Board at the time, the execution of the combined District defined contribution plans was to have waited on the ability of Napa County's payroll function to actually implement the payroll deductions and track the employer contributions. As of the date of this writing, the County still has not implemented those payroll changes and the plans do not, technically, exist. Likewise, while the Board approved contracts with retirement plan managers Silver Leaf Financial Management and Bidwell Consulting

subject to final approval of terms and signature by the General Manager. Those contracts were neither signed nor executed, also pending necessary changes to the County of Napa's payroll programming.

In the intervening eight months, the District has faced a series of serious unforeseen financial setbacks, the most significant of which stem from the COVID-19 pandemic and associated increases in District costs and projected decreases in Transient Occupancy Tax revenues. The unfortunate result of these financial shortfalls is that the District cannot afford the costs of the previously-approved retirement plans; a situation that is unlikely to change for the better over the coming several fiscal years.

Given the above, staff is recommending that the Board take the actions necessary to unwind the November 2019 approvals enabling the retirement plans. We remain committed to working towards equity amongst our two classes of regular employees (those contracted from the County of Napa and those directly employed by the District) and hope to be back before the Board with similar or alternate retirement arrangements when our finances again allow.

In this item we are also requesting a change to the District Personnel Manual which would enable part time regular District employees to receive salary step increases at the same rate as full time regular employees, instead of at the prorated schedule previously adopted. While this will lead to some marginal additional expense for the District, it will mitigate an existing situation in which a valued half time employee receiving positive performance evaluations would take up to eight years to progress through the salary table. To that end, we propose the following revision to Section 2.10, Performance Evaluation (in part), of the Personnel Manual:

Section 2.10 Performance Evaluation

An employee serving a one year introductory period shall receive evaluations from their immediate supervisor at the end of six months and also prior to the completion of the employee's introductory period. If the employee's overall performance review at the end of the one year is at "Below Standards" or "Unsatisfactory", then that employee shall be terminated. The performance evaluations for introductory employees are for informational purposes only, and do not affect the District's ability to separate introductory employees at any time, for any or no stated reason, as provided in Section 2.4.

Thereafter, evaluations shall be completed annually. Such evaluations shall be on forms and under procedures prescribed by the General Manager. Appraisal scores shall be, in descending order: Excellent, Good, Satisfactory, Below Standards, and Unsatisfactory.

Salary movement through the steps of a pay grade will be based on performance as follows. ~~In each case part time employees will have the opportunity for a step increase when they reach the full time hour equivalent.~~

- At six months- If hired at the first step, a half step increase if employee's most recent overall performance review meets or exceeds "Satisfactory".
- At one year- If hired at the first step, a half step increase if employee's most recent overall performance review meets or exceeds "Satisfactory." If hired above the first step, a full step increase if employee's most recent overall performance review meets or exceeds "Satisfactory".

- Each year thereafter until the employee reaches the top salary step- a full step increase if employee's overall performance review meets or exceeds "Good".

Pay grade ranges are approximately 25% from beginning step to the top of the pay grade and will be established for each position by resolution of the Board of Directors. Once an employee reaches the top of their pay grade they will still be subject to annual performance reviews.

RESOLUTION N^o. 20-01

Napa County Regional Park and Open Space District

RESCINDING RESOLUTION NO. 19-04, WHICH SERVED AS A FORMAL RECORD OF ACTION ADOPTING AN EMPLOYEE 401(A) PROFIT SHARING PLAN

WHEREAS, on November 4, 2019, the Napa County Regional Park and Open Space District, alternatively referred to as "DISTRICT", adopted Resolution 19-04, enabling a 401(a) employee profit sharing plan; and

WHEREAS, the 401(a) employee profit sharing plan was never enacted; and

WHEREAS, DISTRICT no longer has the financial resources necessary to support such a plan due to substantial projected revenue shortfalls resulting from the COVID-19 pandemic (an Act of God).

NOW, THEREFORE, the Napa County Regional Park and Open Space District hereby resolves as follows:

1. Resolution No. 19-04, which served as a Formal Record of Action Adopting an Employee 401(A) Profit Sharing Plan is hereby rescinded in its entirety.

THE FOREGOING RESOLUTION WAS DULY AND REGULARLY ADOPTED by the Board of Directors of the Napa County Regional Park and Open Space District at a regular meeting of said Board on the 13th day of July, 2020 by the following vote:

AYES: DIRECTORS _____

NOES: DIRECTORS _____

ABSENT: DIRECTORS _____

Date: _____ Signed: _____
Barry Christian, President

<p>APPROVED BY THE NAPA COUNTY REGIONAL PARK AND OPEN SPACE DISTRICT BOARD OF DIRECTORS</p> <p>Date: _____</p> <p>Processed by: _____ District Secretary</p>
--

RESOLUTION N^o. 20-02

Napa County Regional Park and Open Space District

RESCINDING RESOLUTION NO. 19-05, WHICH SERVED AS A FORMAL RECORD OF ACTION ADOPTING AN EMPLOYEE 457(B) DEFERRED COMPENSATION PLAN

WHEREAS, on November 4, 2019, the Napa County Regional Park and Open Space District, alternatively referred to as "DISTRICT", adopted Resolution 19-05, enabling a governmental 457(b) deferred compensation plan; and

WHEREAS, the 457(b) deferred compensation plan was never enacted; and

WHEREAS, DISTRICT no longer has the financial resources necessary to support such a plan due to substantial projected revenue shortfalls resulting from the COVID-19 pandemic (an Act of God).

NOW, THEREFORE, the Napa County Regional Park and Open Space District hereby resolves as follows:

1. Resolution No. 19-05, which served as a Formal Record of Action Adopting an Employee 457(B) Deferred Compensation Plan is hereby rescinded in its entirety.

THE FOREGOING RESOLUTION WAS DULY AND REGULARLY ADOPTED by the Board of Directors of the Napa County Regional Park and Open Space District at a regular meeting of said Board on the 13th day of July, 2020 by the following vote:

AYES: DIRECTORS _____

NOES: DIRECTORS _____

ABSENT: DIRECTORS _____

Date: _____ Signed: _____
Barry Christian, President

<p>APPROVED BY THE NAPA COUNTY REGIONAL PARK AND OPEN SPACE DISTRICT BOARD OF DIRECTORS</p> <p>Date: _____</p> <p>Processed by: _____ District Secretary</p>
--



NAPA COUNTY REGIONAL PARK &
OPEN SPACE DISTRICT

STAFF REPORT

Date: July 13, 2020

Item: **4.h**

Subject: Receipt of report on expenditures, encumbrances, donations, and grants approved by District staff.

RECOMMENDATION

Receive the report.

BACKGROUND

Section III.A.(7) of the District By-laws 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 \$25,000, 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.

Attached is a report showing all District expenditures for June 2020.

In addition to these expenditures, the General Manager has authorized the following contracts using his signature authority:

None

PARKS & OPEN SPACE DISTRICT - JUNE 2020 EXPENSE REPORT

Gen Admin Dept - 85000-00

Date	Journal Line Description	Name	Monetary Amount
06/03/2020	Mar. 3 Primary Elections		\$ 117,835.07
06/10/2020	Mileage 4/06-12/20	FESSENDEN,RICHARD TODD	\$ 63.25
06/15/2020	05/29/20 Business Cards-Ryan	WOODBURY,JOHN ROBERT	\$ 85.16
06/15/2020	06/01/20 SHRM 1 yr Membership	WOODBURY,JOHN ROBERT	\$ 219.00
06/15/2020	Uniform Shirt - Rick	WOODBURY,JOHN ROBERT	\$ 33.50
06/17/2020	Google G Suite 04/2020	WOODBURY,JOHN ROBERT	\$ 30.00
06/17/2020	05/24-06/23/20 Zoom	WOODBURY,JOHN ROBERT	\$ 14.99
06/30/2020	Reallocation employee salary		\$ 10,375.98
06/30/2020	4th Qtr PBES Admin		\$ 38,888.01
06/30/2020	06/24/20-07/23/20 Zoom Subsc	WOODBURY,JOHN ROBERT	\$ 14.99
06/30/2020	05/2020 Google Suite	WOODBURY,JOHN ROBERT	\$ 30.00

Moore Creek Dept - 85010-00

Date	Journal Line Description	Name	Monetary Amount
06/04/2020	05/2020 Mileage	CAHILL,CHRISTOPHER MICHAEL	\$ 55.20
06/04/2020	Packing Tape, Trufuel	ZELLER'S & CLARKS ACE HARDWARE	\$ 58.80
06/04/2020	Screws, Washers	ZELLER'S & CLARKS ACE HARDWARE	\$ 2.03
06/09/2020	Stihl Bar and Chain Oil	CENTRAL VALLEY BUILDERS	\$ 11.99
06/09/2020	Toilet, Gloves	CENTRAL VALLEY BUILDERS	\$ 54.32
06/10/2020	Mileage 3/10-13/20	FESSENDEN,RICHARD TODD	\$ 27.60
06/10/2020	Mileage 3/23-29/20	FESSENDEN,RICHARD TODD	\$ 94.31
06/10/2020	Mileage 5/11-15/20	FESSENDEN,RICHARD TODD	\$ 23.00
06/10/2020	Mileage 3/30-4/03/20	FESSENDEN,RICHARD TODD	\$ 23.58
06/10/2020	Mileage 2/10-2/15/20	FESSENDEN,RICHARD TODD	\$ 63.26
06/10/2020	mileage 3/16-19/20	FESSENDEN,RICHARD TODD	\$ 37.38
06/10/2020	mileage 3/2-6/20	FESSENDEN,RICHARD TODD	\$ 63.26
06/10/2020	mileage 5/18-24/20	FESSENDEN,RICHARD TODD	\$ 85.69
06/10/2020	mileage 2/18-2/24/20	FESSENDEN,RICHARD TODD	\$ 36.23
06/10/2020	mileage 4/20-25/20	FESSENDEN,RICHARD TODD	\$ 125.36
06/10/2020	mileage 4/27-5/01/20	FESSENDEN,RICHARD TODD	\$ 54.63
06/10/2020	Mileage 4/14-19/20	FESSENDEN,RICHARD TODD	\$ 103.52
06/10/2020	Mileage 5/25-31/20	FESSENDEN,RICHARD TODD	\$ 77.63
06/10/2020	Mileage 4/06-12/20	FESSENDEN,RICHARD TODD	\$ 127.08
06/10/2020	Mileage 4/4-10/20	FESSENDEN,RICHARD TODD	\$ 53.48
06/12/2020	PR2GL Pay End 5/29/20		\$ 313.02
06/12/2020	PR2GL Pay End 5/29/20		\$ 400.85
06/12/2020	PR2GL Pay End 5/29/20		\$ 2,406.40
06/12/2020	PR2GL Pay End 5/29/20		\$ 114.12
06/12/2020	PR2GL Pay End 5/29/20		\$ 4,059.11
06/15/2020	05/2020 Mileage	WOODBURY,JOHN ROBERT	\$ 52.90
06/15/2020	05/04/20 Road Traffic Signs x2	WOODBURY,JOHN ROBERT	\$ 62.58
06/18/2020	June 2020 Invoice	HERITAGE SYSTEMS, INC.	\$ 367.67
06/26/2020	PR2GL Pay End 6/12/20		\$ 626.04
06/26/2020	PR2GL Pay End 6/12/20		\$ 382.71
06/26/2020	PR2GL Pay End 6/12/20		\$ 5,606.40
06/26/2020	PR2GL Pay End 6/12/20		\$ 566.28
06/26/2020	PR2GL Pay End 6/12/20		\$ 116.68
06/30/2020	Reallocation employee salary		\$ (26,887.30)
06/30/2020	4th Qtr PBES Admin		\$ 14,230.32

Oat Hill Mine Trail Dept - 85010-01

Date	Journal Line Description	Name	Monetary Amount
06/10/2020	Mileage 5/11-15/20	FESSENDEN,RICHARD TODD	\$ 40.83
06/10/2020	Mileage 2/24-27/20	FESSENDEN,RICHARD TODD	\$ 42.55
06/10/2020	mileage 3/16-19/20	FESSENDEN,RICHARD TODD	\$ 35.08
06/10/2020	mileage 4/27-5/01/20	FESSENDEN,RICHARD TODD	\$ 54.63
06/10/2020	Mileage 3/23-29/20	FESSENDEN,RICHARD TODD	\$ 92.00
06/30/2020	Reallocation employee salary		\$ 559.61
06/30/2020	4th Qtr PBES Admin		\$ 401.93

NRBT Dept - 85010-02

Date	Journal Line Description	Name	Monetary Amount
06/10/2020	Mileage 3/30-4/03/20	FESSENDEN,RICHARD TODD	\$ 60.96
06/10/2020	Mileage 4/06-12/20	FESSENDEN,RICHARD TODD	\$ 52.33
06/30/2020	Reallocation employee salary		\$ 830.33
06/30/2020	4th Qtr PBES Admin		\$ 879.78

Camp Berryessa Dept - 85010-03

Date	Journal Line Description	Name	Monetary Amount
06/04/2020	Water Testing	CALTEST ANALYTICAL LABORATORY	\$ 50.00
06/08/2020	refund for GMK & Waldorf		\$ (800.00)
06/09/2020	Waste Disposal Service	BERRYESSA GARBAGE SERVICE AND	\$ 85.80
06/15/2020	Refund for Waldorf camp reserv	WALDORF DADS	\$ 300.00
06/15/2020	Refund for GMK camp reserv.	GMK PSYCHOLOGICAL SERVICES	\$ 500.00
06/30/2020	Reallocation employee salary		\$ 3,752.43
06/30/2020	4th Qtr PBES Admin		\$ 542.61
06/30/2020	Water Testing	CALTEST ANALYTICAL LABORATORY	\$ 50.00

Berryessa Vista Dept - 85010-04

Date	Journal Line Description	Name	Monetary Amount
06/30/2020	Reallocation employee salary		\$ 18.17
06/30/2020	4th Qtr PBES Admin		\$ 66.32

NRER Dept - 85010-05

Date	Journal Line Description	Name	Monetary Amount
06/04/2020	Trash Bag, Trufuel Mix	ZELLER'S & CLARKS ACE HARDWARE	\$ 43.08
06/10/2020	Mileage 4/06-12/20	FESSENDEN,RICHARD TODD	\$ 26.45
06/10/2020	Mileage 5/25-31/20	FESSENDEN,RICHARD TODD	\$ 71.31
06/10/2020	Mileage 4/4-10/20	FESSENDEN,RICHARD TODD	\$ 71.88
06/10/2020	Mileage 3/10-13/20	FESSENDEN,RICHARD TODD	\$ 46.58
06/10/2020	mileage 5/18-24/20	FESSENDEN,RICHARD TODD	\$ 98.91
06/10/2020	mileage 4/27-5/01/20	FESSENDEN,RICHARD TODD	\$ 47.73
06/10/2020	mileage 3/2-6/20	FESSENDEN,RICHARD TODD	\$ 8.63
06/10/2020	mileage 4/20-25/20	FESSENDEN,RICHARD TODD	\$ 56.93
06/10/2020	Mileage 3/30-4/03/20	FESSENDEN,RICHARD TODD	\$ 35.65
06/10/2020	Mileage 4/14-19/20	FESSENDEN,RICHARD TODD	\$ 32.20
06/10/2020	Mileage 5/11-15/20	FESSENDEN,RICHARD TODD	\$ 57.50
06/30/2020	Reallocation employee salary		\$ 2,450.11
06/30/2020	4th Qtr PBES Admin		\$ 701.38
06/30/2020	Security Cam 5/14/20-6/13/20	VERIZON WIRELESS	\$ 38.01

Vine Trail Dept - 85010-06

Date	Journal Line Description	Name	Monetary Amount
06/30/2020	4th Qtr PBES Admin		\$ 497.73

Putah Creek Dept - 85010-07			
Date	Journal Line Description	Name	Monetary Amount
06/30/2020	Reallocation employee salary		\$ 18.17
06/30/2020	4th Qtr PBES Admin		\$ 460.88
State Park - 85010-08			
Date	Journal Line Description	Name	Monetary Amount
06/02/2020	Heartland credit card fees-USB		\$ 0.49
06/02/2020	Heartland credit card fees-USB		\$ 36.36
06/04/2020	Phone Line 4/28/20 - 5/27/20	AT&T	\$ 19.68
06/04/2020	Metal signs	NAPA SIGN SHOP	\$ 150.85
06/04/2020	Bothe signs	NAPA SIGN SHOP	\$ 4,199.56
06/04/2020	Copper Cap, Cement, Acid Swabs	SILVERADO ACE HARDWARE	\$ 75.20
06/09/2020	Waste Disposal Service	UPPER VALLEY DISPOSAL SERVICE, INC.	\$ 557.60
06/09/2020	Wire, Receptacle, Switch, Cap	STEVES HARDWARE	\$ 93.35
06/09/2020	50lb Big Tab	DONS SWIMMING POOL CENTER	\$ 145.46
06/09/2020	Oil, GDF Press Treat	CENTRAL VALLEY BUILDERS	\$ 379.78
06/09/2020	Box Switch, Receptacle	SILVERADO ACE HARDWARE	\$ 33.35
06/09/2020	Plug, Bushing, Adaptor	SILVERADO ACE HARDWARE	\$ 43.18
06/10/2020	Heartland credit card fees-USB		\$ 0.43
06/12/2020	PR2GL Pay End 5/29/20		\$ 611.13
06/12/2020	PR2GL Pay End 5/29/20		\$ 1,281.46
06/12/2020	PR2GL Pay End 5/29/20		\$ 1,037.76
06/12/2020	PR2GL Pay End 5/29/20		\$ 274.80
06/12/2020	PR2GL Pay End 5/29/20		\$ 192.73
06/12/2020	PR2GL Pay End 5/29/20		\$ 8,790.60
06/15/2020	05/21/20 Washers&Bolts-BaleMil	WOODBURY,JOHN ROBERT	\$ 103.00
06/18/2020	Hand Soap, Latex, Bleach	CASH & CARRY	\$ 178.61
06/18/2020	Internet Line05/10/20-06/09/20	AT&T	\$ 322.65
06/18/2020	Sprayer Household	SILVERADO ACE HARDWARE	\$ 4.82
06/18/2020	Trap Mouse, Grand Whl	STEVES HARDWARE	\$ 17.24
06/18/2020	Masking Tape, Carpet Bar	SILVERADO ACE HARDWARE	\$ 30.14
06/18/2020	Gloss Meadow	SILVERADO ACE HARDWARE	\$ 10.75
06/23/2020	Calcium Buffer, Acid	LESLIE'S SWIMMING POOL SUPPLIES	\$ 326.83
06/23/2020	Alarm 5/13/20-6/12/20	AT&T	\$ 91.78
06/23/2020	Posters	THE COPY CORNER	\$ 17.95
06/23/2020	Posters	THE COPY CORNER	\$ 32.73
06/23/2020	Batt Cable	BROWN'S AUTO PARTS	\$ 3.66
06/26/2020	PR2GL Pay End 6/12/20		\$ 1,281.46
06/26/2020	PR2GL Pay End 6/12/20		\$ 598.46
06/26/2020	PR2GL Pay End 6/12/20		\$ 8,860.80
06/26/2020	PR2GL Pay End 6/12/20		\$ 159.02
06/26/2020	PR2GL Pay End 6/12/20		\$ 1,037.76
06/30/2020	Reallocation employee salary		\$ (18,918.90)
06/30/2020	4th Qtr PBES Admin		\$ 48,332.13
06/30/2020	05/27/20 Flooring	GRASSI,ROBERT	\$ 522.55
06/30/2020	06/13/20 Cleaning/Safety Supp	JORDAN,JASON GERALD ALLAN	\$ 177.94
06/30/2020	Thermometer	WOODBURY,JOHN ROBERT	\$ 56.20
06/30/2020	PG&E 5/14/20-6/14/20	PACIFIC GAS & ELECTRIC CO	\$ 49.38
06/30/2020	PG&E 5/14/20-6/14/20	PACIFIC GAS & ELECTRIC CO	\$ 141.45
06/30/2020	PG&E 5/14/20-6/14/20	PACIFIC GAS & ELECTRIC CO	\$ 36.98
06/30/2020	06/30/20 Meeting at Bothe	WOODBURY,JOHN ROBERT	\$ 47.15
Suscol Headlands - 85010-09			
Date	Journal Line Description	Name	Monetary Amount

06/04/2020	05/2020 Mileage	CAHILL,CHRISTOPHER MICHAEL	\$	10.35
06/10/2020	Mileage 5/11-15/20	FESSENDEN,RICHARD TODD	\$	12.08
06/10/2020	mileage 3/2-6/20	FESSENDEN,RICHARD TODD	\$	20.13
06/15/2020	Use Permit CC review fee		\$	578.48
06/15/2020	05/18/20 Boundary Signs-Suscol	WOODBURY,JOHN ROBERT	\$	419.55
06/30/2020	Reallocation employee salary		\$	2,165.63
06/30/2020	4th Qtr PBES Admin		\$	3,362.61

Amy's Grove - 85010-10

Date	Journal Line Description	Name		Monetary Amount
06/10/2020	Mileage 4/4-10/20	FESSENDEN,RICHARD TODD	\$	25.88
06/10/2020	Mileage 3/23-29/20	FESSENDEN,RICHARD TODD	\$	39.10
06/10/2020	Mileage 3/10-13/20	FESSENDEN,RICHARD TODD	\$	17.25
06/10/2020	mileage 3/16-19/20	FESSENDEN,RICHARD TODD	\$	17.25
06/10/2020	mileage 2/18-2/24/20	FESSENDEN,RICHARD TODD	\$	15.53
06/10/2020	Mileage 2/24-27/20	FESSENDEN,RICHARD TODD	\$	45.43
06/30/2020	Reallocation employee salary		\$	1,736.59
06/30/2020	4th Qtr PBES Admin		\$	1,016.89

Smitle Creek - 85010-11

Date	Journal Line Description	Name		Monetary Amount
06/10/2020	mileage 3/2-6/20	FESSENDEN,RICHARD TODD	\$	42.55
06/10/2020	Mileage 2/24-27/20	FESSENDEN,RICHARD TODD	\$	37.38
06/10/2020	Mileage 2/10-2/15/20	FESSENDEN,RICHARD TODD	\$	40.25
06/30/2020	Reallocation employee salary		\$	2,257.25
06/30/2020	4th Qtr PBES Admin		\$	311.50

Other Projects - 85010-90

Date	Journal Line Description	Name		Monetary Amount
06/10/2020	Mileage 2/10-2/15/20	FESSENDEN,RICHARD TODD	\$	17.26
06/10/2020	Mileage 2/24-27/20	FESSENDEN,RICHARD TODD	\$	42.55
06/10/2020	mileage 2/18-2/24/20	FESSENDEN,RICHARD TODD	\$	25.89
06/30/2020	Reallocation employee salary		\$	21,641.93
06/30/2020	4th Qtr PBES Admin		\$	9,857.34



Projects Status Report

July 13, 2020

Amy's Grove

Planning and permits for public use of Amy's Grove.

The archaeological survey has been completed and did not find evidence of Native American activity. The botanical survey has been completed and submitted for review. Much of Amy's Grove burned in the October 2017 fires, but the damage appears to be limited. In Sept 2018 the Board approved placing a restrictive covenant over a portion of Amy's Grove, accepting the donation of an adjacent 7 acres of land, approving an option to acquire 164 acres north of Amy's Grove, and applying for a grant to help fund the purchase. Grant awards are expected to be announced in mid-2019. A legal description of the conservation area covering the meadow at Amy's Grove has been completed. PG&E is marking trees for transmission line clearance trimming in the right of way adjacent to our property. We have attempted to limit the scope of that work, but ultimately we have little say in the process. In late July 2019 we learned that we did not receive the Habitat Conservation Fund grant we had applied for to assist with the purchase of the 164 acres to the north. The purchase has been completed using District reserve funds. As soon as State Parks releases the Prop 68 per capita grant funds we will reimburse our reserves. State Parks in June 2020 released the announcement of the per capita grant funds, which the District will use to reimburse about half the cost of the 164 acre purchase.

Bay/River Trail - American Canyon to Napa

An 8+ mile recreational trail. Phase 2-B--Pond 10 to Soscol Ferry Road.

The design for the public crossing of the SMART tracks has been completed, and SMART, NRCA and the PUC have verbally agreed to allow the railroad crossing. A biological survey for the Fagan Marsh area has been completed; based on the results, CDFW has indicated they do not want the trail alignment to follow the levee on the north side of Fagan Marsh; District staff is reviewing the feasibility of an alternative alignment. At the request of the City of American Canyon, in August 2017 City and District staff met to discuss strategies for completing the trail. The Board President and General Manager met with CADFW staff on June 12, 2018 to discuss CDFW concerns. Senator Dodd organized a meeting in October with the City of American Canyon, County of Napa and the District in an attempt to move the project forward, and another meeting with District staff and CADFW staff on November 28, 2018. Staff has been working with BCDC to determine whether CDFW plans to impose user fees for people walking on the trail along the edge of the wetlands would be allowed under DFW's permit from BCDC. Director Christian has been volunteering considerable time to remove weeds blocking the trail both north and south of Green Island Road. Staff has also been working with the Bay Trail Project and Director Christian to ensure the draft Countywide Bicycle Master Plan includes the trail connection from Green Island Road to Suscol Ferry Road. CDFW in April approved policy changes for the Napa-Sonoma marshes, including use of bicycles on designated trails. The District and the City of American Canyon have been developing new and improved signage for the Wetlands Edge trailhead.

Berryessa Vista

Planning, stewardship and expansion of this 304 acre wilderness park.

Volunteers working with the District have completed detailed GIS mapping showing all existing roads, creek crossings, vista points and potential campsites. The District sent a letter to all property owners in that area introducing the District, explaining the deed restriction prohibiting off road vehicles, and asking for their cooperation. Since then there has been less observed damage, although the problem is not resolved. Staff was planning on installing a gate to restrict OHV access, but this has proven infeasible. In 2014 the Land Trust acquired an 80 acre inholding between District and BLM land, based on a District Board action in November 2014 agreeing to acquire the property from the Land Trust at a later date when funding is available. District and Land Trust staff in April 2016 placed a camera on the property in an attempt to identify the off-road vehicle and motorcycle users who have been causing some damage to the property. Staff has been monitoring the cameras since spring 2016 and has noted a small decrease in illegal off road vehicle use; staff will continue to monitor the cameras. Staff is working on plans to create a formal boat-in backcountry camp at Berryessa Vista accessed from the BOR Capell Cove boat launch. Staff has been reviewing PG&E plans to grade and widen an access road to their high power lines that cross the property, to ensure the work does not cause future erosion nor increase vehicular trespass. The Bureau of Reclamation has completed environmental review and authorized the District to improve the trail leading from water's edge up into the District property and install directional signage. We had tremendous success at the volunteer trail building event in early February, building +/- 900 feet of new trail.

(The) Cove at Mt. Veeder*Reconstruction of campground and trails.*

The Cove was severely burned in the October 2017 fires; since then staff has been working on cleanup. Most of the trees in The Cove are dead or will be soon and will need to be removed before the camp can be reopened. Staff hiked most of the property in early January and confirmed that fire damage is severe and extensive. In early February the County Wildlife Commission toured the Cove to inspect fire impacts and discuss ways in which they might direct funding to fire recovery efforts County-wide. Staff worked with a forester to develop a plan for salvage logging to (a) remove hazardous dead trees in the campground area and (b) repair/improve the access road into the site. The Napa Girl Scout troops have already undertaken a number of projects to help restore the Cove, including new signage and rehabbing the campfire circle. Installation can, however, only happen once salvage logging is complete. Doug McConnell (NBC's Open Road) segment on The Cove (and Suscol Headwaters), comparing the effects of the fires in each location and lessons learned, was aired on Sunday June 24, 2018. Salvage logging commenced in late May, 2018 and was completed during the week of July 23rd followed by the logger completing his clean-up and erosion control operations. Road rebuilding is complete. Heavy rains in early 2019 (more than 5 inches in one day) happily did not wreak too much havoc at the Camp or on the new driveway. A State Employment Development Department funded crew of 4 (using fire emergency job training funds) started work on April 2, 2019; they will be available through the end of the calendar year; so far they have completed chipping of much of the remaining woody debris, and are well along with cutting larger logs into rounds for eventual splitting for firewood. In July 2019 we worked with our salvage logging contractor on improvements to the gravel driveway to make it more useable to visitors in 2WD vehicles. We met with a local engineer on site on Sep 5th to begin designing facilities for a rebuilt camp. Our EDD crew has been doing preliminary work clearing debris out of future camp site areas. We removed a very large standing dead oak tree adjacent to the parking area in mid-November for safety reasons. The EDD work crew wrapped up their season at the end of December. Staff is working with Enchanted Hills Camp on a proposal for a 13 week Americorps crew this spring to work on The Cove, Enchanted Hills Camp and other projects. Staff hiked the property extensively in February, trying among other things to relocate the old trails, but most have been destroyed by the 2017 fires and resulting erosion. We continue to work with a local engineer on developing plans for a new water system and, potentially, a new septic system on the property. While the District's budget situation may not allow the system(s) to actually be constructed for some time, having a completed design in place now will be helpful for budgeting, potentially grant writing, and other projects going forward. We have been talking with the Mt Veeder Fire Safe Council who secured a grant to fund fuel reduction work along the Mayacamas ridge on and near the Cove; they plan to begin work in mid-June, accessing the area from Cavedale Road on the Sonoma County side and will clear downed and standing-dead trees along our ridgetop fire road. We continue to work on locating improvements (camp sites, water spigots, etc) for the rebuilt camp and have been working through some potentially more cost effective fixes to the gravel road, which is a struggle for some cars to climb when it's dry and dusty.

EcoCamp Berryessa

Redevelopment and operation of former Boy Scout Camp with a 64 bed group/environmental education camp with 8 tent cabins, 2 covered group activity centers, a canoe/kayak dock, a central amphitheater and campfire ring, and a shower and composting toilet restroom facility.

A grant for \$50,000 to help with construction was provided by the Mead Foundation, together with a \$1.7 million grant from the State Coastal Conservancy. Construction of Phase I, which includes beds for up to 64 campers was completed in June 2016. Jim Hankes, a Bureau of Reclamation maintenance employee and life-long Berryessa resident has moved his park unit trailer onto the property and become our first volunteer camp host. Tuleyome, the BOR, and Forest Trails Alliance have completed the adjacent North End Trail, running from +/- Camp Berryessa to the north end of the Lake, approximately 7 miles each way. In early October, 2017 Caltrans delivered (at no cost to the District) the disassembled and individually numbered pieces of a former Monticello Road stone arch bridge to Camp Berryessa for our eventual use somewhere. Issues with the composting toilets and water systems (the result of poor design and power failures) appear to have all been resolved. With the help of the Bureau of Reclamation, historic bridge stones have been placed around the property to restrict vehicle access and add character. We completed a fresh fee survey in early 2019, the results of which we are now analyzing to see if our rental rates need to be updated, we will be bringing those to the Board. We are looking in to solar battery backups to provide more reliable power as rural blackouts on windy days have become the new normal. BOR has informed us of a new rule restricting open flames during red flag warnings making cooking in our pedestal barbeques impossible. We have been providing notice of the new regulation to all users. As of mid-September 2020, some of our septic system valving and wires have been damaged by denning animals. The septic system is now repaired, and the valve boxes have been hardened to make it more difficult for our furry friends to get into them in the future. Staff met with a plumber on site on the morning of March 9 to discuss repairs and redesign of failing backflow prevention devices that have a hard time with the site's hard water. The EcoCamp has been closed to the public since mid-March. We have been taking the opportunity of this downtime to get on top of spring mowing and other projects and Sarah Clark has been inspecting the property at least once a week. Staff has completed a survey of rates and policies for other group camps in the region, and will be developing a proposal for expanding camp use to include a broader range of group and family campers, for when the camp is not needed by the non-profit and youth organizations which are the primary target audience for the camp. The camp remains closed as required by State and local restrictions on group activities.

Moore Creek Park Development

Improvements and operations at our 1,500 acre regional park in the Lake Hennessey watershed. Includes the Moore Creek unit on land owned by the District and the Lake Hennessey Unit on land owned by the City of Napa.

In November, 2009 the Napa City Council directed city staff to work with the District to finalize an agreement for the proposed Hennessey trails. The District approved a Mitigated Negative Declaration on February 14, 2011. A final lease agreement and operations plan was approved by the District Board in August 2012, and by the City Council in September 2012. The park opened on June 30, 2013. Many miles of trails have been constructed, fencing installed, emergency communications capacity set up, repairs made to the two houses on the property, and invasive French broom removal has been ongoing. Work was completed on the Conn Creek connector trail between the Moore Creek and Lake Hennessey units in June 2013. Lake Hennessey North Shore Trails formally opened with a ribbon cutting on October 18, 2014. The Sam the Eagle Trail was completed in April 2015 and, in staff's opinion, turned out wonderfully. District staff and volunteers installed the Harold Kelly bench in early June 2015 and constructed a short ADA-compliant access trail to it on July 11, 2015. The County Wildlife Conservation Commission awarded the District a +/- \$2,000 grant to fund installation of an interpretive birding trail developed in partnership with Napa Solano Audubon along the north shore of the lake, signage was installed in May 2015. The eastern boundary survey and fencing project was completed June 2014. The property owner to the east of Moore Creek filed suit in June 2017 claiming the District owed additional money for the boundary survey and fence separating his property from ours. After several interim victories, the judge in early April 2018 issued the final ruling in support of the District's position. Staff hosted trail scouting and trail building volunteer events focused on the Madrone Trail in late May and early June, 2018. The Gate House was re-roofed in November 2018 using the Moore Creek maintenance/repair reserve fund. Staff coordinated a meeting with CalFire and a neighbor to determine what level of tree trimming is needed on the neighbor's property next to the ranch house to comply with Firewise regulations and the trimming work is now underway. We are working with the RCD to do a re-oaking project in the area of Julie Yip's bench this spring. Napa Marble and Granite installed (well, carved) new trail signage for the Shoreline and Sam the Eagle trails in early September 2017. Old Man's Beard Trail was completed in February 2018. The Whiskey Ridge and Conn Peak Trails (along with the Conn Peak Spur) are now complete and open to the public, nearly three miles of new singletrack all-in. We have been informed that PG&E will be doing clearing around the high tension lines that cross the Hennessey Unit this spring; as the City of Napa owns the underlying property the District doesn't have authority over any of that work. The Catacoula Trail has been completed in rough form, but work on drag-down, backslopes, and some drainage has been paused, potentially until the fall, as a result of staff furloughs at Conservation Corps North Bay due to the Marin County shelter in place order. The trail is open and safe to use by bikers and hikers in the meantime as the tread itself has been completed; initial user reviews are very positive. The trail is currently closed to horses because equestrian traffic would destroy the still soft and rough outside edge. Central office staff (John, Chris, and Ryan Ayers) and State Park staff (primarily Sarah and JoeJoe Clark) have been rangering at the Conn Valley and Chiles-Pope Valley entrances on Fridays, weekends, and other peak times under the direction of Rick Fessenden (who has also been covering many of the shifts himself). The public has largely been mindful of social distancing protocols and has almost universally been thankful of District staff's hard work and our ability to keep the parks open during this unprecedented moment. Staff is working with the County of Napa and the City of Napa to make improvements to the end of Conn Valley Road to be able to better accommodate demand going forward. Rick has been recruiting volunteers to staff the Conn Valley and Moore Creek entrances on busy weekend days since mid-June, taking some of the burden off of regular district employees and saving money during very tight times.

Oat Hill Mine Trail

Various improvements to the historic Oat Hill Mine Road.

The District is continuing to work with Tuleyome on a project to clean up the Twin Peaks and Corona Mines, in the hopes this may enable the District to safely open the northern Oat Hill Mine Trail for public use. Staff and volunteers in February 2013 did a comprehensive evaluation of erosion issues on the trail, and experts from the RCD joined staff for another evaluation in early April. The Bay Area Ridge Trail did some cleanup and minor improvements in late October 2013 to the staging area, and the lower 4 miles of the OHMT was dedicated as part of the Ridge Trail on November 10, 2013. The 40 acre Randy Lee Johnson property donation was completed in December 2014. Volunteers made drainage improvements on the trail in late January 2015 and work parties to install drain dips to control erosion were held in January and April of 2016. A PG&E contractor attempted to drive an ATV up the OHMT in early June, and ended up going into a gully; they promptly removed the vehicle and repaired the trail damage. The first 1.3 miles of the trail was bulldozed as a result of CalFire efforts to suppress the October 2017 wildfires. CalFire had agreed to come back to do more remediation, but subsequent fires in Southern California diverted their staff to help fight those fires. District staff and volunteers in February 2018 replaced the gate at the Calistoga trailhead that had been damaged by CalFire's fire fighting efforts. Staff has been tracking and participating in the City of Calistoga's trail and parkway redesign project at the Vine / Silverado/ OHM Trail intersection. The lower 1/4 mile of the trail was repaired in early January 2019 by staff and volunteers, with an improved inboard drain, culvert and waterbars, to correct problems created by CalFire's 2017 bulldozing. Deer season trail closure signs were put up in early August. Staff investigated reports of an illegal campsite near the Oat Hill Mine Trail and is investigating reports that people in 4WD vehicles have been clearing vegetation and other obstructions along the trail between Calistoga and the Palisades Trail. The campsite was determined to be located on adjacent private property (the owners have been contacted) and the 4WD enthusiasts own property further up the trail so have the right to drive on the trail. As with Moore Creek Park, the trail has been closed repeatedly in October and November due to hazardous fire weather. Recent PG&E line-clearing work along the lower portion of the trail damaged it in several places and we are working with PG&E to motivate them to fix it themselves, if that doesn't happen it is likely to become a District volunteer project later this winter. Visitation at OHMT has been very high since mid-March. We staffed the trailhead on weekends in late March and early April, but have determined that the dispersed nature of the parking in Calistoga means that it handles the higher level of traffic well and we have since reduced monitoring to occasional check-ins. A large tree fell, blocking the trailhead, but it was bucked the next day by Rob Grassi and Tyler Beach and Rick was able to complete the clearing a few days later. We had reports of an unpermitted running event on the morning of July 4th and have reached out to the organizer to ensure similar events don't happen in the future without advance approval. We are also following up on reports of unauthorized work to make the trail driveable by 4-wheel drive vehicles.

Putah Creek Properties

Acquire 480 acres next to Berryessa Estates from BLM at no fee through their Recreation and Public Purpose Act procedure. Manage Spanish Valley, Crystal Flats and Stone Corral (2,500 acres) open space preserves.

The District in 2009 applied to BLM for a no-fee transfer of this property to the District for the no-fee transfer of this property; while this transfer has received conceptual approval by BLM staff, the formal approval has been delayed because of property title issues between BLM and BOR. The District has completed the donation to the District of a small, 0.2 acre property that provides critical access to the northeast corner of the property. In 2015 Reclamation said they have done their work to clear up the title issue and it is now up to BLM to finish the transfer. BLM thought they would complete their work by the end of 2015, but this did not happen, and a new date for completion has not been set. BLM's timeline has been extended because BLM has determined that not only these but other federal lands in the same general area also need to have their revocation process completed, and they wish to resolve all at the same time. At a meeting on April 14, 2016, the new Superintendent for the Ukiah District of BLM committed to completing the transfer. Because of staffing changes at BLM, as of June 2019 no progress had been made. Per CalFire, the planned prescribed burn for Spanish Valley has been cancelled due to deteriorating weather conditions; we'll try again in 2020. We continue to refine a draft conservation easement for Spanish Valley with the Land Trust, and are close to finalizing the document for Board review. Interpretive staff held a well-attended public hike at Spanish Valley in early November focusing on native plants and the areas interesting geology. Our friends at the Land Trust continue to work with CalFire on coordinating a 2020 prescribed burn at Spanish Valley. Whether or not the burn will actually occur depends on weather, the nature of the fire season, and the ongoing impacts of Covid-19. Unfortunately, limited CalFire resources and bad luck with weather have forced the prescribed burn to be delayed another year. The Lake Berryessa Estates Property Owners Association in June 2020 retained an attorney to help them develop an agreement between the District and the Association authorizing the Association to manage and enforce regulations for use of the campground and boat launch areas of Crystal Flats and Stone Corral.

Skyline Park

Permanent protection of Skyline Park and support for Skyline operations.

Three past legislative efforts to authorize sale to the County failed due to unrelated disagreements between the state legislature and administration. Separately, the County in September 2009 approved a new park overlay zone and an updated Master Plan for Skyline Park. A fourth legislative effort by Assembly member Evans in 2010, sponsored by Napa County and supported by the District, was approved by the legislature and signed by the Governor. The County and State General Services were unable to agree on the fair market value of the property, negotiations stalled, and the legislative authorization expired. A Draft EIR was released in late September 2013 for the proposed expansion of the adjacent Syar Quarry. The District Board approved comments on the DEIR at its October 2013 meeting. The Final EIR was released in

November of 2014; the Planning Commission certified the EIR on October 21, 2015. On October 22, 2015, the State applied to the county to rezone Skyline Park by removing the Skyline Wilderness Park Combining District overlay, which would make it easier for the State to sell for development and at a higher price. The Planning Commission certification for the quarry expansion was appealed to the Board of Supervisors by two organizations. The District in February 2016 submitted two letters to the Board of Supervisors, one requesting the setback between the quarry and the park be protected through a permanent conservation easement, and the other expressing support for the changes to the quarry project that were recommended by the County Planning Department, with additional protection for Pasini Ridge. The Board of Supervisors rejected the appeals and approved the quarry expansion in July 2016. Legislation introduced by Senator Wolk in January 2016 stalled when the State announced it was opposed to any sale of Skyline Park to the District until completion of a state planning process for future health and welfare services. Senator Dodd in December 2018 introduced SB 20, which would again authorize the State to sell Skyline Park to the District and/or county for the sole purpose of it continuing to be a public park. In January 2019 the District sponsored the filming of a short feature for Doug McConnell's Open Road TV series to help build support for the purchase of Skyline. The District is working with SPCA to utilize a TBID grant obtained by the District to upgrade their web site including an on-line reservation system, improve their park map and brochure, and install an automatic pay machine on the River to Ridge Trail. As of early August 2019, a new Skyline map has been completed, the new web site is up and running, the on-line reservation system is operational, and the automatic pay station should be installed any day now. The Governor has signed legislation authorizing the sale of the park to the District or the County, but separately the State has also released plans to potentially lease 20 acres of Skyline Park for the development of housing, complicating matters. Staff has been working with bicycle advocates and Skyline Park Citizens Association to plan and develop a bicycle skills course on a 1/4 acre portion of Skyline Park. The State has completed their review of the latest draft of the agreement authorizing the bicycle skills course, and the draft is now under review by County Counsel.

Smittle Creek

Planning and permits to open this 411 acre holding for public use.

The District completed purchase of this property in December 2015. The next step is to conduct resource surveys, complete CEQA, and obtain permits. A botanist was retained in early 2016 to do a reconnaissance level survey of plant resources as the first step in planning for the property; his report was received in January 2017; the report describes the property as one of the best locations in the County for native grasses. US Geological Survey has requested permission to place a seismic monitoring station on the property; staff has worked with them to identify an appropriate location. In July 2016 the placement request was submitted to the Wildlife Conservation Board (WCB) for concurrence, which as the provider of the grant to acquire the property has the right to review such changes. WCB approved the request in August. An access agreement with USGS is before the District Board for approval at the September 2016 meeting. A group of 20+ people from Tuleyome were given a hiking tour of the property in December 2016, as a way to build interest in the property and build a pool of volunteers to help with restoration and improvement of the property. On March 4 2017, Tuleyome volunteers brushed the Iron Mountain trail (in the Cedar Roughs Wilderness, but

accessed via Smittle Creek.) The State Fish and Wildlife Game Warden for this area has been most helpful in patrolling the property looking for illegal poaching. A well-attended volunteer cleanup project was held on October 28th, more than filling a 30 yard dumpster with debris. In late May, field staff met with the US Geological Service to assist with the placement of a remote seismographic station on the property. Our volunteer caretaker for this property has made repairs to the dirt roads and the perimeter fencing. Staff in January 2020 flagged a route for the proposed new trail access into the property from Reclamation's Smittle Creek Day Use Area parking lot, and a botanist has been retained to conduct a floristic survey this winter and spring. Kyra Purvis is working on the CEQA analysis and on putting together a use permit application to the County of Napa to open Smittle Creek to the public. Kyra also continues to work with Reclamation on an MOU to authorize the public to use their Smittle Creek Day Use Area parking lot to access our property.

State Parks

Operate Bothe-Napa Valley State Park, Bale Grist Mill State Historic Park, and RLS State Park.

The District, with assistance from the Napa Valley State Parks Association, took over management of the parks on April 1, 2012. Since then the District has obtained permits and done improvements to the pool, installed 7 yurts, instituted recycling in the campground and day use areas, pumped all septic system tanks annually, repaired the historic Wright House for use as a rental property, restored 5 cabins, constructed a new shower/toilet facility, and made a large dent in the backlog of deferred maintenance. District efforts to pass legislation allowing the sale of grain from the Bale Mill were unsuccessful. The District has de facto also taken on responsibility for Robert Louis Stevenson State Park, funding repairs to the Silverado House, working with State Parks to get a caretaker into that house to prevent vandalism. In 2014 the District started the process of extending the District's 5 year Operating Agreement and including RLS in the agreement; approval of that new agreement is still pending. The existing OA expired on March 31, 2017; the District is now operating the parks on a month-to-month basis until State Parks can complete the new agreement. The draft OA is now undergoing final review in Sacramento. The District is working with the Vine Trail on the proposed alignment of the Vine Trail through Bothe. More detail on current activities are contained in a separate Parks Report for Bothe and Bale. A storage area at the vacant Silverado House in RLS was broken into in May 2018; State Parks has agreed to let the District repair the house and place a camp host/caretaker on site to prevent further vandalism. The well and water tank was repaired in late 2018, and a District employee is now living on site and serving as the caretaker. A tree fell on the Silverado House in the late Feb 2019 storms; this was cleaned up last week, but the roof which was already in poor shape is now leaking. We have been attempting, but so far with no success, to get State Parks approval to repair the roof. The new Operating Agreement with State Parks has been approved by the District and is now just awaiting final signatures by the head of State Parks and General Services. As noted elsewhere, visitation at Robert Louis Stevenson State Park has been very high in the wake of the Covid-19 pandemic. We have been staffing the parking lot off Highway 29 during peak times, which is a particularly tough job given the nature and location of the lot. Jay Jessen has been covering most of those shifts, with backup from Jason Jordan.

Suscol Headwaters Preserve

Improvements to Suscol Headwaters Preserve and opening the property as a public park.

Having completed purchase of the Preserve in November, 2017 the District now needs to make improvements required by funders, acquire a Napa County Use Permit, and make improvements necessary to open and operate the eventual park. Improvements needed to satisfy funders include the construction of a California red legged frog (CRLF) breeding pond and various habitat improvements focused on, but not exclusively in, the pond area. Improvements necessary to open and operate the eventual park include in the planning and construction of a trail network, design and installation of signage, and the potential future construction of a parking lot and trailhead improvements off-property to the south, on or near Highway 12 in Jameson Canyon . On July 1st 2015 the board of the Napa Sanitation District approved an easement option agreement which may allow us to construct a trail and trailhead parking lot on their Kelly Road sprayfield property. Alternate off-site options are also being pursued. A portion of the property, mostly in Phase II, burned in the October 2017 firestorm; some trees were killed, and a perimeter grazing fence was destroyed, but otherwise damage was not catastrophic. We have installed No Trespassing signs adjacent to ranch roads descending off of Suscol Knob to further limit access to the lower portions of the preserve, where property lines are not necessarily well marked or fenced. As of November, Caltrans is once again working on plans and specs for the red legged frog pond. We plan to file a use permit to open the preserve to the public as soon as the biological survey update that is scheduled for spring/summer 2019 is complete. As of early April 2019 we have begun actively assembling a trail development plan and working on final CARLF pond plans and specifications with Caltrans. We have hired Kevin Smallman, to help with trail corridor planning and spent May 10 and 11 hiking and flagging the property. In late June we met on site with Caltrans and USFWS biologists and geologists to refine preliminary pond plans. Negotiations with the City of American Canyon and an adjacent property owner regarding the potential to relocate the access easement to our property from Highway 12 did not work out because of a change of mind by the property owner. Suscol Headwaters Park was approved by the County Planning Commission on February 19th and is now officially open to the public via Skyline Park. Staff focus is now shifting to finalizing the future trailhead and staging area for accessing the property from Highway 12 and/or Kelly Road. Kyra has been working hard on boundary, trailhead, and other signage along with designing a brochure and park map. We hope to get property boundary signs, which we now have in hand, installed sometime in the next month or so. Chris met with REMBA's Executive Director on the property in early July to discuss funding opportunities and partnerships that may allow some new singletrack trails to be constructed at Suscol Headwaters as early as this coming rainy season.

Vine Trail

A Class I bicycle/pedestrian path extending from Calistoga to the Vallejo Ferry Terminal sponsored by the Vine Trail Coalition, of which the District is a participating member.

The District has entered into an MOU with the Vine Trail Coalition to provide assistance as requested by the Coalition in receiving funds, preparing plans and environmental documents, constructing and operating the trail. The District, the Bay Area Ridge Trail, the San Francisco Bay Trail and the Vine Trail Coalition have prepared a joint Case Statement for the combined trail network for fundraising purposes. The District on February 5, 2010 submitted an appropriations request for FY 2011 to Senator Feinstein, and a similar request to Congressman Thompson on February 26, 2010 on behalf of the Vine Trail Coalition. The District in April 2013 approved and sent a letter of support for the City of Calistoga's request for a grant from the Coastal Conservancy to plan the trail through Calistoga. The Board President in early June 2014 sent a letter of support for a Vine Trail federal "Tiger" grant to help construct the section of trail between Yountville and Napa. The District continues to coordinate with the Vine Trail on plans to route the Vine Trail through Bothe-Napa Valley State Park. A joint Vine Trail/Ridge Trail dedication event was held at Bothe on July 27, 2014. In March 2015 the Vine Trail initiated discussions with district staff about the possibility of the District providing maintenance for the entire Vine Trail, but in the end the cities and the county decided that each entity will maintain the section within their jurisdiction, rather than paying into a common fund for common maintenance. District staff joined with Vine Trail and State Parks staff in October 2016 to discuss the Vine Trail route through Bothe-Napa Valley State Park; the solution that State Parks is willing to accept will add an estimated \$600,000 to the cost of the Vine Trail. On behalf of the District, the GM in January 2017 wrote a letter of support for their application for funding from NVTA. Caltrans is proposing to replace the aging bridge over Mill Creek; since the construction as proposed could have significant adverse effects for both the Vine Trail and the Bale Mill, District and Vine Trail staff meet with Caltrans and NVTA to discuss ways to mitigate the impacts. In Sept 2018 the Vine Trail Coalition requested the District accept an easement to facilitate the trail connection between Kennedy Park and Napa Pipe. Staff met with the Vine Trail and Syar on March 6, 2019 to work out details related to the easement. A revised version of the easement, and an associated agreement allocating responsibilities is still being negotiated. District staff is continuing to support Vine Trail plans for developing the Vine Trail through Bothe-Napa Valley State Park. At the request of the Vine Trail Coalition, staff is exploring with the County whether to take on the eventual maintenance of the section between Calistoga and St. Helena, with the costs to be paid 50/50 by the County and the Coalition.

Completed Projects

Amy's Grove

Donation of 50 acres along Dry Creek and Wing Creek.

The donation of approximately 50 acres of open space from the Chamberlain family to the District closed in December 2015. An additional 9 acres was donated to the District in 2019. The District also completed the purchase of another 164 acres from the Chamberlain family in 2019.

Bay Area Ridge Trail Realignment

In December of 2012 the Bay Area Ridge Trail Council approved the proposed realignment of the Ridge Trail through Napa County as requested by the District.

Bay Area Ridge Trail Napa-Solano Ridge Trail Loop

The Bay Area Ridge Trail Council obtained a donated easement from the Tuteur family and constructed a section of Bay Area Ridge Trail adjacent to Skyline Park. In March 2018 the Ridge Trail Council transferred the easement to the District, and with the support of the Tuteur family revised the easement to facilitate an extension of the trail south onto the District's Suscol Headwaters Preserve.

Bay/River Trail - American Canyon to Napa Phase I

Phase One - Eucalyptus Drive to Green Island Road.

Constructed approximately 5 miles of Class I bicycle and pedestrian path in the vicinity of American Canyon along the Napa River was completed in April 2012, in partnership with the City of American Canyon, Department of Fish and Game and Napa Vallejo Waste Management Authority. A formal opening ceremony was held June 2, 2012.

Phase Two - Pond 10.

DFW surfaced the existing levee with gravel and opened the gate to the public in spring 2015.

Phase Three - Soscol Ferry Road to Napa Pipe

Completed construction in spring of 2015 of 0.7 miles between Soscol Ferry Road and the Napa Pipe property in the Napa Valley Corporate Park.

Berryessa 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. A Negative Declaration and Use Permit hearing was approved December 16, 2009 by the County Planning Commission. An Operations and Management Plan was approved by the property owner and the District. BLM's biologist inspected the alignment on September 17, 2011. The trail was constructed over the course of two years using volunteer crews, and continues to be maintained by volunteers (mostly provided by Tuleyome and Yolo Hiker)

Berryessa Vista Acquisition

Purchase of 224 acres from the Land Trust of Napa County for use as a public park completed in early 2008 using State Prop 12 funds.

Cedar Roughs/Smittle Creek

Purchase of 443 acres of land that will provide public access to Cedar Roughs from the Smittle Creek Day Use Area closed in December 2015.

Connolly Ranch

Construction of patio, restrooms and cooking facilities completed in 2008 using State Prop 12 funds.

The Cove at Mt Veeder

The acquisition of 164 acres from the Girl Scouts was completed in December 2017.

Historic ROW Analysis

Staff has completed a comprehensive review of historic rights-of-way, and is now focusing attention on those that have greatest potential.

Linda Falls Conservation Easement

Conservation easement accepted in spring 2008 from Land Trust of Napa County to provide additional protection for this 39 acre property, which is owned by the land trust. The District previously obtained a conservation easement on one of several parcels owned by the Land Trust of Napa County. The purpose is to provide an additional layer of protection for the property. This is a continuation of a long-term project for the district and land trust to hold easements over each other's properties to protect against unforeseen circumstances that could threaten the conservation values of the properties. The District Board approved acceptance of the easement at its October 2016 meeting, and the easement was finalized and recorded in December 2016.

Master Plan Development and Updates

The Master Plan for 2008-2013 was approved in January 2009. It was updated in 2011 and again in 2019.

Moore Creek Open Space Park

Acquisition of 673 acres in the Moore Creek Watershed completed in December 2008. The City of Napa subsequently approved an agreement with the District to incorporate approximately 900 acres of City of Napa Lake Hennessey watershed lands into Moore Creek Park.

Napa River Ecological Reserve Improvements & Restoration

Parking area paved, and rock barrier installed to control vehicular access in 2007. Trash enclosure constructed and entry signs restored by volunteers in 2008. Deteriorated kiosk removed in 2008. The District in July 2008 assumed the County's role in managing the preserve under the joint management agreement with DFG. A new maintenance contract with the non-profit organization Options 3 was started in January 2009. The old deteriorated information kiosk, which had become a serious eyesore, was removed in November 2008. This multi-year project resulted in the removal of the bulk of the invasive teasel that had taken over the 5 acre meadow at the entrance to the Reserve, and the construction of a

short native plant interpretive trail. Work was done by volunteers, students, and paid contractors. In doing this work, several thousand students received a day of environmental education about native and invasive plants and riparian ecology.

Napa River Flood Control Easement

Conservation easement accepted by District in 2007 to facilitate Flood District project and grant funding.

Newell Preserve Improvements

As part of the arrangement with the land trust on the District's purchase of Berryessa Vista, the land trust was willing to use some of the proceeds from the transaction to fund a well pump and distribution system at the Preserve, which is owned by the City of American Canyon. However, the first well drilled by the City of American Canyon came up dry. The City has dropped plans for digging any more test wells.

Oat Hill Mine Trail

The Oat Hill Mine Trail was formally opened in May Of 2008, after a major volunteer work party doing signage installation, brush removal and erosion control. The District in 2008 applied to BLM for a non-fee transfer to the District of a 40 acre parcel at Maple Springs on the Oat Hill Mine Trail; BLM in April 2016 indicated they did not want to transfer this parcel, so the District's application has been dropped.

River to Ridge Trail

Lot line adjustment to legalize River to Ridge Trail as constructed (it had encroached on private property in two locations) has been completed. Installation of animal silhouettes along the entryway fence illustrating the types of birds and mammals that can be found in the area completed by Eagle Scout candidate in 2008. A new information kiosk was installed at the entrance in December 2008 as part of a Boy Scout project. In 2011 volunteers made some drainage improvements.

Skyline Park Road and Trail Improvements

Erosion control work on Lake Marie Road, and paving of campground loop road, completed in 2007 using State Prop 12 funds. The District and the Skyline Park Citizens Association have continued to cooperate on various trail maintenance projects.

Skyline Park Concessionaire Agreement Renewal

District staff negotiated renewal of concessionaire agreement on behalf of the County in 2010, 2015 and 2020. The renewal involved changes to the fee schedule and amendments to and approval of sub agreements with three non-profit partner organizations.

Skyline Park Facility Improvements

The proposals for a second greenhouse (from CNPS) and a covered equestrian arena (from Skyline Riders) were approved by the Department of General Services and by the County Board of Supervisors. The sponsors of these projects however ended up not pursuing either project.

Suscol Headwaters Preserve Acquisition

Acquisition of 709 acres of the former Kirkland Ranch in two phases was completed in November 2017.

Trinchero/Putah Creek Open Space Acquisition

The donation by the Trinchero family of 2,500 acres of open space (Spanish Valley, Crystal Flats and Stone Corral) was completed on December 29, 2010. A related granting of an access easement to the Lake Berryessa Resort Improvement District was completed in mid-January 2011.

Wild Lake Ranch

The District participated in the development of a strategic plan for the property, together with other public lands in the area, that was led by the Land Trust of Napa County. The land trust has decided, at least for the near term, to manage the Wildlake-Duff property itself.

Deferred Projects

District Non-profit Foundation

The District Board has approved the goals, objectives and basic structure for a non-profit foundation to assist the District with fundraising. Plans have been postponed while the District first focuses on increasing fundraising and outreach capacity without the challenges of establishing and supporting another legal entity, and to ensure what the District does is coordinated with fundraising efforts of other organizations.

Milliken Reservoir Trails and Picnic Area Feasibility Study

The feasibility study to *construct approximately 3 miles of Bay Area Ridge Trail plus additional feeder and loop trails, along with a staging and picnic area* within the City of Napa's Milliken Watershed was completed and accepted by the Board of Directors in 2009. The Napa City Council in November, 2009 approved city staff recommendation to hold off on considering the Milliken Reservoir trails project until the Lake Hennessey Unit of Moore Creek Park is completed.

Montesol West

The District had the opportunity to purchase 1,254 acres west of Highway 29 adjacent to Robert Louis Stevenson State Park. The area's conservation values have already been protected through an easement negotiated by the Trust for Public Land and now held by the Land Trust of Napa County. Purchase of fee title would permit the area to be used for public recreation. The District prepared and obtained a Habitat Conservation Program grant that, together with a Moore Foundation grant obtained by the Trust for Public Land, would fully fund the purchase. A public presentation to the Middletown Area Town Hall was made on August 10, 2017, and to the Middletown Area Merchants Association on August 15 and September 14, 2017. Unfortunately, the option expired at the end of February without TPL exercising it, because we were unable to provide the type of liability insurance the seller wanted to protect his interest in carbon credits that had been sold to the State for timber located on the property. Staff has begun discussions with other conservation partners about a strategy for changing the ARB carbon project rules so they don't prevent public ownership and access.

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 it would need to be updated given the passage of time. The project concept was approved by the District Board, and was positively viewed by the Veterans Home administration. However, there were subsequently a series of changes and controversies within the Department of Veterans Affairs, which undid the progress we had made. The area in question also involves the Department of Fish and Wildlife, since they have an easement to allow hunters to use the area; the Department was initially supportive of the District pursuing a formal trail through the property, but personnel changes within their Department means their review also needs to be restarted. Finally, with the approval of the Go North alignment of the Bay Area Ridge Trail, this segment of trail is no longer part of the officially proposed alignment for the Ridge Trail. For all these reasons, this project is deferred until other District priorities are under control.

Vallejo Lakes

Possible purchase of 1100 acres of surplus Vallejo Water District lands, of which 200 acres are located in Napa County, and Lake Curry which is entirely in Napa County.

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 surplussing of the property. The City of Vallejo has hired an appraiser to prepare an estimate of the property's fair market value, but this has not yet been released. The District GM, together with the County of Solano EO, in February 2012 each sent letters to the City of Vallejo formally expressing interest in the property and requesting notification per state law of any planned surplussing of the property. Sale of the property by the City has been delayed because of complications related to questions about how best to supply water to residents in Green Valley. The Trust for Public Land has expressed interest in assisting with the purchase of this area. Staff from the District and its partners met with the Vallejo City Manager in April 2014; the surplussing process has become more complicated and the City does not anticipate any action in the near future, but meanwhile the City Manager appears open to working with us to figure out a mutually beneficial outcome. Staff had a very interesting meeting with City of Vallejo water division staff and a tour of Lake Curry in late May. The Lake Curry property can only be described as a jewel, and the City of Vallejo would clearly like to divest it. District staff is presently exploring a broad array of options. The Solano County Board of Supervisors has met in closed session to discuss the Lake Curry property. A meeting with Solano County representatives took place January 27, 2017. Solano County is investigating the feasibility of acquiring the lakes and managing their water supplies; as part of this investigation they are also looking at the feasibility of partnering with the District to manage public recreational access. Further progress on this project depends on the City of Vallejo and Solano County; the District cannot do more until they decide what direction to head.



**NAPA COUNTY REGIONAL PARK &
OPEN SPACE DISTRICT**

By: Jason Jordan
Date: July 1, 2020
Item: 4.J
Subject: June 2020 State Park Report for Bothe-Napa Valley SP, Robert Louis Stevenson SP and Bale Grist Mill SHP

- Trail systems at Bothe-Napa and Robert Louis Stevenson State Parks remain open. Both parks have seen steady use for hiking with some reduction recently due to heat. Annual pass sales this year for Bothe have seen a significant increase with more people hiking.
- The Bothe Campground reopened on June 17th with restrictions according to plan submitted to State Parks and County health. Since the campground reopened, occupancy has been high including weekdays. Demand for camping appears to be high with call volume relentless.
- Staff has been adjusting and learning the new point of sale system for campground collections and management since it was deployed during the closure.
- The Bothe Swimming Pool reopened on June 26th with restrictions according to plan provided to county health. Reduced capacity and 2- 2 hour swim sessions are among the changes made to operations. A refresher and new procedure meeting was held for lifeguards.
- The 3rd Saturday hike this month was again virtual. The theme of the hike was an introduction to Suscol Headwaters Preserve.
- Continued progress was made on the Bale Waterwheel restoration project. Staff have assembled all outer shrouds, replaced buckets and sole planking. The only remaining pieces are inner and outer gear shrouds.
- Replacement signage was received for Bothe and Bale Parks. Staff has installed most of the signs in between park maintenance operations.
- Staff spent time finishing up campground and facility clean up, trail brushing, pool preparations for opening. COVID signage including rules and information was developed and installed throughout use areas.
- We have decided to cancel the summer camp scheduled for August at Bothe due to the complicated and rapidly changing logistical challenges caused by the COVID-19 pandemic.
- Management met with State Parks District Superintendent staff to view past projects and discuss future proposals. NOSD asked for support on moving some projects forward including Cemetery Interpretive Panels, Bothe Park Brochure and Silverado Roof Project.
- The Bale Mill and Visitor Center remained closed. Plans and risk assessments will be developed in the near future.