

Appendix A
Initial Study

ENVIRONMENTAL CHECKLIST FORM

1. **Project Title:** Napa River Salt Marsh Restoration Project
2. **Lead Agency Name and Address:** Department of Fish & Game
Robert Floerke
7329 Silverado Trail
Napa, CA 94558
707/944-5500
3. **Contact Person and Phone Number:** Nadine Hitchcock
510-286-4176
4. **Project Location:** The Napa River Salt Marsh (Napa River Unit) is located on the west side of the Napa River between the shoreline of San Pablo Bay and the Southern Pacific Railroad line in Napa and Solano Counties, California.
5. **Project Sponsor's Name and Address:** California Department of Fish and Game
P.O. Box 47
Yountville, CA 94599

U. S. Army Corps of Engineers
333 Market Street
San Francisco, CA 94105
6. **General Plan Designation:** Solano County: Land Extensive Agriculture
Napa County: Agriculture, Watershed, Open Space
Sonoma County: Extensive Agriculture
Marin County: Extensive Agriculture, Residential, Open Space, Recreation
7. **Zoning:** Zoning conforming with general plan designations described above.

8. Description of Project: The California State Coastal Conservancy (Coastal Conservancy), together with the U.S. Army Corps of Engineers (Corps) and the California Department of Fish and Game (DFG), propose the salinity reduction and habitat restoration of Napa Salt Marsh, DFG's 9,850-acre property within the Napa River Unit. The Napa River Salt Marsh Restoration Project objective is to restore tidal salt marsh and ecologically related habitats to this property to support increased populations of endangered species, migratory waterfowl, shorebirds, and anadromous and native fish. The project consists of the construction of new water-intake and -discharge structures, replacement and modification of onsite canals and pipelines, and levee breaches to reduce pond salinities and to restore ponds to tidal action, thereby providing a large increase in slough habitat and tidal channels. Salinity reduction will be achieved through the use of tidal Napa River water and possibly through the use of tertiary treated wastewater (i.e., recycled water). Water that is conveyed from the ponds back into the river will be carefully monitored to ensure it does not exceed water quality standards permitted by the San Francisco Regional Water Quality Control Board (RWQCB). Once salinities are reduced, the existing levees on some of the ponds will be breached to produce a natural, self-sustaining habitat that can adjust to naturally occurring changes in physical processes, with minimum ongoing intervention. Other ponds will be managed using water control structures.

9. Surrounding Land Uses and Setting:

Napa Slough borders the west side of the project area, and agricultural lands lie to the west and north. The Napa River lies to the east of the project, and to the south are U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service (USFWS)-owned tidal lands and seasonal wetlands. A residential neighborhood is adjacent to Pond 8 on the east side of Edgerley Island.

10. Other Public Agencies Whose Approval Is Required:

Regional Water Quality Control Board
United States Fish and Wildlife Service
National Marine Fisheries Service
United States Army Corps of Engineers
State Water Resources Control Board
Department of Fish and Game
State Historic Preservation Officer
Napa County
Solano County
Sonoma County
Bay Area Air Quality Management District

Environmental Factors Potentially Affected:

The environmental factors checked below would potentially be affected by this project (i.e., the project would involve at least one impact that is a “potentially significant impact”), as indicated by the checklist on the following pages.

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

Determination:

On the basis of this initial evaluation:

- I find that the proposed project COULD NOT have a significant effect on the environment, and a NEGATIVE DECLARATION will be prepared.
- I find that although the proposed project could have a significant effect on the environment, there will not be a significant effect in this case because revisions to 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 an impact on the environment that is “potentially significant” or “potentially significant unless mitigated” but at least one effect (1) has been adequately analyzed in an earlier document pursuant to applicable legal standards and (2) has been addressed by mitigation measures based on the earlier analysis, as described on attached sheets. An ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACT REPORT is required, but it must analyze only the effects that remain to be addressed.
- I find that although the proposed project could have a significant effect on the environment, because all potentially significant effects (a) have been analyzed adequately in an earlier ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACT REPORT or NEGATIVE DECLARATION pursuant to applicable standards, and (b) have been avoided or mitigated pursuant to that earlier ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACT REPORT or NEGATIVE DECLARATION, including revisions or mitigation measures that are imposed upon the project, nothing further is required.

_____	_____
Signature	Date
<u>Robert Floerke</u>	_____
Printed Name	For

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

- a. The project site is located near Highway 37, a California Department of Transportation- (Caltrans-) eligible “scenic roadway” in Solano and Sonoma Counties (Caltrans 2000). Highway 37 is also listed in the Sonoma and Solano County general plans as a scenic roadway (Sonoma County Planning Department 1998, Solano County 1999). The restoration project will not cause adverse effects to the scenic vista. Currently, the view consists of salt ponds and agricultural lands. As the project proceeds, it will provide a scenic view of the marsh habitat. Development of the marsh habitat will involve flooding and flushing portions of the area to reduce salinity. If recycled water is used in the desalination process, an existing pipeline will be extended to the project site. However, because this pipeline would be underground, it would not cause an adverse change in views.
- b. A site visit and preliminary analysis of aerial photography did not reveal any scenic resources on site as the project area is composed of salt evaporation ponds. Scenic resources such as trees, rock outcroppings, and historic buildings could occur along Highway 37 near the proposed project. No such resources were identified during a review of aerial photography. Therefore, it is not anticipated that such resources will be affected by the project.
- c. The restoration project will not degrade the existing visual character or quality of the site. The conversion of the project area from salt evaporation ponds to tidal marsh will likely enhance the visual quality of the site. Salt evaporation ponds are notable for the different colors caused by salt production. These colors range from red/orange to blue. The marsh habitat will resemble more “natural” colors like mud brown and water blue. The construction activities in the project area may have a temporary adverse effect on the visual quality of the site. Because of the short-term nature of the activities, this impact will be temporary.
- d. The project will not involve installation of any new lighting systems or sources of glare.

	Potentially Significant Impact	Less than Significant with Mitigation Incorporated	Less-than-Significant Impact	No Impact
II. AGRICULTURAL RESOURCES. In determining whether impacts on agricultural resources are significant environmental effects, lead agencies may refer to the California Agricultural Land Evaluation and Site Assessment Model (1997) prepared by the California Department of Conservation. Would the project:				
a. Convert Prime Farmland, Unique Farmland, or Farmland of Statewide Importance (Farmland), as shown on the maps prepared pursuant to the Farmland Mapping and Monitoring Program of the California Resources Agency, to non-agricultural use?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
b. Conflict with existing zoning for agricultural use or conflict with a Williamson Act contract?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
c. Involve other changes in the existing environment that, due to their location or nature, could result in conversion of Farmland to non-agricultural use?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>

- a. Based on an initial review of Napa and Solano County general plans, the proposed project will not require the conversion of Prime Farmland, Unique Farmland, or Farmland of Statewide Importance (Napa County 1996, Solano County 1999). A more thorough analysis will be provided in the environmental impact report/environmental impact statement (EIR/EIS), including an examination of adjacent farmlands and the indirect effects caused by the proposed project on these lands.
- b. Most of the project area is contained within Napa and Solano Counties. If recycled water were used in the desalination process, a pipeline for water conveyance would be located in a small portion of Napa and Sonoma Counties. The northern portion of the project area is located in Napa County and the lands are designated as “agriculture, watershed, and open space.” This land use designation does not conflict with the project’s intended uses. Both Solano and Sonoma Counties have designated the remaining areas of the proposed project area as “land extensive agriculture.” This land use designation does not conflict with the project’s intended uses.
- c. Currently, the agricultural lands north and west of the project site are used for cultivating hay. If recycled water is used for the project and made available to adjacent agricultural landowners upon completion of the desalinization portion of the project, the types and intensity of agricultural use may change, but are not anticipated to change to nonagricultural uses.

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

- a. The potential air quality impacts of the project are limited to short-term construction-generated emissions, notably dust and vehicle emissions. The Bay Area Air Quality Management District construction requirements concerning particulate matter and organic compounds will ensure that construction impacts are less than significant. Additional evaluation and analysis will be provided in the EIR/EIS.
- b. Because of the limited earthmoving activity associated with the project, a violation of air quality standards is not expected. The EIR/EIS will identify the project’s contribution to key air quality pollutants and relationship to air quality standards.
- c. The air pollutants potentially generated by the project during construction-related activities will include dust and particulate matter. Emissions from construction vehicles will be minor because construction-related activities will be temporary and there will be relatively few construction vehicles at the site. Construction workers will be exposed to dust for only very short periods of time.
- d. The lack of nearby sensitive receptors and low pollutant concentrations indicate there will be no impact on sensitive receptors.

- e. Restoration is not anticipated to create objectionable odors; the system would be managed to minimize likelihood of algal blooms and fish kills that would be potential sources of odors. The project is also anticipated to decrease objectionable odors by improving tidal circulation.

	Potentially Significant Impact	Less than Significant with Mitigation Incorporated	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 checked="" 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, or regulations, or by the California Department of Fish and Game or U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service?	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
c.	Have a substantial adverse effect on federally protected wetlands as defined by Section 404 of the Clean Water Act (including, but not limited to, marshes, vernal pools, coastal wetlands, etc.) through direct removal, filling, hydrological interruption, or other means?	<input checked="" 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 checked="" 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 checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
f.	Conflict with the provisions of an adopted habitat conservation plan, natural community conservation plan, or other approved local, regional, or state habitat conservation plan?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>

a. The proposed project would restore native habitats and is expected to provide a net long-term benefit to native species. However, implementation may adversely affect, at least in the short term, individuals or habitat for several state- or federally listed species and species of concern, including soft bird’s-beak, Mason’s lilaopsis, Pacific cordgrass, Suisun Marsh aster, Delta tule pea, Marin knotweed, California clapper rail, California black rail, western snowy plover, salt marsh harvest mouse, Sacramento River winter-run chinook salmon, Sacramento splittail, steelhead trout, and other nonlisted species that could be listed over the life of the proposed project. The impacts on these species and their habitats will be evaluated and discussed in the EIR/EIS.

- b. The proposed project is intended to help restore sensitive natural communities. However, in the restoration process, the project could potentially adversely affect sensitive natural communities identified by DFG and USFWS, including coastal brackish marsh and northern coastal marsh. The impacts on these habitats or communities will be evaluated and discussed in the EIR/EIS.
- c. The proposed project is expected to result in the long-term increase in the functions and values of coastal marsh wetlands in San Pablo Bay. Implementation, however, may involve interruption or modification of hydrologic function, including filling of coastal salt and brackish marsh wetlands and sloughs through designed levee breaches, water diversions, or other means. These habitats are likely to be considered jurisdictional waters of the United States, under Section 404 of the Clean Water Act. The proposed project's effects on federally protected wetlands will be evaluated and discussed in the EIR/EIS.
- d. In the long term, the proposed project is expected to enhance native wildlife populations. However, in the short term, the project could interfere with the movement of some native resident or migratory fish or wildlife species and with established resident or migratory wildlife corridors. Changes in water levels could have an adverse impact on established daily movement patterns and loafing sites of high-tide roosting shorebirds and waterfowl. Increased salinity within sloughs and the Napa River could inhibit the movements of migratory anadromous fish such as striped bass, sturgeon, steelhead, and starry flounder. The proposed project could have an adverse impact on native wildlife nursery sites of juvenile steelhead and striped bass if salinity releases impede movement, as well as known rookery sites for the double-crested cormorant and great blue heron. The proposed project would provide a substantial long-term net benefit for many species, but the resulting altered habitats may modify wildlife use of the site. The proposed project's effects on wildlife, migratory corridors, and fish usage will be evaluated and discussed in the EIR/EIS.
- e. The proposed project is expected to be consistent with local policies regarding environmental protection and restoration and local tree ordinances. The proposed project's impacts on these policies and ordinances will be evaluated and discussed in the EIR/EIS.
- f. According to planning staff of the Napa County planning office, Napa County does not have any habitat conservation or natural community conservation plans (Bardona pers. comm.). In Solano County, the Solano County Water District is in the preliminary stages of habitat conservation planning. It is currently unclear what areas will be covered by their plan or what areas of the county will be considered mitigation sites (Okita pers. comm.). Information is being gathered regarding habitat conservation planning in Sonoma County. The project could potentially conflict with habitat conservation planning in Solano County and/or Sonoma County. This potential conflict will be addressed in the EIR/EIS.

		Potentially Significant Impact	Less than Significant with Mitigation Incorporated	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 Section 15064.5?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
b.	Cause a substantial adverse change in the significance of an archaeological resource pursuant to Section 15064.5?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
c.	Directly or indirectly destroy a unique paleontological resource or site or unique geologic feature?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
d.	Disturb any human remains, including those interred outside of formal cemeteries?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>

a. Existing information regarding potential historical and archaeological resources within the study area is limited. Structures such as water control facilities, small docks, and buildings associated with salt production, duck clubs, ranching, and other postsettlement land uses are located in several areas throughout the former salt pond complex. These structures have not been evaluated for potential historic significance. There are archaeological records of Native Americans living in the vicinity of Napa Marsh on Suscol Creek and Carneros Creek, but because the actual project area was a tidal salt marsh prior to European settlement, it is unlikely that significant archaeological resources, including human remains, are present. The Corps is planning to conduct site-specific surveys to inventory and evaluate the absence/presence of significant historical and archaeological resources. The findings of these surveys will be evaluated and discussed in the EIR/EIS.

b. Please see response to “a” above.

c. No unique paleontological resources or geologic features are known in the project area, but no formal surveys have been made. The Corps plans to conduct site-specific cultural resource surveys, which will be evaluated and discussed in the EIR/EIS.

d. Please see response to “a” above.

	Potentially Significant Impact	Less than Significant with Mitigation Incorporated	Less-than-Significant Impact	No Impact
VI. GEOLOGY AND SOILS. Would the project:				
a. Expose people or structures to potential substantial adverse effects, including the risk of loss, injury, or death involving:				
1. Rupture of a known earthquake fault, as delineated on the most recent Alquist-Priolo Earthquake Fault Zoning Map issued by the State Geologist for the area or based on other substantial evidence of a known fault? Refer to Division of Mines and Geology Special Publication 42.	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
2. Strong seismic groundshaking?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
3. Seismic-related ground failure, including liquefaction?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
4. 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 checked="" 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 an onsite or offsite landslide, lateral spreading, subsidence, liquefaction, or collapse?	<input checked="" 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 (1994), creating substantial risks to life or property?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
e. Have soils incapable of adequately supporting the use of septic tanks or alternative wastewater disposal systems in areas where sewers are not available for the disposal of wastewater?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>

a. The project will result in levee modifications and the installation of structures that could be lost during an earthquake, strong seismic groundshaking, or liquefaction. The project is in an area not subject to landslides because of the small elevation differences. However, because structures will be engineered to withstand seismic events to the extent practicable, the effects of such events are expected to be less than significant. It is particularly important to ensure that levee improvements adjacent to Highway 37 are seismically sound because a large number of people travel along this corridor. Facilities in this area will also be engineered to prevent the loss of structures and minimize public effects, and these effects are anticipated to be less than significant. These effects will be analyzed and evaluated in the EIR/EIS.

- b. Depending on the size of the levee breaches and amount of scour in adjacent slough channels, there could be substantial erosion of existing mudflat and slough marsh habitat in the project area. These effects will be analyzed and evaluated in the EIR/EIS.
- c. Please see response to “a” above.
- d. The project is not located on expansive soils.
- e. Wastewater disposal is not proposed as part of the project. Recycled water is fully-treated wastewater, and will be included as a water delivery alternative.

	Potentially Significant Impact	Less than Significant with Mitigation Incorporated	Less-than-Significant Impact	No Impact
VII. HAZARDS AND HAZARDOUS MATERIALS.				
Would the project:				
a.	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
b.	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
c.	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
d.	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
e.	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
f.	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
g.	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
h.	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>

a. Except for construction materials, the project will not require the transport or use of hazardous materials. Typical construction-related materials, such as fuels and oils, will be used during construction. Construction workers may therefore be exposed to dust or emissions containing these materials. This impact is considered temporary and less than significant. Standard construction

procedures will be implemented to reduce the emissions of dust or other pollutants during the proposed project. Qualified personnel will evaluate all potentially contaminated areas, if encountered during construction, in the context of applicable local, state, and federal regulations governing hazardous waste. Handling and storage of fuels, flammable materials, and common construction-related hazardous materials are governed by California Occupational Safety and Health Administration (Cal/OHSA) standards for storage and fire prevention. These effects will be evaluated and discussed in the EIR/EIS.

- b. Though the bittern and hypersaline brines are not formally classified as a “hazardous material,” they pose a toxic risk from accidental releases into existing water bodies. The removal of the bittern and hypersaline brines, and potential toxic releases will be addressed in water quality.
- c. The proposed project is not in the vicinity of an existing or proposed school.
- d. Please see the response to “a” above.
- e. The Napa County Airport is located approximately 1 mile from the project. However, the project will pose no significant safety hazard for people working or residing in the area as no new lighting systems, sources of glare, tall structures, or significant sources of noise are associated with the project.
- f. The project area is not located within the vicinity of a private airstrip.
- g. The proposed project would not interfere with an adopted emergency response plan or emergency evacuation plan, because construction-related activities would be located off the primary road network.
- h. Implementation of the proposed project would not expose people or structures to a risk of wildland fires because of the lack of nearby urbanized areas and flammable wildlands. Any potential increase in fire hazards at the project site will be minimized because construction staff will adhere to all rules and regulations regarding the handling and storage of fuels and flammable materials.

		Potentially Significant Impact	Less than Significant with Mitigation Incorporated	Less-than-Significant Impact	No Impact
VIII. HYDROLOGY AND WATER QUALITY.					
Would the project:					
a.	Violate any water quality standards or waste discharge requirements?	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
b.	Substantially deplete groundwater supplies or interfere substantially with groundwater recharge, resulting in 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 that would not support existing land uses or planned uses for which permits have been granted)?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
c.	Substantially alter the existing drainage pattern of the site or area, including through the alteration of the course of a stream or river, in a manner that would result in substantial erosion or siltation onsite or offsite?	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
d.	Substantially alter the existing drainage pattern of the site or area, including through the alteration of the course of a stream or river, or substantially increase the rate or amount of surface runoff in a manner that would result in flooding onsite or offsite?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
e.	Create or contribute runoff water that would exceed the capacity of existing or planned stormwater drainage systems or provide substantial additional sources of polluted runoff?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
f.	Otherwise substantially degrade water quality?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
g.	Place housing within a 100-year flood hazard area, as mapped on a federal Flood Hazard Boundary or Flood Insurance Rate Map or other flood hazard delineation map?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
h.	Place within a 100-year flood hazard area structures that would impede or redirect floodflows?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
i.	Expose people or structures to a significant risk of loss, injury, or death involving flooding, including flooding as a result of the failure of a levee or dam?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>

		Potentially Significant Impact	Less than Significant with Mitigation Incorporated	Less-than-Significant Impact	No Impact
j.	Contribute to inundation by seiche, tsunami, or mudflow?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>

- a. Restoration project alternatives have the potential to discharge contaminants that have accumulated in the salt ponds to receiving waters as a result of tidal or mechanical exchange and mixing of water with salt pond sediments. Potential constituents of concern that could be discharged to receiving waters include saline and other inorganic compounds, temperature, sediment, oxygen-demanding substances, nitrogen and phosphorus, and trace metals. A potential concern is also the long-term dissolution of minerals into receiving waters from previously precipitated deposits remaining in the salt ponds. Discharges associated with project alternatives will need to be designed to protect beneficial uses in the receiving waters and comply with applicable state and federal water quality regulations including mixing zone restrictions and numerical water quality criteria. The impacts are considered potentially significant and will be evaluated and discussed in the EIR/EIS.
- b. Groundwater will not be affected as a result of implementing the project because no groundwater will be used, and there will not be any substantial excavations that could intercept groundwater or alter groundwater flow paths. Therefore, no impacts on groundwater are anticipated.
- c. The project will involve changes to the existing flow patterns of the tidal prism within the ponds and the Napa River. By allowing water to flow in and out of the salt ponds, the rate, volume, and direction of water exchange will change and could subsequently cause changes in sedimentation patterns within the Napa River, in addition to the initial sediment deposition in the salt ponds. In addition, changing the tidal prism within the Napa River may change flow patterns that can alter patterns of erosion and channel scour along streambanks, levees, and the main river channel. Changes in sedimentation patterns can cause impacts on human-made structures within the water bodies, alter water quality, and affect aquatic habitat important to vegetation, aquatic organisms, and terrestrial wildlife that depend on the aquatic habitat. The impacts are considered potentially significant and will be evaluated and discussed in the EIR/EIS.
- d. Levee and channel modifications that are implemented or result from implementation of restoration project alternatives may also alter flooding patterns within the salt ponds and Napa River channel. Changing the tidal prism may cause small changes in the pattern of floodflow within the Napa River. The changes are expected to be small and result in minor changes to other resource issues such as inundation patterns, changes to habitat features, and exposure of structures to flooding velocities or inundation patterns. Their impacts are considered less than significant.
- e. The salt ponds are currently exposed to storm events. As a result of opening the salt ponds to tidal exchange with the Napa River, the receiving waters (Napa River and San Pablo Bay) will be exposed to stormwater runoff from the salt ponds. There would not be any appreciable effects on stormwater conveyance or management practices because the project area is not associated with any other developed stormwater facilities. However, stormwater runoff from the salt ponds may contain elevated concentrations of contaminants of concern. The stormwater water quality impacts are considered less than significant because the incremental discharge of contaminants during storm events to receiving waters will be relatively negligible compared to the dilution from typical high

flow conditions during the winter storm season and/or floodflows within the receiving waters. The potential water quality effects of the project during summer low-flow periods (discussed under checklist question “a”) are much more important to beneficial uses of the water resources and compliance with water quality regulations.

- f. Potential water quality impacts are discussed under checklist question “a.”
- g. No housing would be placed within the 100-year floodplain. Therefore, there would be no impact.
- h. As described in checklist question “d,” under the project alternatives, modifications will occur to levees and channels within the salt ponds that may change floodflow and inundation patterns. Because the area is very level and located essentially at sea level, the potential changes to flooding conditions during a 100-year flow are expected to be less than significant.
- i. The project area is an undeveloped area of the tidal floodplain of San Pablo Bay proposed for habitat restoration. The site is not expected to expose people to hazards from flood events or inundation.
- j. The project may be currently exposed to inundation because it lies within a floodplain and is adjacent to San Pablo Bay. However, the project alternatives would not alter the exposure to inundation.

	Potentially Significant Impact	Less than Significant with Mitigation Incorporated	Less-than-Significant Impact	No Impact
IX. LAND USE AND PLANNING. Would the project:				
a. Physically divide an established community?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
b. Conflict with any applicable land use plan, policy, or regulation of an agency with jurisdiction over the project (including, but not limited to, a general plan, specific plan, local coastal program, or zoning ordinance) adopted for the purpose of avoiding or mitigating an environmental effect?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
c. Conflict with any applicable habitat conservation plan or natural community conservation plan?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>

- a. The project is not within an established community.
- b. The following plans and polices will be reviewed for consistency with the proposed project:
 - Coastal Zone Management Act/San Francisco Bay Plan
 - Long Term Management Strategy [U.S. Environmental Protection Agency, Corps, State Water Quality Control Board, Regional Water Quality Control Board, and Bay Conservation and Development Commission]
 - San Francisco Estuary Project Comprehensive Conservation Management Plan
 - Ecosystem Restoration Program Plan [CALFED Bay-Delta Program]
 - Bay Trail Plan
 - Solano County General Plan
 - Napa County General Plan
 - Sonoma County General Plan

As discussed in the agricultural section, a preliminary review of land use designations within the project area found that Sonoma and Solano County designations does not conflict with the project’s intended uses.

- c. According to planning staff of the Napa County planning office, Napa County does not have any habitat conservation or natural community conservation plans (Bardona pers. comm.). In Solano County, the Solano County Water District is in the preliminary stages of habitat conservation planning. It is currently unclear what areas will be covered by their plan or what areas of the county will be considered mitigation sites (Okita pers. comm.). Information is being gathered regarding habitat conservation planning in Sonoma County. The project could potentially conflict with habitat conservation planning in Solano County and/or Sonoma County. This will be addressed in the EIR/EIS.

		Potentially Significant Impact	Less than Significant with Mitigation Incorporated	Less-than-Significant Impact	No Impact
X.	MINERAL RESOURCES. Would the project:				
a.	Result in the loss of availability of a known mineral resource that would be of value to the region and the residents of the state?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
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"/>

- a. The project site was formerly used for harvesting the salt left behind from the evaporation of bay water. However, the project site has been defunct as a salt-producing area for 10 years, and there are many other sources of salt in the region and state that are able to meet salt demand. Therefore, the project would result in no significant loss of mineral resources.
- b. The project site is not designated as an important mineral resource recovery site in local plans.

		Potentially Significant Impact	Less than Significant with Mitigation Incorporated	Less-than-Significant Impact	No Impact
XI. NOISE.	Would the project:				
a.	Expose persons to or generate noise levels in excess of standards established in a local general plan or noise ordinance or applicable standards of other agencies?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
b.	Expose persons to or generate excessive groundborne vibration or groundborne noise levels?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
c.	Result in a substantial permanent increase in ambient noise levels in the project vicinity above levels existing without the project?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
d.	Result in a substantial temporary or periodic increase in ambient noise levels in the project vicinity above levels existing without the project?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
e.	Be located within an airport land use plan area, or, where such a plan has not been adopted, within two miles of a public airport or public use airport and expose people residing or working in the project area to excessive noise levels?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
f.	Be located in the vicinity of a private airstrip and 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"/>

- a. Construction would be expected to generate short-term elevation of noise levels but would not violate noise standards for nearby communities. These effects will be evaluated and discussed in the EIR/EIS.
- b. Residents near the project area will not be exposed to excessive groundborne vibration or groundborne noise levels. These effects will be evaluated and discussed in the EIR/EIS.
- c. The project would not produce a permanent increase in ambient noise levels.
- d. Please see answer to “a” above.
- e. The Napa County Airport is approximately 1 mile from the northeast corner of the project. However, construction related noise will not affect ambient noise levels at the Napa County Airport.
- f. The project area is not located within the vicinity of a private airstrip.

	Potentially Significant Impact	Less than Significant with Mitigation Incorporated	Less-than-Significant Impact	No Impact
XII. POPULATION AND HOUSING. Would the project:				
a. Induce substantial population growth in an area, either directly (e.g., by proposing new homes and businesses) or indirectly (e.g., through extension of roads or other infrastructure)?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
b. Displace a substantial number of existing housing units, necessitating the construction of replacement housing elsewhere?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
c. Displace a substantial number of people, necessitating the construction of replacement housing elsewhere?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>

- a. The project will not induce population growth because it does not provide new homes or businesses and does not provide for the expansion of facilities that induce growth. The possible use of recycled water at the project site would not induce growth because the water is nonpotable.
- b. The project will not result in the displacement of any housing units or people. Consequently, there will be no population and/or housing impacts associated with the project.
- c. Please see answer to “b” above.

	Potentially Significant Impact	Less than Significant with Mitigation Incorporated	Less-than-Significant Impact	No Impact
--	--------------------------------	--	------------------------------	-----------

XIII. PUBLIC SERVICES. Would the project:

a. Result in substantial adverse physical impacts associated with the provision of new or physically altered governmental facilities or a 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 following public services:

Fire protection?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
Police protection?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
Schools?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
Parks?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
Other public facilities?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>

a. The proposed project will not increase the human population in the area. Therefore, the service ratios and response times or performance objectives of the local fire protection and police protection will not be affected. Demand for schools will not change. It is not anticipated that other public facility providers will be affected. Public service effects will be evaluated in the EIR/EIS.

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

- a. There is a duck club on the property, but the project is not expected to create any substantial increase in the use of that facility. A recreation plan will be included in the project. It is anticipated that during the recreation planning process, the extent and type of public access that will be allowed on the project site will be determined. Public access and its impacts will be analyzed and evaluated in the EIR/EIS.
- b. The project includes construction and expansion of some, but a limited number of, recreational facilities. Facilities will be located away from endangered species habitat to avoid adverse effects. New public facilities and their effects on the environment will be analyzed and evaluated in the EIR/EIS.

	Potentially Significant Impact	Less than Significant with Mitigation Incorporated	Less-than-Significant Impact	No Impact
XV. TRANSPORTATION/TRAFFIC. Would the project:				
a. Cause an increase in traffic that is substantial in relation to the existing traffic load and capacity of the street system (i.e., result in a substantial increase in the number of vehicle trips, the volume-to-capacity ratio on roads, or congestion at intersections)?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
b. Cause, either individually or cumulatively, exceedance of a level-of-service standard established by the county congestion management agency for designated roads or highways?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
c. Result in a change in air traffic patterns, including either an increase in traffic levels or a change in location that results in substantial safety risks?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
d. Substantially increase hazards because of a design feature (e.g., sharp curves or dangerous intersections) or incompatible uses (e.g., farm equipment)?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
e. Result in inadequate emergency access?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
f. Result in inadequate parking capacity?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
g. Conflict with adopted policies, plans, or programs supporting alternative transportation (e.g., bus turnouts, bicycle racks)?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>

- a. The project would not result in any substantial long-term increase in traffic. Project-related activities would require only a limited amount of equipment at any one time and only at times related to construction. Project-related traffic is not anticipated to substantially increase traffic volumes. Equipment would be parked in designated construction areas at the end of each work day and adequate signage will be placed to warn passing motorists about the construction activities. Traffic and its impacts will be analyzed and evaluated in the EIR/EIS.
- b. Please see answer to “a” above.
- c. The project would not affect air traffic patterns for the nearby Napa County Airport.
- d. The project may require construction access to/from Highway 37. Such access would be in accordance with Caltrans requirements for safe ingress/egress.
- e. The project would not introduce residents or result in any other reasons to increase emergency access.

- f. The project does not require or propose permanent parking.
- g. The project is neither a residential nor employment-generating land use, and there is no need for alternative transportation facilities.

		Potentially Significant Impact	Less than Significant with Mitigation Incorporated	Less-than-Significant Impact	No Impact
XVI. UTILITIES AND SERVICE SYSTEMS.	Would the project:				
a.	Exceed wastewater treatment requirements of the applicable Regional Water Quality Control Board?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
b.	Require or result in the construction of new water or wastewater treatment facilities or expansion of existing facilities, the construction of which could cause significant environmental effects?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
c.	Require or result in the construction of new stormwater drainage facilities or expansion of existing facilities, the construction of which could cause significant environmental effects?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
d.	Have sufficient water supplies available to serve the project from existing entitlements and resources, or would new or expanded entitlements be needed?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
e.	Result in a determination by the wastewater treatment provider that serves or may serve the project that it has adequate capacity to serve the project's projected demand in addition to the provider's existing commitments?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
f.	Be served by a landfill with sufficient permitted capacity to accommodate the project's solid waste disposal needs?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
g.	Comply with federal, state, and local statutes and regulations related to solid waste?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>

- a. The proposed project is not expected to release discharges that exceed the requirements of the San Francisco RWQCB. A discussion regarding the mechanisms that will be implemented to ensure that discharge will not exceed RWQCB Standards will be included in the EIR/EIS.
- b. The proposed project may require the expansion of an existing pipeline to the salt ponds/project area. The recycled water from the pipeline will provide a temporary source of fresh water for the desalinization process. Once the salt removal process is completed, the pipeline route will be altered to provide water to adjacent agricultural lands. Therefore, the environmental impact caused by the pipeline expansion will be temporary. After the ponds are desalinated, some amount of recycled water may be used to manage the ponds in the long-term.
- c. The project will have no effect on stormwater facilities.

- d. No new or expanded water supply entitlements would be needed, as the project will use tidal water and possibly some recycled water.
- e. The project will create no additional demand on wastewater treatment providers.
- f. The project would not generate substantial amounts of solid waste and would not affect a landfill.
- g. The project would comply with federal, state, and local solid waste standards.

	Potentially Significant Impact	Less than Significant with Mitigation Incorporated	Less-than-Significant Impact	No Impact
--	--------------------------------	--	------------------------------	-----------

XVII. MANDATORY FINDINGS OF SIGNIFICANCE

a.	Does the project have the potential to degrade the quality of the environment, substantially reduce the habitat of a fish or wildlife species, cause a fish or wildlife population to drop below self-sustaining levels, threaten to eliminate a plant or animal community, reduce the number or restrict the range of a rare or endangered plant or animal, or eliminate important examples of the major periods of California history or prehistory?	<input checked="" 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 checked="" 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 checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>

- a. As described in Section IV. *Biological Resources*, the project has the potential to result in significant biological resource impacts. There is little likelihood that major periods of California’s history or prehistory would be eliminated as a result of the project; however, these impacts will be described and analyzed in the EIR/EIS.
- b. Cumulative adverse effects are possible for biological resources because of other proposed restoration areas in San Pablo Bay that could also result in the near-term loss of marsh habitat and a longer timeframe needed for natural ecosystems to replace the marsh habitat. Cumulative adverse effects are also a possibility for some water quality parameters. These impacts will be described and analyzed in the EIR/EIS.
- c. As described throughout the preceding checklist sections, the proposed project will not result in any environmental impacts that would cause substantial adverse effects on human beings, either directly or indirectly.