

4. Consultation and Coordination

This section presents the agencies consulted during development of the document and a discussion on public involvement.

4.1 Agency Consultation and Coordination

The ESA requires federal agencies to ensure that any action they authorize, fund, or carry out is not likely to jeopardize the continued existence of any listed species (according to the lists maintained by the USFWS and the NMFS) or to result in the destruction or adverse modification of habitat critical to such species' survival. To ensure against jeopardy, each federal agency must consult with the USFWS or NMFS or both. No federally listed threatened or endangered species have been documented to occur or were considered to have the potential to occur in the project area. Based on the analysis in this EA/IS, the proposed activity is likely to have no effect on federally listed species and therefore is not likely to jeopardize the continued existence of listed species or result in the destruction or adverse modification of designated critical habitat. Reclamation has issued a determination of no effect for this project.

The NHPA of 1966, as amended (16 USC, 470 et seq.), requires that federal agencies give the Advisory Council on Historic Preservation an opportunity to comment on the effects of an undertaking on historic properties that are eligible for listing on the National Register of Historic Places. The 36 CFR, Part 800, regulations implement Section 106 of the NHPA. Compliance with Section 106 follows a series of steps that are designed to identify interested parties, to determine the APE, to conduct cultural resource inventories, to determine if historic properties are present within the APE, and to assess effects on any identified historic properties. One archaeological resource, CA-NAP-0655, has been identified next to the project site but has been determined to be ineligible for listing on the National Register of Historic Places. Reclamation consulted with the SHPO regarding a determination of no adverse effects to historic properties resulting from the long term development of Camp Berryessa. The SHPO concurred with Reclamation's determination on February 4, 2011. Since Reclamation has determined that the Proposed Action will result in no adverse effects to historic properties and SHPO has concurred, Reclamation's responsibilities under Section 106 of the NHPA have been fulfilled.

Native American consultations for the Proposed Action have been completed. No Native American resources, such as sacred sites or TCPs, were identified through the consultations.

Reclamation's Mid-Pacific Region ITA Coordinator Patricia Rivera has reviewed the Proposed Action and determined that there are no ITAs within the project area and no ITAs would be affected by the project.

The Proposed Action may require the approval of several other federal, state, and local agencies, which would generally be granted in the form of permits, as discussed in Section 1.4. Reclamation and the District would obtain the necessary permits and clearances before initiating any activities for which they may be required.

4.2 Public Involvement

The draft EA/IS and draft Mitigated Negative Declaration for Camp Berryessa were distributed on December 28, 2010, for 30 days of public review and comment. A notice of availability was published in local newspapers to ensure that interested persons were notified and was posted on the District Internet website. The draft EA/IS and draft Mitigated Negative Declaration for Camp Berryessa were also submitted with a Notice of Completion to the State Clearinghouse. The comment period closed on January 27, 2011. During the 30-day public review period for the draft EA/IS, one comment was submitted, from the State Coastal Conservancy via e-mail, dated January 27, 2011. The commenter requested clarification of how water use resulting from implementation of the Proposed Action would impact the groundwater supply. Section 3.6 of the EA/IS has been revised to further clarify that the Proposed Action would not significantly impact groundwater by depleting the groundwater supply.

5. Conclusions

5.1 Relationship Between Local Short-Term Uses of the Environment and Long-Term Productivity

Construction associated with the Proposed Action would be short term and temporary. Short-term damage to the environment from construction includes direct and indirect erosion, emissions impacts on air quality, short-term impacts on wildlife related to construction disturbances, impacts on local vegetation, and temporary surface water quality impacts.

Providing an environmental education facility would help to foster appreciation for natural resources and an understanding of finite resources. In the long term, this could increase public awareness and appreciation of the local natural environment and of the activities that impact the environment and could foster long-term preservation and respect of the land.

5.2 Irreversible and Irretrievable Commitments of Resources

Implementing the Proposed Project would require committing energy and material resources for constructing buildings and infrastructure for the proposed facility. This energy expenditure would occur over the short term and would be irreversible once construction is completed. Materials required for construction include wood, cement, and fuel for heavy equipment.

5.3 Summary of Impacts

Implementing the Proposed Action would have less than significant adverse impacts on biological resources, cultural resources, geology and soils, water resources, hazardous materials, public health and safety, utilities, traffic and transportation, air quality, noise, visual resources, and socioeconomics. Cumulative effects for these resources are also expected to be less than significant.

The Proposed Action would have beneficial impacts on recreation and socioeconomics. No impacts are expected on land use and environmental justice.

5.3.1 Biological Resources

Plant Communities

Temporary impacts on vegetation would occur from clearing for staging or trampling by workers or heavy machinery. Long-term direct impacts would result from permanently removing vegetation where new facilities and infrastructure would be located, including removing several trees and shrubs. Mitigation Measure BIO-1 would be implemented to further reduce impacts on native oak woodland vegetation.

Mitigation Measure BIO-1

Tree protection measures would reduce impacts to trees during construction and may include the following measures:

- To avoid impacts on mature oak trees (those with a six-inch minimum diameter at breast height), orange construction barrier fencing would be installed at their drip lines. Where appropriate, the barrier fencing would be installed 20 feet outside their drip lines;
- Trees in designated construction areas would be removed only if they had been designated for removal. Removed oak trees would be replaced within the project boundaries at a 3:1 ratio. Replanting of other removed tree species would be determined after consultation with Reclamation's area Natural Resource Specialist;
- Where avoidance is not possible, long-term impacts on oaks would be minimized by trimming limbs and branches over access roads or construction zones and by avoiding parking and excavating in the root zone.

Wildlife

During construction, temporary impacts on wildlife due to increased noise, human presence, vegetation removal, and soil disturbance would occur. Permanent impacts would occur from habitat loss in those locations where vegetation is removed due to the construction of new structures and development. Implementing Mitigation Measure BIO-2 would ensure impacts would be less than significant.

Mitigation Measure BIO-2

To the extent possible, removal of trees and potential bird breeding habitat in the project area would occur between September 1 and January 31, when birds are not expected to be nesting, in order to comply with the Migratory Bird Treaty Act. Prior to any tree removal and construction, a qualified biologist would conduct preconstruction field surveys in and adjacent to the project area for nesting migratory birds, including raptors. Surveys would be conducted during the season immediately preceding tree removal and grading operations when birds are building and defending nests or when young are still in nests and dependent on the parents. If no nests are found during the surveys, tree removal and grading may proceed. If nests are found, construction activities including tree removal shall not be conducted within a buffer zone designated by USFWS or the CDFG

around the nest(s) until after the breeding season (typically February to the end of August).

Special Status Species

Plants

During Construction would have short-term temporary and long-term permanent, indirect, less than significant impacts on special status plant species due to habitat disturbance and loss. Reclamation would implement Mitigation Measure BIO-3 to ensure less than significant project impacts.

Mitigation Measure BIO-3

Before construction begins and during the appropriate season, a qualified biologist would conduct a survey for Green jewelflower, Jepson's milk-vetch, two-carpellate western flax, and Napa western flax. If these species were observed during surveys, project features would be adjusted to the degree possible to avoid impacts. If it were not possible to adjust project features to avoid sensitive plants, appropriate conservation measures would be implemented to ensure that impacts were less than significant. Possible conservation measures include transplanting particular specimens to a location outside of the construction zone and replacing affected individuals with nursery stock in the same location after restoring the affected area.

Wildlife

Bald eagle, golden eagle, and prairie falcon could occur within the project vicinity. Construction would have short-term indirect impacts on these species due to increased noise and human presence. With the implementation of Mitigation Measure BIO-4, impacts would be less than significant.

Mitigation Measure BIO-4

If construction activities must occur during the breeding season for special-status birds and/or bats (February 1 to August 31), a qualified wildlife biologist would conduct nesting-bird surveys within 500 feet of the project site. These surveys must be conducted within one week prior to initiation of construction activities at any time between February 1 and August 31. In addition, surveys for bald eagle nesting would be required prior to construction activity after December 1.

If no active nests or roosts are detected during surveys, then no additional minimization measures are required.

If special-status birds are found in the construction area or in the adjacent surveyed area, a no-disturbance buffer will be established around the nesting/roosting location to avoid disturbance or destruction of the nest site/roost site until after the breeding season or after a wildlife biologist determines that the young have fledged (usually late-June through mid-July). The extent of these buffers will be determined by a wildlife biologist in consultation with the applicable resource agencies (i.e., USFWS and CDFG) and will depend on the level of noise or construction disturbance, line of site between the

nest/roost and the disturbance, ambient levels of noise and other disturbances, and other topographical or artificial barriers. These factors will be analyzed and used by a qualified wildlife biologist to assist the USFWS and CDFG in making an appropriate decision on buffer distances.

5.3.2 Recreation

Proposed recreation at Camp Berryessa would impact the recreation resource of the area by offering an array of new recreation activities not offered at the project site. The Proposed Action would benefit the recreation experience by expanding the types of recreation offered at the lake.

5.3.3 Cultural Resources

One archaeological resource, CA-NAP-0655, has been identified next to the APE and has been determined to be ineligible for listing on the NRHP. Therefore, no significant impacts on known archaeological resources are anticipated.

In the event that previously unidentified cultural resources were encountered during construction or operation of the Camp Berryessa recreation facilities, Reclamation would comply with all applicable laws, including the Native American Graves Protection and Repatriation Act, in the event that human remains were identified. To avoid significant impacts on potentially buried or otherwise unanticipated cultural resources, Mitigation Measure CR-1 would be implemented.

Mitigation Measure CR-1

If previously unidentified cultural resources were discovered as a result of the Proposed Action, project activities within the vicinity of the find would be stopped and a Reclamation archaeologist would be consulted on how to proceed.

5.3.4 Geology and Soils

The Proposed Action would have adverse impacts on geology and soils in the project area, namely soil excavation and compaction and disturbance of naturally occurring asbestos in serpentinite. With implementation of the planned SWPPP and erosion control plan, as well as the legally required asbestos dust mitigation plan, these effects would be considered less than significant in the short term and long term.

5.3.5 Water Resources

The Proposed Action would make use of the contours of the topography as much as possible. The proposed site's landscaping would be enhanced to preserve and stabilize drainage patterns. There would be less than significant impacts involving erosion and siltation associated with the proposed site's drainage pattern. Impacts from runoff during construction would be minimized by implementing a SWPPP.

An on-site well is proposed to provide Camp Berryessa's water supply. Based on what is currently known about the old well, the water supply needs for Camp Berryessa would be met without substantially depleting groundwater supplies. Minimizing water use is a criterion in the general design guidelines for Camp Berryessa, and the facility's water consumption would be relatively small. In addition, there are no facilities with competing groundwater uses on adjacent lands. Further pump testing would be conducted to ensure the proposed project does not substantially deplete groundwater supplies, and ensure there would be less than significant impacts involving groundwater supplies. If necessary, based on water availability, some facilities could be eliminated from the proposed buildout to reduce water use.

5.3.6 Hazardous Materials

Impacts from long-term storage and use of hazardous substances for operations and maintenance and short-term use and storage for construction would be less than significant.

The project site includes naturally occurring asbestos from serpentine rock. An Asbestos Dust Mitigation Plan would be required under the Asbestos Airborne Toxic Control Measure for Construction, Grading, Quarrying, and Surface Mining Operations (Title 17 CCR, Section 93105). With proper implementation of this plan, impacts from airborne hazardous materials would be negligible.

5.3.7 Public Health and Safety

The Proposed Action is not expected to significantly increase the threat to public health and safety from site access, recreation, or ignition or spread of a fire.

5.3.8 Utilities

Water and wastewater utilities would be contained within the project site and would not affect the capacity of any local utility. Electricity demands would be relatively low for this small-scale low-impact development and would have a negligible impact on PG&E or customers using PG&E power. Solid waste generation from this small-scale low-impact development would have a negligible impact on waste disposal services and landfills.

5.3.9 Traffic and Transportation

Implementing the Proposed Action would contribute to the overall traffic volume in the vicinity of Lake Berryessa and especially onto Berryessa-Knoxville Road from increased recreation use. However, due to the limited capacity of the project site, this would be a relatively small, less than significant increase and would likely reach a maximum volume similar to what existed when the Boy Scout camp was in operation. A short-term, less than significant increase in trucks and heavy equipment using Berryessa-Knoxville Road would occur during construction of the project site.

5.3.10 Air Quality

Air pollutant and GHG emissions would be generated by the proposed project during construction and operation. An additional air quality issue is the potential exposure of site occupants to naturally-occurring asbestos. Results of the analysis show that criteria pollutant and greenhouse gas emissions associated with construction and operation would be less than the BAAQMD impact significance thresholds and less than the CAA conformity thresholds. Development and implementation of an Asbestos Dust Mitigation Plan would avoid potential impacts from exposure to naturally-occurring asbestos.

5.3.11 Noise

Less than significant noise and groundborne vibration impacts are expected. Noise impacts of the Proposed Action include temporary increases in local noise levels from construction and long-term incremental increases in area noise levels from increases in vehicle traffic associated with the additional recreation in the project area. Construction would be limited to daytime, primarily on weekdays, consistent with the requirements of the Napa County noise ordinance. Temporary groundborne vibration at the project site would be generated by construction equipment. However, groundborne vibration of the construction equipment would be noticeable only in the immediate vicinity of the construction site.

5.3.12 Land Use

No land use impacts or conflicts over land use plans would occur by implementing the Proposed Action.

5.3.13 Visual Resources

The Proposed Action would result in short-term and permanent changes to the setting and visual quality of the proposed project site. The visual quality of the area would be temporarily impacted by any vegetation removal during construction. Permanent loss of vegetation during construction would not be significant as work would include only limited tree removal, trimming, and minor grading. Temporary impacts on visual resources would also result from the construction vehicles and equipment at staging areas at the proposed site. Dark sky lighting would be used for project components requiring nighttime illumination for safety and security. Under the Proposed Action the visual quality of the site during and after construction would not substantially degrade the visual quality of the area, nor would it have a substantial adverse effect. The improvements at the site would implement the General Design Guidelines listed in the Camp Berryessa Master Plan, which would minimize the impact of the Proposed Action on the visual quality of the site.

5.3.14 Socioeconomics

The Proposed Action would directly contribute additional revenue to the state and local communities and would provide other economic benefits. Due to the camp's location,

most spending would likely occur in Napa County, with additional spending in Solano County if sought services were not found in Napa County. Spending on materials purchased within these counties would be subject to sales tax. The Proposed Action would generate employment opportunities during both construction and operation. There might be a slight increase in demand for temporary housing, such as hotels and motels, both by workers during construction and by visitors from outside the area once Camp Berryessa is operational. However, due to the abundance of temporary lodging in the ROI, direct impacts on short-term housing would be less than significant.

5.3.15 Environmental Justice

The implementation of a recreation-based camp and the resultant physical changes to the project site are not actions that could substantially affect human health or the environment by excluding persons, by denying persons benefits, or by subjecting persons to discrimination. In addition, although minority and low-income populations do reside within the ROI, because of the nature of the Proposed Action, none were identified as having potential for disproportionate human health or environmental effects.

This page intentionally left blank.

6. References

BAAQMD (Bay Area Air Quality Management District). 2010a. Air Quality Standards and Attainment Status. Internet website: http://hank.baaqmd.gov/pln/air_quality/ambient_air_quality.htm. Accessed September 29, 2010.

_____. 2010b. California Environmental Quality Act (CEQA) Guidelines. Internet website: www.baaqmd.gov/Divisions/Planning-and-Research/CEQA-GUIDELINES.aspx. Accessed June 19, 2010.

California Code of Regulations, Title 17, Section 93105. Final Regulation Order: Asbestos Airborne Toxic Control Measure for Construction, Grading, Quarrying, and Surface Mining Operations.

California Department of Boating and Waterways. 2010. *ABCs of the California Boating Law*.

CDFG (California Department of Fish and Game). 2010. California Natural Diversity Database. (Commercial Version, dated August 3, 2010). Biogeographic Data Branch, Sacramento, California.

California Energy Commission. 2009. The Future Is Now: An Update on Climate Change Science Impacts and Response Options for California. PIER Energy-Related Environmental Program. CEC-500-2008-071. Internet website: www.climatechange.ca.gov/research/2008_assessment/index.html. Accessed July 13, 2009.

CNPS (California Native Plant Society). Inventory of Rare and Endangered Plants (online edition). California Native Plant Society. Sacramento, CA.

Chuck Nozicka Consulting. 2009. Camp Berryessa, Master Plan and Feasibility Study, Market and Economic Feasibility Analysis. Prepared for Questa Engineering and Napa County Regional Parks and Open Space District.

EPA (US Environmental Protection Agency). 2010. Safe Drinking Water Information System (SDWIS) Violation Report, Lake Berryessa Boy Scout Camp, Pleasant Hill, California 94523. Internet website: http://oaspub.epa.gov/enviro/sdw_report_v2.first_table?pws_id=CA2800638&state=CA&source=Surface_water&population=25&sys_num=1. Accessed on September 7, 2010.

- IPCC (Intergovernmental Panel on Climate Change). 2007. Climate Change 2007: Technical Summary of the Working Group I Report. Internet website: www.ipcc.ch. Accessed June 23, 2008.
- Jones and Stokes Associates. 2007. Software User's Guide: URBEMIS2007 for Windows. Version 9.2, Emissions Estimation for Land Use Development Projects. Internet website: www.urbemis.com/support/manual.html. Accessed July 13, 2008.
- Metropolitan Transportation Commission. 2009. Metropolitan 2035 Transportation Plan for the San Francisco Bay Area. April 2009.
- Napa County. 1993. Napa County Code of Ordinances. Health and Safety Code.
- _____. 2008. Napa County General Plan.
- Nickels, Adam. 2010. US Bureau of Reclamation – Mid-Pacific Region Archaeologist. Personal communication with Erin King, Tetra Tech Archaeologist. September 15, 2010.
- Questa Engineering. 2009. On-Site Wastewater Feasibility Study for Camp Berryessa. Prepared for Napa County Regional Park and Open Space District.
- _____. 2010. Camp Berryessa Operations, Design, and Preliminary Engineering Study. Prepared for Napa County Regional Park and Open Space District.
- Reclamation (US Department of the Interior, Bureau of Reclamation). 1992. Lake Berryessa Reservoir Area Management Plan.
- _____. 2005. Final Environmental Impact Statement for Future Recreation Use and Operations of Lake Berryessa (also known as the Visitor Services Plan).
- _____. 2006. Record of Decision for Future Recreation Use and Operations of Lake Berryessa.
- _____. 2008. Final Lake Berryessa Resource Inventory.
- _____. Undated. Planning for a Safe Visit to Lake Berryessa. Written by Ranger Bradford Mills.
- _____. 2009. Class III Cultural Resource Inventory Report for Camp Berryessa, Lake Berryessa, Napa County, California. Prepared by Adam M. Nickels and Stephen A. Overly. Project Tracking No: 09-CCAO-017.
- _____. 2010. Continued Cultural Resources Investigations and Presence Absence Testing for the Development of Camp Berryessa, Lake Berryessa, Napa County, California. Prepared by Adam M. Nickels. Project Tracking No: 09-CCAO-017.1.

- Rivera, Patricia. 2008. US Bureau of Reclamation – Mid-Pacific Region. Personal communication with Melissa Brockman, US Bureau of Reclamation, Lake Berryessa Recreation Resource Office. October 14, 2008.
- RWQCB (California Regional Water Quality Control Board). August 25, 2010. *Fact Sheet on Former Putah Creek Resort*. Staff letter soliciting public comments for planned remediation.
- Sawyer, J. O., and T. Keeler-Wolf. 1995. *A Manual of California Vegetation California Native Plant Society, Sacramento, California*.
- State of California. 2010. Department of Finance, California County Race/Ethnic Population Estimates and Components of Change by Year, July 1, 2000–2008. Sacramento, California, June 2010.
- True, D.L., M.A. Baumhoff, and J.E. Hellen. 1979. Milling Stone Cultures in Northern California: Berryessa I. *Journal of California and Great Basin Anthropology*, Vol. 1, No. 1, Summer 1979.
- US Bureau of Economic Analysis, 2010. Regional Economic Accounts. Table CA1-3 - Personal income. <http://www.bea.gov/regional/reis/default.cfm?selTable=CA1-3§ion=2>. Accessed September 8, 2010.
- US Bureau of Labor Statistics. 2010. Local Area Unemployment Statistics. Internet website: <http://www.bls.gov/lau/#tables>. Accessed September 8, 2010.
- US Census Bureau. 2010a. US Census Bureau, Population Division, Table 4. Annual Estimates of Housing Units for Counties in California: April 1, 2000, to July 1, 2009 (HU-EST2009-04-06).
- _____. 2010b. American Fact Finder. Decennial Census Data. Internet website: http://factfinder.census.gov/home/saff/main.html?_lang=en&_ts=. Accessed September 13, 2010.
- _____. 2010c. 2006-2008 American Community Survey. Poverty. Poverty Status for Individuals. Internet website: http://factfinder.census.gov/home/saff/main.html?_lang=en&_ts=. Accessed September 10, 2010.
- US Department of the Interior. 1995. Departmental Manual Part 512.2: Departmental Responsibilities for Indian Trust Resources. Internet website: http://elips.doi.gov/app_dm/index.cfm?fuseaction=home.
- Vignau, Melissa. 2010a. Natural Resources Specialist, CCAO, Personal correspondence with Kelly Bayer of Tetra Tech. Email regarding Cumulative Projects. September 9, 2010.

_____. 2010b. Natural Resources Specialist, CCAO, Bureau of Reclamation. Personal communication with Kelly Bayer of Tetra Tech. September 15, 2010.

_____. 2010c. Natural Resources Specialist, CCAO, Bureau of Reclamation. Personal communication with Kelly Bayer of Tetra Tech. November 10, 2010.

Woodbury, John. 2010. General Manager, Napa County Regional Park and Open Space District. Personal communication with Kelly Bayer of Tetra Tech. November 17, 2010.

7. List of Preparers

This EA/IS was prepared by staff from Reclamation and the District, with technical assistance from Tetra Tech. Team members are listed below, along with their role in the project and additional information regarding their qualifications, as appropriate.

Bureau of Reclamation

| Name | Role |
|------------------|--|
| Dan Holsapple | Recreation Technical Review |
| Adam Nickels | Cultural Resources Technical Review |
| Robert Schroeder | Resource Management Review |
| Melissa Vignau | Reclamation Project Manager, NEPA Support and Technical Review |

Napa County Regional Park and Open Space District

| Name | Role |
|---------------|-------------------------------|
| John Woodbury | CEQA Support, General Manager |

Tetra Tech Consulting Team

| Name | Years Experience | Role/ Responsibility | Education |
|-------------------|------------------|--|---|
| Kelly Bayer | 17 | Project Manager | BS, Biology and Marine Science |
| Rima Ghannam | 11 | Noise | MS, Environmental Management BS, Agriculture |
| Derek Holmgren | 10 | Water Resources, Public Health and Safety | MPA, Environmental Policy and Natural Resources Management MS, Environmental Science BS, Environmental Science BA, International Studies |
| Erin King, RPA | 9 | Cultural Resources, Geology and Soils | MA, Cultural Anthropology BA, Cultural Anthropology |
| Shannon Lindquist | 4 | Biological Resources | MS, Environmental Studies BS, Ecology and Evolutionary Biology |
| Matt Loscalzo | 6 | Recreation, Socioeconomics, Environmental Justice | MS, Environmental Studies. BA, Political Science |
| Julia Mates | 10 | Aesthetics and Visual Resources, Land Use | MA, History BA, History |
| Craig Miller | 18 | Utilities and Infrastructure, Traffic and Transportation | MS, Wildlife Biology |
| Nihal Oztek | 4 | Hazardous Materials and Wastes | BA, Environmental Sustainability and Social Justice |

Tetra Tech Consulting Team

| Name | Years Experience | Role/ Responsibility | Education |
|-------------|-----------------------------|-----------------------------|----------------------------|
| Bob Sculley | 38 | Air Quality, Noise | MS, Ecology BS, Zoology |

APPENDIX A
CEQA CHECKLIST

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**

Camp Berryessa

2. **Property Owner**

Bureau of Reclamation

3. **Contact person and phone number**

John Woodbury, General Manager, (707) 259-5933, jwoodbury@ncrposd.org

4. **Project location and APN**

The proposed Mitigated Negative Declaration covers approximate 10 buildable acres and adjacent uplands and water area on the Putah Creek arm of Lake Berryessa on federal land managed by the U.S. Bureau of Reclamation (APN #019-550-001)

5. **Project Sponsor's Name and Address**

Napa County Regional Park and Open Space District, John Woodbury, General Manager, 1195 Third Street, Rm 210, Napa, CA 94559 (jwoodbury@ncrposd.org)

6. **General Plan Description**

The project site is designated as Agricultural Watershed/Open Space in the County of Napa General Plan. However, since it is on federal land, it is exempt from the County General Plan. Land use policies for the site are set by the Bureau of Reclamation's Record of Decision for its Visitor Service Plan adopted in 2006.

7. **Current Zoning**

The project site is designated as Agricultural Watershed in the County of Napa Zoning Code. However, since it is on federal land, it is exempt from County Zoning.

8. **Project Description**

The Napa County Regional Park and Open Space District (the District) proposes to construct and operate recreation facilities and associated infrastructure on land at Lake Berryessa managed by the US Bureau of Reclamation (Reclamation). The District would develop facilities that would serve a broad range of constituents, with a mix of outdoor education and recreation opportunities and a primary focus on students, youth organizations, and nonprofit organizations. Further, the project would focus on sustainable energy-efficient design, the use of natural and recycled materials, and resource conservation. The programs that would be offered as well as the facility itself would be self supporting to avoid fiscal impacts on the District and Reclamation. The District, in cooperation with Reclamation, would construct and operate recreation facilities, utilities, and transportation infrastructure on Reclamation-managed federal land at Camp Berryessa under a long-term lease. Phased construction and full build out of the project would be over up to ten years, beginning in late 2011, with the timing depending on funding and market demand.

Camp Berryessa is a former Boy Scout Camp on Lake Berryessa, along the east shore of Putah Creek. Lake Berryessa, located approximately 30 miles northeast of Napa, is a reservoir that was formed when Reclamation built Monticello Dam on Putah Creek in 1957. In addition to flood control, the lake is used for agricultural irrigation and drinking water and is one of the largest bodies of freshwater in California. It is also a major

recreation destination, serving the San Francisco Bay Area and the Sacramento Valley, and offers opportunities for boating and water sports, camping, fishing, hiking, and other outdoor recreation. With the termination of Reclamation's long-term concessionaire resort leases in 2008, there is a gap in public recreation at and access to the lake, as well as new opportunities to construct sustainably designed facilities.

The Camp Berryessa site includes approximately 10 acres of land suitable for development. The project would be completed in separate phases, depending on funding commitments, permitting, and market demand. Initial development would likely include basic utility and transportation infrastructure, such as well development and the water system, wastewater improvements, electrical system, roads, parking, trails, and the camp host site and storage building. Camping facilities, such as the tent cabins and recreation amenities, would be added incrementally. The major central facility, large flush toilet restroom/shower facility, permanent dormitories for paid staff, and wood cabins would be considered as part of the later development phases.

9. **Environmental Setting and Surrounding Land Uses**

The project site is surrounded by undeveloped chaparral-covered land to the east, and the water of Lake Berryessa to the south, west and north. The now-closed Putah Creek campground was located a few miles to the south; this area will be redeveloped as a private campground by Pensus, who holds a concessionaire agreement with the Bureau of Reclamation. Scattered rural development (residential and limited commercial) on private land is located along the Knoxville-Berryessa Road south of Pope Putah Creek. There is one private residence a few miles north of the project site on Knoxville-Berryessa Road, and a public hand-launch boat launch several miles further north.

10. **Other agencies whose approval is required:** (e.g., permits, financing approval, or participation agreement). Potentially required permits and approvals include:

| | |
|--------------------------------------|---|
| Regional Water Quality Control Board | Section 401, Clean Water Act certification; Porter-Cologne Water Quality Control Act consultation |
| State Water Resources Control Board | Section 402, National Pollution Discharge Elimination System general construction permit |
| Army Corps | Section 404, Clean Water Act |
| California Dept of Fish and Game | Section 1602, Streambed Alteration Agreement, CESA consultation |
| US Fish and Wildlife Service | ESA Section 7 consultation |
| State Historic Preservation Office | Section 106 consultation, National Register of Historic Places evaluation |
| Napa County | Grading permit, building permit, water well and wastewater system disposal permit |

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 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.

John Woodbury

BY: John Woodbury
General Manager
Napa County Regional Park and Open Space District

____12/23/10_____
Date

CEQA Environmental Checklist

Dist.-Co.-Rte.

P.M/P.M.

E.A.

This checklist identifies physical, biological, social and economic factors that might be affected by the proposed project. In many cases, background studies performed in connection with the projects indicate no impacts. A NO IMPACT answer in the last column reflects this determination. Where there is a need for clarifying discussion, the discussion is included either following the applicable section of the checklist or is within the body of the environmental document itself. The words "significant" and "significance" used throughout the following checklist are related to CEQA, not NEPA, impacts. The questions in this form are intended to encourage the thoughtful assessment of impacts and do not represent thresholds of significance.

I. AESTHETICS: Would the project:

| | Potentially Significant Impact | Less Than Significant with Mitigation | Less Than Significant Impact | No Impact |
|---|--------------------------------|---------------------------------------|-------------------------------------|-------------------------------------|
| a) Have a substantial adverse effect on a scenic vista | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> |
| b) Substantially damage scenic resources, including, but not limited to, trees, rock outcroppings, and historic buildings within a state scenic highway | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> |
| c) Substantially degrade the existing visual character or quality of the site and its surroundings? | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> |
| d) Create a new source of substantial light or glare which would adversely affect day or nighttime views in the area? | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> |

a and b) The proposed project is not located within the view of either a scenic vista or scenic highway, therefore there would be no effect to either resource (Reclamation 1992).

- c) Permanent impacts would result from construction of the Proposed Action, however construction of Camp Berryessa's buildings and structures would follow the design guidelines found in VSP (Reclamation 2005) as well as those policies for aesthetics in Napa County's General Plan. The design of the buildings would therefore be compatible with the natural environment and reflect the site's scenic value. Buildings and utilities would be sited to preserve viewsheds and painted surfaces would be limited. Most surfaces of buildings would be unfinished or earth-tone and non-reflective siding would be used. Implementing these guidelines would reduce the impacts on visual resources to less than significant.
- d) There are no houses on the hillsides that overlook the proposed project site and motorists can only see the proposed project site from the Putah Creek Bridge, located on Knoxville Road, just to the south of the proposed Camp Berryessa site. Therefore, nighttime views of the site are currently minimal. The Napa County General Plan includes a discussion of the CEC's energy efficiency bill passed in 2001, which requires the CEC to set higher requirements for outdoor lighting. Napa County complies with these requirements and most of the County falls under the "rural" designation of the law. Therefore, any lighting that is created by the proposed action must comply with these standards. The new sources of light at the proposed project site will be present, but will not be substantial and therefore impacts will be less than significant.

II. AGRICULTURE AND FOREST RESOURCES: In

determining whether impacts to agricultural resources are significant environmental effects, lead agencies may refer to the California Agricultural Land Evaluation and Site Assessment Model (1997) prepared by the California Dept. of Conservation as an optional model to use in assessing impacts on agriculture and farmland. In determining whether impacts to forest resources, including timberland, are significant environmental effects, lead agencies may refer to information compiled by the California Department of Forestry and Fire Protection regarding the state's inventory of forest land, including the Forest and Range Assessment Project and the Forest Legacy Assessment Project; and the forest carbon measurement methodology provided in Forest Protocols adopted by the California Air Resources Board. Would the project:

| | Potentially Significant Impact | Less Than Significant with Mitigation | Less Than Significant Impact | No Impact |
|--|--------------------------------|---------------------------------------|------------------------------|-------------------------------------|
| 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 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 by Public Resources Code section 4526), or timberland zoned Timberland Production (as defined by 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? | <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 or conversion of forest land to non-forest use? | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> |

-
- a) The proposed project would not impact Prime or Unique Farmland.
 - b) The proposed project would not conflict with zoning for agricultural use or a Williamson Act Contract.
 - c) The proposed project would not impact the zoning of forest land.
 - d) The proposed project would not result in the loss or conversion of forest land.
 - e) The proposed project would not result in the conversion of farmland or forest land.
-

| III. AIR QUALITY: Where available, the significance criteria established by the applicable air quality management or air pollution control district may be relied upon to make the following determinations. Would the project: | Potentially Significant Impact | Less Than Significant with Mitigation | Less Than Significant Impact | No Impact |
|--|--------------------------------|---------------------------------------|-------------------------------------|--------------------------|
| a) Conflict with or obstruct implementation of the applicable air quality plan? | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input checked="" 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 non- attainment under an applicable federal or state ambient air quality standard (including releasing emissions which exceed quantitative thresholds for ozone precursors)? | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> |
| d) Expose sensitive receptors to substantial pollutant concentrations? | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> |
| e) Create objectionable odors affecting a substantial number of people? | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> |

-
- a) The project would be a small source of pollutant emissions during construction and operation, but emission quantities would be less than BAAQMD impact significance thresholds and would not obstruct implementation of any air quality plans.
 - b) The project would be a small source of pollutant emissions during construction and operation, but emission quantities would be less than BAAQMD impact significance thresholds and would not cause any local violations of air quality standards.
 - c) The project is located in a rural recreation area. No future large scale development projects are anticipated in the project area. Additional recreational facilities will be developed around Lake Berryessa, but most of those will be modifications or replacements of previously developed recreational facilities. Consequently, no significant cumulative air quality impacts are anticipated from the combination of existing and planned projects in the area.
 - d) The project site contains serpentine rock outcrops, and thus has the potential to expose facility users to naturally occurring asbestos. Exposure to naturally occurring asbestos will be mitigated by development and implementation of an asbestos mitigation plan (required by California Code of Regulations, Title 17, Section 93150).
 - e) Proper design and operation of wastewater treatment and disposal facilities will minimize the potential for objectionable odors at the project site.
-

IV. BIOLOGICAL RESOURCES: Would the project:

| | Potentially Significant Impact | Less Than Significant with Mitigation | Less Than Significant Impact | No Impact |
|--|--------------------------------|---------------------------------------|-------------------------------------|-------------------------------------|
| 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 checked="" 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 checked="" type="checkbox"/> |
| c) Have a substantial adverse effect on federally protected wetlands as defined by Section 404 of the Clean Water Act (including, but not limited to, marsh, vernal pool, coastal, etc.) through direct removal, filling, hydrological interruption, or other means? | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input checked="" 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 checked="" type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> |
| e) Conflict with any local policies or ordinances protecting biological resources, such as a tree preservation policy or ordinance? | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input checked="" 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 checked="" type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> |

- a) Several special status species may occur in the project area (see Section 3.2 of the attached EA for a description of special status species in the area). Prior to construction, surveys for special status species would be carried out to determine presence or absence. If these species were present in or near the project area, the project would be designed to avoid their habitat or to occur during periods when they were least likely to be present. The project proponent will consult with USFWS under Section 7 of the Endangered Species Act, and with CDFG under the California Endangered Species Act, to avoid effects on these species.
- b) No riparian habitat or other sensitive natural community is present within the project site.
- c) No wetlands occur within the project site. Lake Berryessa is a jurisdictional 'other waters' feature by the US Army Corps of Engineers and should be delineated in accordance with requirements of the USACE and be subject to a USACE Section 404 Nationwide Permit and a RWQCB Section 401 Water Quality Certification. Affected waters will also be permitted by CDFG under Section 1600 of the California Fish and Game Code. All affected jurisdictional features will be restored in accordance with permit requirements.
- d) No native resident or migratory fish or wildlife species or with established native resident or migratory wildlife corridors occur within the project site.
- e) The proposed project will comply with Napa County oak woodland habitat preservation requirements.
- f) Napa County does not have a comprehensive Habitat Conservation Plan in place at this time.

V. CULTURAL RESOURCES: Would the project:

| | Potentially Significant Impact | Less Than Significant with Mitigation | Less Than Significant Impact | No Impact |
|---|--------------------------------|---------------------------------------|-------------------------------------|-------------------------------------|
| a) Cause a substantial adverse change in the significance of a historical resource as defined in §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 §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 checked="" type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> |

- a) No historic-era built-environment resources have been identified within or near the APE. Therefore, the Proposed Action is not expected to have impacts on these types of historical resources.
- b) One archaeological resource, CA-NAP-0655, has been identified next to the APE and has been determined to be ineligible for listing on the NRHP. Therefore, no significant impacts on known archaeological resources are anticipated.
- c) Grading of the ROI required for the Proposed Action is considered minor and would occur only for roads, trails, parking areas, building pads, and for miscellaneous landscaping and fencing. Therefore the project would not destroy any unique geologic or paleontological resources. (Discussed in corresponding EA under Geology and Soils.)
- d) In the event that previously unidentified cultural resources were encountered during construction or operation of the Camp Berryessa recreation facilities, Reclamation would comply with all applicable laws, including the Native American Graves Protection and Repatriation Act, in the event that human remains were identified. To avoid significant impacts on unanticipated cultural resources, Mitigation Measure CR-1 would be implemented.

VI. GEOLOGY AND SOILS: Would the project:

| | Potentially Significant Impact | Less Than Significant with Mitigation | Less Than Significant Impact | No Impact |
|--|--------------------------------|---------------------------------------|-------------------------------------|-------------------------------------|
| a) Expose people or structures to potential substantial adverse effects, including the risk of loss, injury, or death involving: | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> |
| i) Rupture of a known earthquake fault, as delineated on the most recent Alquist-Priolo Earthquake Fault Zoning Map issued by the State Geologist for the area or based on other substantial evidence of a known fault? Refer to Division of Mines and Geology Special Publication 42? | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> |
| ii) Strong seismic ground shaking? | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> |
| iii) Seismic-related ground failure, including liquefaction? | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> |
| iv) Landslides? | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> |
| b) Result in substantial soil erosion or the loss of topsoil? | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> |
| c) Be located on a geologic unit or soil that is unstable, or that would become unstable as a result of the project, and potentially result in on- or off-site landslide, lateral spreading, subsidence, liquefaction or collapse? | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> |

VI. GEOLOGY AND SOILS: Would the project:

| | Potentially Significant Impact | Less Than Significant with Mitigation | Less Than Significant Impact | No Impact |
|--|--------------------------------|---------------------------------------|-------------------------------------|-------------------------------------|
| 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 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 checked="" type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> |

- a) The ROI includes slopes of up to 75 percent, however the geologic unit and soils are considered stable. The potential for landslide, lateral spreading, subsidence, liquefaction, or collapse is considered minimal. Although the ROI is within a seismically active area, it is not situated near a fault. The nearest faults are considered unlikely to exhibit seismic activity in the foreseeable future. As such, the Proposed Action is not expected to expose people or structures to geologic or seismic hazards and impacts associated with seismicity are expected to be negligible.
- b) Under the Proposed Action, the all or portions of the 10-acre ROI would be cleared and minimally graded in preparation for construction of the new buildings, facilities, and utilities. As part of the clearing and grading, an unknown, but likely small amount of topsoil would need to be removed. This soil would likely be re-used or disposed of onsite. The wastewater treatment and disposal system would require imported sediments to raise the depth of soil. During construction, temporary erosion may occur in areas that have been cleared and graded. Soils located in the equipment staging areas are subject to compaction from the use of heavy equipment for from supporting truck traffic. This may result in the reduction of soil infiltration capacity and, therefore, accelerated stormwater runoff from the disturbed areas to Lake Berryessa. After building construction is complete, minimal native landscaping would be used to revegetate the ROI. The project has incorporated the preparation and implementation of a SWPPP as well as an erosion control plan to reduce impacts from erosion and stormwater runoff. The ROI however does include naturally occurring asbestos in the form of serpentine. As such, an Asbestos Dust Mitigation Plan is also required under the Asbestos Airborne Toxic Control Measure for Construction, Grading, Quarrying, and Surface Mining Operations (Title 17 CCR Section 93105). With proper implementation of these plans, impacts associated with loss of soil are expected to be negligible.
- c) The ROI includes slopes of up to 75 percent, however the geologic unit and soils are considered stable. The potential for landslide, lateral spreading, subsidence, liquefaction, or collapse is considered minimal.
- d) Soils within the ROI are not expansive and construction would not pose substantial risks to life or property.
- e) Unmodified, the thin soils of the ROI would be incapable of adequately supporting the planned wastewater treatment and disposal system. In fact the RAMP identifies the soils as "undesirable" for construction of sanitary facilities (Reclamation 1992). However, the Onsite Wastewater Feasibility Study (Questa Engineering 2009) and the Preliminary Engineering Study (Questa Engineering 2010) have designed a modified landscape involving imported materials to support the disposal system that has been incorporated into the Proposed Action. Therefore, the soils as designed in the Proposed Action are expected to be able to adequately support the planned wastewater treatment and disposal system.

VII. GREENHOUSE GAS EMISSIONS: Would the project:

| | Potentially Significant Impact | Less Than Significant with Mitigation | Less Than Significant Impact | No Impact |
|--|--------------------------------|---------------------------------------|-------------------------------------|--------------------------|
| a) Generate greenhouse gas emissions, either directly or indirectly, that may have a significant impact on the environment? | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> |
| b) Conflict with an applicable plan, policy or regulation adopted for the purpose of reducing the emissions of greenhouse gases? | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> |

- a) The project would be a small source of greenhouse gas emissions during construction and operation, but emission quantities would be less than BAAQMD impact significance thresholds.
- b) The project would be a small source of greenhouse gas emissions during construction and operation, but emission quantities would be less than BAAQMD impact significance thresholds and would not obstruct implementation of state or regional plans, policies, or regulations for reducing greenhouse gases.

VIII. HAZARDS AND HAZARDOUS MATERIALS: Would the project:

| | Potentially Significant Impact | Less Than Significant with Mitigation | Less Than Significant Impact | No Impact |
|--|--------------------------------|---------------------------------------|-------------------------------------|-------------------------------------|
| a) Create a significant hazard to the public or the environment through the routine transport, use, or disposal of hazardous materials? | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> |
| b) Create a significant hazard to the public or the environment through reasonably foreseeable upset and accident conditions involving the release of hazardous materials into the environment? | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> |
| c) Emit hazardous emissions or handle hazardous or acutely hazardous materials, substances, or waste within one-quarter mile of an existing or proposed school? | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> |
| d) Be located on a site which is included on a list of hazardous materials sites compiled pursuant to Government Code Section 65962.5 and, as a result, would it create a significant hazard to the public or the environment? | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> |
| e) For a project located within an airport land use plan or, where such a plan has not been adopted, within two miles of a public airport or public use airport, would the project result in a safety hazard for people residing or working in the project area? | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> |
| f) For a project within the vicinity of a private airstrip, would the project result in a safety hazard for people residing or working in the project area? | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> |
| g) Impair implementation of or physically interfere with an adopted emergency response plan or emergency evacuation plan? | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> |
| h) Expose people or structures to a significant risk of loss, injury or death involving wildland fires, including where wildlands are adjacent to urbanized areas or where residences are intermixed with wildlands? | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> |

a and b) Hazardous materials in the form of fuels and lubricants used for constructions machinery will be transported and stored at the site. During operation, the most potentially hazardous substances at Camp Berryessa would likely be chemical landscaping aids, water and sewage treatment chemicals, paint, gasoline, and oil. Small quantities of these materials would only be used for maintenance of the Camp Berryessa site, and not for daily activities or recreational use. This allows for the possibility of accidental release of these materials into the environment at the project site.

c) There are no existing or proposed schools within one-quarter mile of the project site.

d) The project is not located on a site which is included on a list of hazardous materials sites compiled pursuant to Government Code Section 65962.5.

e and f) There are no airports near the project area. The Napa County Airport and Angwin Airport are at approximately 30 miles and 20 miles from Lake Berryessa, respectively. There are no private air strips in the vicinity of the proposed project.

g) The proposed project would not impact adopted emergency response plans or emergency evacuation plans.

h) Planting and design would take into consideration clear zones for fire suppression and management. Use of native plant species would be emphasized and, where possible, vegetation would be planted in a manner to facilitate fire suppression and weed management. Structures would have appropriate fire suppression supplies, such as fire extinguishers. The access road would be improved consistent with Napa County standards.

IX. HYDROLOGY AND WATER QUALITY: Would the project:

| | Potentially Significant Impact | Less Than Significant with Mitigation | Less Than Significant Impact | No Impact |
|---|--------------------------------|---------------------------------------|-------------------------------------|-------------------------------------|
| a) Violate any water quality standards or waste discharge requirements? | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> |
| b) Substantially deplete groundwater supplies or interfere substantially with groundwater recharge such that there would be a net deficit in aquifer volume or a lowering of the local groundwater table level (e.g., the production rate of pre-existing nearby wells would drop to a level which would not support existing land uses or planned uses for which permits have been granted)? | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> |
| c) Substantially alter the existing drainage pattern of the site or area, including through the alteration of the course of a stream or river, in a manner which would result in substantial erosion or siltation on- or off-site? | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> |
| d) Substantially alter the existing drainage pattern of the site or area, including through the alteration of the course of a stream or river, or substantially increase the rate or amount of surface runoff in a manner which would result in flooding on- or off-site? | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> |
| e) Create or contribute runoff water which would exceed the capacity of existing or planned stormwater drainage systems or provide substantial additional sources of polluted runoff? | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> |
| f) Otherwise substantially degrade water quality? | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> |
| g) Place housing within a 100-year flood hazard area as mapped on a federal Flood Hazard Boundary or Flood Insurance Rate Map or other flood hazard delineation map? | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> |
| h) Place within a 100-year flood hazard area structures which would impede or redirect flood flows? | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> |
| i) Expose people or structures to a significant risk of loss, injury or death involving flooding, including flooding as a result of the failure of a levee or dam? | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> |
| j) Inundation by seiche, tsunami, or mudflow | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> |

- a) The Proposed Action would disturb an area greater than one acre in size, and would therefore require an NPDES permit from the Central Valley Regional Water Quality Control Board. The proposed project would not have any point sources that would discharge contaminants or pollutants into waterbodies. There would be less than significant impacts involving water quality standards or waste discharge requirements.
- b) A well would only need to produce a modest 11 or 12 gallons per minute during the 12 hour pumping period (with adequate storage) to meet the needs of 200 users with a relatively high water demand of 40 gallons per day. Based on what is currently known about the old well, the water supply needs for Camp Berryessa would be met without substantially depleting groundwater supplies. Minimizing water use is a criterion in the general design guidelines for Camp Berryessa, and the facility's water consumption would be relatively small. In addition, there are no facilities with competing groundwater uses on adjacent lands. Further pump testing would be conducted to ensure the proposed project does not substantially deplete groundwater supplies, and ensure there would be less than significant impacts involving groundwater supplies. If necessary, based on water availability, some facilities could be eliminated from the proposed buildout to reduce water use.
- c) The proposed project would not alter the course of a river or stream. The proposed project would make use of the existing contours of the topography as much as possible. Enhancing the proposed site's landscaping would be conducted so as to preserve and stabilize existing drainage patterns.
- d) The proposed site would be developed in a manner to prevent on-site flooding. Most importantly, the proposed project is adjacent to Lake Berryessa and, therefore, there are no developed areas downstream of the proposed

project that could be affected by runoff from the proposed project.

- e) The proposed project does not have a stormwater drainage system. The proposed project would not have a stormwater drainage system. Stormwater would continue to drain into Lake Berryessa. There would be no impact involving creating or contributing runoff water which would exceed the capacity of existing or planned stormwater drainage systems.
- f) Runoff from the proposed project would enter Lake Berryessa. Runoff could be contaminated with, for example, pollutants found on the surface of parking lots and litter left on the ground. The proposed project would maintain sufficient receptacles with lids for disposing of garbage and recycling materials. Runoff from impervious surfaces would not be channeled directly into Lake Berryessa.
- g, h and i) The Base Floodplain is 440 feet to 450 feet MSL. The reservoir water level may fluctuate from 455 feet MSL to a minimum elevation of 253 feet MSL. During preparation of the Camp Berryessa Operations, Design and Preliminary Engineering Study (Questa Engineering 2010), Reclamation senior staff interpreted the Visitor Services Plan to mean that all permanent structures and facilities at Camp Berryessa will need to be located above 455 feet MSL (1929 datum). This includes the wastewater disposal field facility. All permanent structures and facilities, including the wastewater disposal field facility, would be at least five feet above the Base Floodplain. There would be no impact involving flooding.
- i) A seiche and tsunami can be created in a lake by an earthquake. Although the area of the proposed project is within a seismically active area, it is not situated near a fault (see Section 3.5, Geology and Soils). The nearest faults are considered unlikely to exhibit seismic activity in the foreseeable future. The area of the proposed project includes slopes of up to 75 percent, however the geologic unit and soils are considered stable. The potential for landslide, lateral spreading, subsidence, liquefaction, or collapse is considered minimal. There would be less than significant impacts involving a seiche, tsunami, or mudflow.

X. LAND USE AND PLANNING: Would the project:

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

- a) The proposed project would not divide an established community.
- b) The project will not conflict with applicable land use plans.
- c) The project area does not conflict with applicable conservation plans or natural community conservation plans.

XI. MINERAL RESOURCES: Would the project:

| | Potentially Significant Impact | Less Than Significant with Mitigation | Less Than Significant Impact | No Impact |
|---|--------------------------------|---------------------------------------|------------------------------|-------------------------------------|
| 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"/> |

- a) No effects to known mineral resources are anticipated.
- b) No effects to known mineral resources are anticipated.

XII. NOISE: Would the project result in:

| | Potentially Significant Impact | Less Than Significant with Mitigation | Less Than Significant Impact | No Impact |
|---|--------------------------------|---------------------------------------|-------------------------------------|-------------------------------------|
| a) Exposure of persons to or generation of noise levels in excess of standards established in the local general plan or noise ordinance, or applicable standards of other agencies? | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> |
| b) Exposure of persons to or generation of excessive groundborne vibration or groundborne noise levels? | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> |
| c) A substantial permanent increase in ambient noise levels in the project vicinity above levels existing without the project? | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> |
| d) A substantial temporary or periodic increase in ambient noise levels in the project vicinity above levels existing without the project? | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> |
| e) For a project located within an airport land use plan or, where such a plan has not been adopted, within two miles of a public airport or public use airport, would the project expose people residing or working in the project area to excessive noise levels? | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> |
| f) For a project within the vicinity of a private airstrip, would the project expose people residing or working in the project area to excessive noise levels? | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> |

- a) The project would not result in any long-term noise generation that would exceed the standards established in the Napa County noise ordinance, or applicable standards of other agencies. Generally, noise levels in the immediate vicinity of the project sites would increase due to construction activities. Construction-related noise levels in the immediate vicinity (600 feet) of the project site could temporarily exceed the Napa County noise standards. However, no sensitive receptors such as residences, schools, or hospitals are located near the project area. The Putah Creek Park area is over 2,000 feet from the project site. Portions of the trail along the northeast shore of Putah Creek are the only recreational facilities within 600 feet of the project site. Because noise from construction would be limited to daytime period and would be fairly away from areas currently visited at Lake Berryessa, noise impacts during the construction period would be less than significant.
- b) Temporary groundborne vibration at the project site would be generated by construction equipment. However, ground borne vibration of the construction equipment would be noticeable only in the immediate vicinity of the construction site. As noted above, no sensitive receptors are located near the project area. Portions of the trail along the northeast shore of Putah Creek are the only recreational facilities within 600 feet of the project site. Because construction activities would be intermittent and limited to daytime period, temporary impacts related to groundborne vibration would be less than significant.
- The project would not add to the permanent groundborne vibration. Impacts of the permanent groundborne vibration from the project resulting from the additional traffic to and from the project site would be comparable to groundborne vibration associated with the current vehicle trips to the project area. Therefore, potential impacts from groundborne vibration would be less than significant.
- c) There would be minor project-related increase in ambient noise levels. Additional noise would result from the increase in the number of visitors to the new recreational facilities. However, the parking capacity of the proposed project is 50 to 60 spaces. The project's marginal increase to the existing traffic volumes would not cause a noticeable increase in the ambient noise level in the project area.
- d) Temporary increase in noise levels would be related to construction activities at the project site. Noise from construction activities would be intermittent and limited to daytime period and would be fairly away from areas currently visited near Lake Berryessa. Therefore, temporary increase in ambient noise levels at the project site would be less than significant
- e) There are no airports near the project area. The Napa County Airport and Angwin Airport are at approximately 30 miles and 20 miles from Lake Berryessa, respectively.
- f) There are no private airstrips within the project area.

XIII. POPULATION AND HOUSING: Would the project:

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

- a) The increase in visitation to the project site from the targeted user groups such as school-age children, as well as user groups located outside Napa County, such as other education groups, aquatic-related camp groups, hiking groups, corporate retreats, and other youth groups would increase the short-term population within the ROI. However, this impact is expected to be minimal because a high percentage of students that would use the facility are assumed to come from within Napa County area schools.
- b) Because the majority of users of Camp Berryessa are expected to come from within Napa County, the demand for lodging from the proposed action is not expected to exceed the capacity of the ROI and therefore would be less than significant.
- c) No residents of Napa or Solano county or any adjacent county would be displaced by the Proposed Action.

XIV. PUBLIC SERVICES:

| | Potentially Significant Impact | Less Than Significant with Mitigation | Less Than Significant Impact | No Impact |
|---|--------------------------------|---------------------------------------|------------------------------|-------------------------------------|
| a) Would the project result in 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: | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> |
| Fire protection? | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> |
| Police protection? | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> |
| Schools? | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> |
| Parks? | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> |
| Other public facilities? | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> |

- a) The project would not increase demand for schools or parks. Existing fire and police protection facilities would be adequate to serve the project site.

XV. RECREATION:

| | Potentially Significant Impact | Less Than Significant with Mitigation | Less Than Significant Impact | No Impact |
|---|--------------------------------|---------------------------------------|-------------------------------------|--------------------------|
| a) Would the project increase the use of existing neighborhood and regional parks or other recreational facilities such that substantial physical deterioration of the facility would occur or be accelerated? | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> |
| b) Does the project include recreational facilities or require the construction or expansion of recreational facilities which might have an adverse physical effect on the environment? | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> |
| a) The proposed project would increase the use of existing recreational facilities at Lake Berryessa by making the Lake a more attractive destination for local residents and tourists. However, this impact would be less than significant because Camp Berryessa would be managed as a group-camp facility on a reservation basis, thereby limiting the number of participants to the area. | | | | |
| b) Construction of Camp Berryessa's buildings and structures would follow the design guidelines found in VSP (Reclamation 2005) as well as other design criteria incorporated into the project description intended to minimize impacts on the environment. | | | | |

XVI. TRANSPORTATION/TRAFFIC: Would the project:

| | Potentially Significant Impact | Less Than Significant with Mitigation | Less Than Significant Impact | No Impact |
|---|--------------------------------|---------------------------------------|------------------------------|-------------------------------------|
| a) Conflict with an applicable plan, ordinance or policy establishing measures of effectiveness for the performance of the circulation system, taking into account all modes of transportation including mass transit and non-motorized travel and relevant components of the circulation system, including but not limited to intersections, streets, highways and freeways, pedestrian and bicycle paths, and mass transit? | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> |
| b) Conflict with an applicable congestion management program, including, but not limited to level of service standards and travel demand measures, or other standards established by the county congestion management agency for designated roads or highways? | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> |
| c) Result in a change in air traffic patterns, including either an increase in traffic levels or a change in location that results in substantial safety risks? | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> |
| d) Substantially increase hazards due to a design feature (e.g., sharp curves or dangerous intersections) or incompatible uses (e.g., farm equipment)? | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> |
| e) Result in inadequate emergency access? | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> |
| f) Conflict with adopted policies, plans or programs regarding public transit, bicycle, or pedestrian facilities, or otherwise decrease the performance or safety of such facilities? | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> |

- a) The project would not conflict with any applicable plan, ordinance or policy establishing measures of effectiveness for the performance of the circulation system. Increases in traffic are anticipated to be small and similar to levels prior to closure of the prior camp. Traffic volume on local roads is generally below capacity.
- b) The project would not conflict with any applicable congestion management program (see "a").
- c) The project is too small and the nearest airport too distant for any impact.
- d) No design features are anticipated to create a danger or an incompatible use.
- e) Project design features include adequate emergency access.
- f) Project incorporates existing and future trails and would not decrease safety. No public transit exists near the project site.

XVII. UTILITIES AND SERVICE SYSTEMS: Would the project:

| | Potentially Significant Impact | Less Than Significant with Mitigation | Less Than Significant Impact | No Impact |
|---|--------------------------------|---------------------------------------|-------------------------------------|-------------------------------------|
| 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 storm water drainage facilities or expansion of existing facilities, the construction of which could cause significant environmental effects? | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> |
| d) Have sufficient water supplies available to serve the project from existing entitlements and resources, or are new or expanded entitlements needed? | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> |
| e) Result in a determination by the wastewater treatment provider which serves or may serve the project that it has adequate capacity to serve the project's projected demand in addition to the provider's existing commitments? | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> |
| f) Be served by a landfill with sufficient permitted capacity to accommodate the project's solid waste disposal needs? | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> |
| g) Comply with federal, state, and local statutes and regulations related to solid waste? | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> |

- a) Project would comply with all applicable wastewater treatment requirements.
- b) Construction of the proposed onsite water and wastewater systems would have less than significant impacts.
- c) The project design will incorporate measure to handle stormwater drainage onsite through natural processes.
- d) Groundwater is available under the site for a well.
- e) Not applicable. Wastewater treatment would be contained on-site.
- f) Development is small scale. Solid waste disposal needs from site would be very light.
- g) Project would comply with all federal, state, and local statutes and regulations related to solid waste.

XVIII. MANDATORY FINDINGS OF SIGNIFICANCE

| | Potentially Significant Impact | Less Than Significant with Mitigation | Less Than Significant Impact | No Impact |
|--|--------------------------------|---------------------------------------|-------------------------------------|--------------------------|
| 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, substantially 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 checked="" 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 checked="" type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> |
| c) Does the project have environmental effects which 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"/> |
