

## **A. Notice of Preparation and Initial Study**

---

**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 following documents and programs: the proposed Napa Valley Transportation Authority Sales Tax Ordinance and Transportation Improvement Expenditure Plan, the Napa County Transportation Planning Agency's (NCTPA) Strategic Transportation Plan, the NCTPA's Short Range Transit Plan, the NCTPA's Countywide Bicycle Plan, the Metropolitan Transportation Commission's (MTC) Regional Transportation Plan, MTC's Transportation Improvement Program, MTC's Regional Bicycle Plan, MTC's North Bay Corridor Study, Caltrans' Interregional Transportation Plan, Caltrans Corridor Concept Reports, the California Transportation Commission's State Transportation Improvement Program, the other sources of information listed in the file, and the comments received, conversations with knowledgeable individuals; the preparer's personal knowledge of the proposed project. For further information, see the background information contained in the permanent file on this proposed project.


**AGENCY STAFF PARTICIPATING IN THE INITIAL STUDY:**

Resource Evaluation: N/A	Date: _____
Site Review: N/A	Date: _____
Planning/Zoning Review: N/A	Date: _____

**DETERMINATION:**

On the basis of this initial evaluation:

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

  
 \_\_\_\_\_  
 Signature

12/4/05  
 \_\_\_\_\_  
 Date

John Ponte  
 \_\_\_\_\_  
 Printed Name

## NOTICE OF PREPARATION

To: From: Napa County Transportation  
Planning Agency

Subject: **Notice of Preparation of a Draft Program Environmental Impact Report**

The Napa County Transportation Planning Agency will be the Lead Agency and will prepare a programmatic environmental impact report for the project identified below. We need to know the views of your agency as to the scope and content of the environmental information which is germane to your agency's statutory responsibilities in connection with the proposed project. Your agency will need to use the EIR prepared by our agency when considering your permit or other approval for the project.

The project description, location, and the potential environmental effects are contained in the attached materials. A copy of the Initial Study is attached.

Due to the time limits mandated by State law, your response must be sent at the earliest possible date but not later than 30 days after receipt of this notice.

Please send your response to John Ponte, Deputy Director at the address shown above.

We will need the name for a contact person in your agency.

Project Title: Adoption of the Napa Valley Transportation Authority Sales Tax Ordinance and Transportation Improvement Expenditure Plan

Project Applicant, if any: Napa County Transportation Planning Agency

Date: October 3, 2005

Title: Deputy Director

Telephone: (707) 259-8636

**NAPA COUNTY TRANSPORTATION PLANNING AGENCY**  
**707 RANDOLPH ST, SUITE 100**  
**NAPA, CA 94559**  
**(707) 259-8631**

**Initial Study Checklist**  
**(reference CEQA, Appendix G)**

1. **Project title:** Adoption of the NAPA VALLEY TRANSPORTATION AUTHORITY SALES TAX ORDINANCE AND TRANSPORTATION IMPROVEMENT EXPENDITURE PLAN
2. **Property owner:** N/A
3. **Contact person and phone number:** John Ponte, NCTPA, (707) 259-8634
4. **Project location and APN:** Napa County
5. **Project sponsor's name and address:** Napa County Transportation Planning Agency, 707 Randolph Street, Suite 100, Napa, California 94559; Napa Valley Transportation Authority, 707 Randolph Street, Suite 100, Napa, California 94559.
6. **General Plan description:** N/A
7. **Zoning:** N/A
8. **Description of Project.** The project analyzed in this Initial Study is the proposed adoption by the Napa Valley Transportation Authority (NVTA) of a retail transactions and use tax ordinance ("tax ordinance") and related expenditure plan for the disposition of collected tax revenues to be utilized for transportation improvements and services. A copy of the proposed tax ordinance is attached hereto, and the expenditure plan is incorporated herein by reference. The expenditure plan delineates how the tax revenues would be utilized. The tax ordinance is being proposed for adoption by NVTA, subject to voter approval, by the Napa County Transportation Planning Agency, the countywide transportation planning body for the incorporated and unincorporated areas within Napa County.

NVTA would be a Local Transportation Authority organized under the provisions of California Public Utilities Code ("PUC") sections 180000 et seq., entitled "Local Transportation Authority and Improvement Act". The purpose of the Authority is to provide a mechanism by which Napa County may raise additional local revenues to provide highway capital improvements and maintenance and to meet local transportation needs in a timely manner. Revenue of the Authority is raised by the voter approved imposition of the retail transactions and use tax ordinance (2/3rds voter approval required), not to exceed one-half of one percent. The funds raised are used to supplement and not replace existing local revenues used for transportation purposes. The Authority is the entity responsible for overseeing the expenditure of these supplemental transportation funds. The funds are to be spent in accordance with an approved county transportation expenditure plan ("expenditure plan"), which lists those projects that may be eligible for supplemental funding. The expenditure plan is prepared by the Authority, and must be approved by the board of supervisors and of the city councils representing both a majority of the cities in the county and a majority of the population residing in the incorporated areas of the county. The expenditure plan is incorporated into the tax ordinance requiring voter approval, and is included in the voter information handbook provided with the sample ballot for the voter approval of the retail transaction and use tax ordinance.

Upon adoption of the proposed tax ordinance, the Authority would then request the Napa County Board of Supervisors to call an election for voter approval of the tax ordinance. Two-thirds voter approval is required to pass the tax ordinance. If passed, the Authority, as allowed by the expenditure plan, may allocate the funds received for the construction and improvement of state highways, the construction, maintenance, improvement, and operation of local streets, roads, and highways, and the construction, improvement, and operation of public transit systems. The funds will be allocated as and when transportation projects have received approval by the agency responsible for the particular project's implementation, i.e, Caltrans, local cities, and the County of Napa.

The tax ordinance would impose a one-half percent retail transactions and use tax on the incorporated and unincorporated areas of Napa County. It is anticipated the tax would be imposed for up to a 30 year period, and may only continue or be reimposed with voter approval. The funds received from the tax could only be used to provide funding for transportation projects contained in the approved expenditure plan. The expenditure plan breaks down into broad categories the purposes for which the funds may be used. Generally, within each category are further identified specific projects for which a certain amount of tax revenue has been allocated. These specific projects may or may not come to fruition, depending on actions to be taken by those local or state agencies responsible for their implementation, including any necessary specific environmental evaluation and approval. The broad categories are as follows:

1. Jamieson Corridor Program - Of the annual tax revenues, it is expected that approximately 28% (total estimated funding of \$151 million) will be allocated for major highway congestion relief and safety projects. It is unknown whether the potential identified projects below will actually be implemented:

- (i) Jamieson Canyon (SR 12 and I-80 to SR 29) - Widen to four-lanes with turn lanes and place safety barriers as appropriate. Approval and implementation of this project would be the responsibility of Caltrans. There is currently an EIR/EIS being conducted by Caltrans to comply with CEQA requirements. It is expected that Caltrans will fully comply with its CEQA obligations and impose appropriate mitigation measures as required in association with any project approval.
- (ii) Airport Interchange (SR 12/29) - Construct interchange at the intersection of State Route 12/Airport Blvd. and Route 29. Approval and implementation of this project would be the responsibility of Caltrans. There is currently an EIR/EIS being conducted by Caltrans to comply with CEQA requirements. It is expected that Caltrans will fully comply with its CEQA obligations and impose appropriate mitigation measures as required in association with any project approval.
- (iii) Soscol Flyover (SR 12/29/221) - Construct southbound SR 221 flyover ramp to southbound SR 12/29. Approval and implementation of this project would be the responsibility of Caltrans. There is currently an environmental analysis being conducted by Caltrans to comply with CEQA requirements. It is expected that Caltrans will fully comply with its CEQA obligations and impose appropriate mitigation measures as required in association with any project approval.

2. Transportation Demand Management Program - Of the annual tax revenues, it is expected that approximately 5% (total estimated funding of \$29 million) will be allocated for a countywide transportation demand management program. Potential projects could include employer and employee education, guaranteed ride home program, preferential carpool parking program, bicycle and pedestrian facilities, park and ride lots, express bus service, senior transit services and transit transfer center(s). To the extent any specific proposed project is not subject to a CEQA exemption, the local agency implementing the work will be responsible for conducting the appropriate environmental review. The exact scope of any such needed review is impossible to ascertain at this time. It is expected that the responsible agency will fully comply with its CEQA obligations and impose appropriate mitigation measures as required in association with any project approval.

3. Safe Streets and Roads Maintenance and Congestion Relief Program - Of the annual tax revenues available, it is expected that approximately 66% will be allocated to the cities (Cities of Napa, American Canyon, St. Helena, Calistoga, and the Town of Yountville) and Napa County to supplement local revenue for local street and road improvements, 75% of which will be expended on maintenance, rehabilitation and reconstruction. These programs are generally categorically exempt from CEQA review under Guideline 15301 (repair/maintenance of existing facilities). To the extent any maintenance program is not categorically exempt, the local agency implementing the work will be responsible for conducting the appropriate environmental review. The remaining 25% may be expended on a variety of project and programs including safety, bicycle, pedestrian, signal installation and timing, operational, transit, and congestion relief. As it is unknown what projects may be implemented by local jurisdictions, the scope of any needed specific CEQA review is impossible to ascertain at this time. It is expected that the responsible agency will fully comply with its CEQA obligations and impose appropriate mitigation measures as required in association with any project approval.

There is no assurance at this time that any particular project will ultimately be implemented. If certain projects should prove to be infeasible, the Authority has the ability to amend the expenditure plan to delete/add projects, subject to the requirements set forth in the tax ordinance and Public Utilities Code section 180207. Added projects resulting from plan amendment would be required to undergo appropriate environmental review. Alternately, the tax ordinance provides a mechanism for allocating excess funds, or those that are not spent, into the Safe Streets and Roads Maintenance Program for appropriate use by the local jurisdictions.

9. **Describe the environmental setting and surrounding land uses.** Napa County comprises some 520,000 acres of land, of which 23,000 acres is water, primarily Lake Berryessa. Some 6% (30,400 acres) is designated for urban uses. The balance is designated for agricultural uses, either agricultural resource or agricultural watershed lands. Approximately 86,000 acres of land within the County is publicly owned.

Within Napa County, there are approximately 449.9 miles of local roads in the unincorporated area, 284.2 miles of local roads in the incorporated or urban areas, and 119.1 miles of state roads in the county, in both incorporated and unincorporated areas.

10. **Other agencies whose approval is required.** The proposed expenditure plan must be approved by the Cities and Napa County prior to its adoption by NVTA. The NVTA itself does not have the approval authority for any of the projects in the expenditure plan. Each of those projects will require environmental review and clearance by the entity responsible for its construction and/or operation. The Authority simply supplies financing based on the expenditure plan that potentially accelerates the construction date of the project

#### **JURISDICTIONAL BACKGROUND: Public Plans and Policies**

Based on an initial review, the following findings have been made for the purpose of the Initial Study and do not constitute a final finding by the Authority in regard to the question of consistency.

	YES	NO	N/A
Is the project consistent with:			
a) Regional and Subregional Plans and Policies?	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
b) LAFCOM Plans and Policies?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
c) The County General Plan?	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
d) Appropriate City General Plans?	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
e) Adopted Environmental Plans and Goals of the Community?	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
f) Pertinent Zoning?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>

**Responsible (R) and Trustee (T) Agencies**

Caltrans  
 Fish and Game  
 City of American Canyon  
 City of Calistoga  
 City of Napa  
 County of Napa  
 City of St. Helena  
 Town of Yountville  
 County of Solano  
 Solano Transportation Authority  
 Regional Water Quality Control Board  
 Bay Conservation and Development Commission  
 Metropolitan Transportation Commission

**Other Agencies Contacted**

FHWA  
 Fish and Wildlife  
 Army Corps of Engineers  
 Bay Area Air Quality Management District  
 State Clearing House

**ENVIRONMENTAL FACTORS POTENTIALLY AFFECTED**

The environmental factors checked below would be potentially affected by this project, involving at least one impact that is a "Potentially Significant Impact" as indicated by the checklist on the following pages.

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

**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 following documents and programs: the proposed Napa Valley Transportation Authority Sales Tax Ordinance and Transportation Improvement Expenditure Plan, the Napa County Transportation Planning Agency's (NCTPA) Strategic Transportation Plan, , the NCTPA's Short Range Transit Plan, the NCTPA's Countywide Bicycle Plan, the Metropolitan Transportation Commission's (MTC) Regional Transportation Plan, MTC's Transportation Improvement Program, MTC's Regional Bicycle Plan, MTC's North Bay Corridor Study, Caltrans' Interregional Transportation Plan, Caltrans Corridor Concept Reports, the California Transportation Commission's State Transportation Improvement Program, the other sources of information listed in the file, and the comments received, conversations with knowledgeable individuals; the preparer's personal knowledge of the proposed project. For further information, see the background information contained in the permanent file on this proposed project.

**AGENCY STAFF PARTICIPATING IN THE INITIAL STUDY:**

Resource Evaluation: N/A Date: \_

Site Review: N/A Date: \_

Planning/Zoning Review: N/A Date: \_

**DETERMINATION:**

On the basis of this initial evaluation:

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

\_\_\_\_\_  
Signature

\_\_\_\_\_  
Date

\_\_\_\_\_  
John Ponte  
Printed Name

## ENVIRONMENTAL CHECKLIST FORM

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

Impact Discussion: The subject proposal, although it does not cause a specific new development project to be undertaken, does set forth transportation projects which may receive funding if the tax ordinance obtains voter approval which projects may have aesthetic impacts. Such impacts may include, depending on the design, location and use of the projects, structures which may impede the views from selected locations, the removal of trees and other potential scenic resources from state right-of-way, other visual impacts to the existing visual character of an area, and lighting on the project itself or lights from vehicles using the projects which may create glare.

Projects which are eligible to receive funding are either categorically exempt from CEQA review, or the agency responsible for project implementation will conduct appropriate, project specific environmental review. It is impossible at this point to ascertain which projects will ultimately receive available funding. The tax ordinance and expenditure plan set forth a framework where funding may be made available for costs necessary for the approval and implementation of potential projects by the agency (state or local) responsible for the improvements. That agency is responsible for specific environmental review, if required, on the proposed project. As it is unknown what specific transportation projects will be undertaken in association with subject proposal, it is impossible to ascertain with any precision what environmental impacts might occur to aesthetics as set forth in subsections a - d, above, and the preparation of a program EIR is appropriate.

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

Impact Discussion: The subject proposal, although it does not cause a specific new development project to be undertaken, does set forth transportation projects which may receive funding if the tax ordinance obtains voter approval and includes potential projects that may have agricultural resource impacts. Such impacts may include, depending on the design, location and use of the projects, changes to the existing environment which could result in the conversion of farmland to non-agricultural use, mainly, if not exclusively, through the acquisition of right-of-way for potential transportation projects. The exact extent of such right-of-way acquisitions is unknown at this time, and will be project dependent.

Projects which are eligible to receive funding are either categorically exempt from CEQA review, or the agency responsible for project implementation will conduct appropriate, project specific environmental review. It is impossible at this point to ascertain which projects will ultimately receive available funding. The tax ordinance and expenditure plan set forth a framework where funding may be made available for costs necessary for the approval and implementation of potential projects by the agency (state or local) responsible for the improvements. That agency is responsible for specific environmental review, if required, on the proposed project. As it is unknown what specific transportation projects will be undertaken in association with

**Project Name:** Adoption of the Napa Valley Transportation Authority Sales Tax Ordinance and Transportation Improvement Expenditure Plan

subject proposal, it is impossible to ascertain with any precision what environmental impacts might occur to agricultural resources arising from right-of-way acquisitions as set forth in subsections a -c, above, and the preparation of a Program EIR is appropriate.

	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporation	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
III. <b>AIR QUALITY.</b> Where available, the significance criteria established by the applicable air quality management or air pollution control district may be relied upon to make the following determinations. Would the project:				
a) Conflict with or obstruct implementation of the applicable air quality plan?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
b) Violate any air quality standard or contribute substantially to an existing or projected air quality violation?	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input 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 checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
d) Expose sensitive receptors to substantial pollutant concentrations?	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
e) Create objectionable odors affecting a substantial number of people?	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>

Impact Discussion: The subject proposal, although it does not cause a specific new development project to be undertaken, does set forth transportation projects which may receive funding if the tax ordinance obtains voter approval, and the potential projects may have air quality impacts. Such impacts may include, depending on the design, location and use of the projects, potential violations of carbon monoxide standards at individual locations and the exposure of sensitive receptors to increased pollutant concentrations. The Jamieson Corridor projects have already been analyzed for their contributions to air quality in the Bay Area Air Quality Management District by the Metropolitan Transportation Commission in the analysis for the Regional Transportation Program. However, other potential projects may cause carbon monoxide hot spot difficulties or may increase concentrations of pollutants near sensitive receptors.

Projects which are eligible to receive funding are either categorically exempt from CEQA review, or the agency responsible for project implementation will conduct appropriate, project specific environmental review. It is impossible at this point to ascertain which projects will ultimately receive available funding. The tax ordinance and expenditure plan set forth a framework where funding may be made available for costs necessary for the approval and implementation of potential projects by the agency (state or local) responsible for the improvements. That agency is responsible for specific environmental review, if required, on the proposed project. As it is unknown what specific transportation projects will be undertaken in association with subject proposal, it is impossible to ascertain with any precision what environmental impacts might occur to air quality as set forth in subsections a -e, above, and the preparation of a Program EIR is appropriate.

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

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

Impact Discussion: The subject proposal, although it does not cause a specific new development project to be undertaken, does set forth transportation projects which may receive funding if the tax ordinance obtains voter approval which projects may have impacts on biological resources. Such impacts may include, depending on the design, location and use of the projects, all subcategories of biological resources as set forth in subsections a -f, above.

Projects which are eligible to receive funding are either categorically exempt from CEQA review, or the agency responsible for project implementation will conduct appropriate, project specific environmental review. It is impossible at this point to ascertain which projects will ultimately receive available funding. The tax ordinance and expenditure plan set forth a framework where funding may be made available for costs necessary for the approval and implementation of potential projects by the agency (state or local) responsible for the improvements. That agency is responsible for specific environmental review, if required, on the proposed project. As it is unknown what specific transportation projects will be undertaken in association with subject proposal, it is impossible to ascertain with any precision what environmental impacts might occur to biological resources as set forth in subsections a -f, above, and the preparation of a Program EIR is appropriate.

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

Impact Discussion: The subject proposal, although it does not cause a specific new development project to be undertaken, does set forth transportation projects which may receive funding if the tax ordinance obtains voter approval which projects may have impacts on biological resources. Such impacts may include, depending on the design, location and use of the projects, all subcategories of cultural resources as set forth in subsections a-d above mainly through the acquisition of rights-of-way for the construction or improvement of transportation facilities.

Projects which are eligible to receive funding are either categorically exempt from CEQA review, or the agency responsible for project implementation will conduct appropriate, project specific environmental review. It is impossible at this point to ascertain which projects will ultimately receive available funding. The tax ordinance and expenditure plan set forth a framework where funding may be made available for costs necessary for the approval and implementation of potential projects by the agency (state or local) responsible for the improvements. That agency is responsible for specific environmental review, if required, on the proposed project. As it is unknown what specific transportation projects will be undertaken in association with subject proposal, it is impossible to ascertain with any precision what environmental impacts might occur to cultural resources as set forth in subsections a -d, above, and the preparation of a Program EIR is appropriate.

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

	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporation	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
ii) Strong seismic ground shaking?	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
iii) Seismic-related ground failure, including liquefaction?	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
iv) Landslides?	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
b) Result in substantial soil erosion or the loss of topsoil?	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
c) Be located on a geologic unit or soil that is unstable, or that would become unstable as a result of the project, and potentially result in on- or off-site landslide, lateral spreading, subsidence, liquefaction or collapse?	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
d) Be located on expansive soil, as defined in Table 18-1-B of the Uniform Building Code (1997), creating substantial risks to life or property?	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
e) Have soils incapable of adequately supporting the use of septic tanks or alternative waste water disposal systems where sewers are not available for the disposal of waste water?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>

Impact Discussion: The subject proposal, although it does not cause a specific new development projects to be undertaken, does set forth transportation projects which may receive funding if the tax ordinance obtains voter approval which projects may be impacted by geology and soils. Such impacts may include, depending on the design, location and use of the projects, increased danger of structural collapse, particularly at locations at which no structures now exist, landslides due to earthquake following re-contouring of properties, or possible use or location of projects on or near unstable or expansive soils.

The subject proposal does not cause a specific new development project to be undertaken. The expenditure plan sets forth transportation projects which may receive funding if the transactions and use tax obtains voter approval. Projects which are eligible to receive funding are either categorically exempt from CEQA review, or the agency responsible for project implementation will conduct appropriate, project specific environmental review. It is impossible at this point to ascertain which projects will ultimately receive available funding. The tax ordinance and expenditure plan set forth a framework where funding may be made available for costs necessary for the approval and implementation of potential projects by the agency (state or local) responsible for the improvements. That agency is responsible for specific environmental review, if required, on the proposed project. As it is unknown what specific transportation projects will be undertaken in association with subject proposal, it is impossible to ascertain with any precision what environmental impacts might occur to geology and soils resources as set forth in subsections a -e, above, and the preparation of a Program EIR is appropriate.

	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporation	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
<b>VII. HAZARDS AND HAZARDOUS MATERIALS.</b> Would the project:				
a) Create a significant hazard to the public or the environment through the routine transport, use, or disposal of hazardous materials?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
b) Create a significant hazard to the public or the environment through reasonable foreseeable upset and accident conditions involving the release of hazardous materials into the environment?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
c) Emit hazardous emissions or handle hazardous or acutely hazardous materials, substances, or waste within one-quarter mile of an existing or proposed school?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
d) Be located on a site which is included on a list of hazardous materials sites compiled pursuant to Government Code Section 65962.5 and, as a result, would it create a significant hazard to the public or the environment?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
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"/>

	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporation	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
f) For a project within the vicinity of a private airstrip, or, where such a plan has not been adopted, within two miles of a public airport or public use airport, would the project result in a safety hazard for people residing or working in the project area?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
g) Impair implementation of or physically interfere with an adopted emergency response plan or emergency evacuation plan?	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
h) Expose people or structures to a significant risk of loss, injury or death involving wild-land fires, including where wild-lands are adjacent to urbanized areas or where residences are intermixed with wild-lands?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>

Impact Discussion: The subject proposal, although it does not cause a specific new development project to be undertaken, does set forth transportation projects which may receive funding if the tax ordinance obtains voter approval, which projects will not manufacture, release or cause to be transported hazardous materials. The project may, during times of construction, cause delays under adopted emergency response plans or evacuation plans; however, those periods are expected to be limited. The project may also be the proximate cause of remediation or removal of hazardous materials within project-rights-of-way.

The subject proposal does not cause a specific new development project to be undertaken. The expenditure plan sets forth transportation projects which may receive funding if the transactions and use tax obtains voter approval. Projects which are eligible to receive funding are either categorically exempt from CEQA review, or the agency responsible for project implementation will conduct appropriate, project specific environmental review. It is impossible at this point to ascertain which projects will ultimately receive available funding. The tax ordinance and expenditure plan set forth a framework where funding may be made available for costs necessary for the approval and implementation of potential projects by the agency (state or local) responsible for the improvements. That agency is responsible for specific environmental review, if required, on the proposed project. As it is unknown what specific transportation projects will be undertaken in association with subject proposal, it is impossible to ascertain with any precision what environmental impacts might occur to hazards and hazardous materials as set forth in subsections a - h, above, and the preparation of a Program EIR is appropriate.

	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporation	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
VIII. <b>HYDROLOGY AND WATER QUALITY.</b> Would the project:				
a) Violate any water quality standards or waste discharge requirements?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
b) Substantially deplete groundwater supplies or interfere substantially with groundwater recharge such that there would be a net deficit in aquifer volume or a lowering of the local groundwater table level (e.g., the production rate of pre-existing nearby wells would drop to a level which would not support existing land uses or planned uses for which permits have been granted)?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
c) Substantially alter the existing drainage pattern of the site or area, including through the alteration of the course of a stream or river, in a manner which would result in substantial erosion or siltation on- or off-site?	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
d) Substantially alter the existing drainage pattern of the site or area, including through the alteration of the course of a stream or river, or substantially increase the rate or amount of surface runoff in a manner which would result in flooding on- or off-site?	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input 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 checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
f) Otherwise substantially degrade water quality?	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
g) Place housing within a 100-year flood hazard area as mapped on a federal Flood Hazard Boundary or Flood Insurance Rate Map or other flood hazard delineation map?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>

	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporation	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
h) Place within a 100-year flood hazard area structures which would impede or redirect flood flows?	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
i) Expose people or structures to a significant risk of loss, injury or death involving flooding, including flooding as a result of the failure of a levee or dam?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
j) Inundation by seiche, tsunami, or mudflow?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>

Impact Discussion: The subject proposal, although it does not cause a specific new development project to be undertaken, does set forth transportation projects which may receive funding if the tax ordinance obtains voter approval which projects may have impacts on hydrology and water quality. Such impacts may include, depending on the design, location and use of the projects, categories which concern the possible alteration or blocking of flows with structures or facilities, as set forth in subsections c, d, e, f, and h, above.

Projects which are eligible to receive funding are either categorically exempt from CEQA review, or the agency responsible for project implementation will conduct appropriate, project specific environmental review. It is impossible at this point to ascertain which projects will ultimately receive available funding. The tax ordinance and expenditure plan set forth a framework where funding may be made available for costs necessary for the approval and implementation of potential projects by the agency (state or local) responsible for the improvements. That agency is responsible for specific environmental review, if required, on the proposed project. As it is unknown what specific transportation projects will be undertaken in association with subject proposal, it is impossible to ascertain with any precision what environmental impacts might occur to hydrology and water quality materials as set forth in subsections a -j, above, and the preparation of a Program EIR is appropriate.

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

Impact Discussion: The subject proposal, although it does not cause a specific new development project to be undertaken, does set forth transportation projects which may receive funding if the tax ordinance obtains voter approval which projects may have impacts on land use planning. Such impacts may include, depending on the design, location and use of the projects, all subcategories of land use and planning as set forth in subsections a-c, above.

Projects which are eligible to receive funding are either categorically exempt from CEQA review, or the agency responsible for project implementation will conduct appropriate, project specific environmental review. It is impossible at this point to ascertain which projects will ultimately receive available funding. The tax ordinance and expenditure plan set forth a framework where funding may be made available for costs necessary for the approval and implementation of potential projects by the agency (state or local) responsible for the improvements. That agency is responsible for specific environmental review, if required, on the proposed project. As it is unknown what specific transportation projects will be undertaken in association with subject proposal, it is impossible to ascertain with any precision what environmental impacts might occur to land use and planning as set forth in subsections a -c, above, and the preparation of a Program EIR is appropriate.

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

	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporation	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
b) Result in the loss of availability of a locally-important mineral resource recovery site delineated on a local general plan, specific plan or other land use plan?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>

Impact Discussion: The subject proposal, although it does not cause a specific new development project to be undertaken, does set forth transportation projects which may receive funding if the tax ordinance obtains voter approval which projects will not have a reasonably foreseeable impact on mineral resources, as there are no mineral resources being extracted or known mineral resources in the potential areas of the project.

Projects which are eligible to receive funding are either categorically exempt from CEQA review, or the agency responsible for project implementation will conduct appropriate, project specific environmental review. It is impossible at this point to ascertain which projects will ultimately receive available funding. The tax ordinance and expenditure plan set forth a framework where funding may be made available for costs necessary for the approval and implementation of potential projects by the agency (state or local) responsible for the improvements. That agency is responsible for specific environmental review, if required, on the proposed project.

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

Impact Discussion: The subject proposal, although it does not cause a specific new development project to be undertaken, does set forth transportation projects which may receive funding if the tax ordinance obtains voter approval which projects may have impacts on noise. Such impacts may include, depending on the design, location and use of the projects, all subcategories of noise impacts as set forth in subsections a-f, above. Transportation projects may create noise impacts during both construction and operation, although primarily during construction.

Projects which are eligible to receive funding are either categorically exempt from CEQA review, or the agency responsible for project implementation will conduct appropriate, project specific environmental review. It is impossible at this point to ascertain which projects will ultimately receive available funding. The tax ordinance and expenditure plan set forth a framework where funding may be made available for costs necessary for the approval and implementation of potential projects by the agency (state or local) responsible for the improvements. That agency is responsible for specific environmental review, if required, on the proposed project. As it is unknown what specific transportation projects will be undertaken in association with subject proposal, it is impossible to ascertain with any precision what environmental impacts might occur to noise as set forth in subsections a -f, above, and the preparation of a Program EIR is appropriate.

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

Impact Discussion: The subject proposal, although it does not cause a specific new development project to be undertaken, does set forth transportation projects which may receive funding if the tax ordinance obtains voter approval which projects may have impacts on population and housing. Such impacts may include, depending on the design, location and use of the projects, all subcategories of population and housing resources as set forth in subsections a-c, above.

The subject proposal does not cause a specific new development project to be undertaken. The expenditure plan sets forth transportation projects which may receive funding if the transactions and use tax obtains voter approval. Projects which are eligible to receive funding are either categorically exempt from CEQA review, or the agency responsible for project implementation will conduct appropriate, project specific environmental review. It is impossible at this point to ascertain which projects will ultimately receive available funding. The tax ordinance and expenditure plan set forth a framework where funding may be made available for costs necessary for the approval and implementation of potential projects by the agency (state or local) responsible for the improvements. That agency is responsible for specific environmental review, if required, on the proposed project. As it is unknown what specific transportation projects will be undertaken in association with subject proposal, it is impossible to ascertain with any precision what environmental impacts might occur to population and housing as set forth in subsections a - c, above, and the preparation of a Program EIR is appropriate.

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

Impact Discussion: The subject proposal, although it does not cause a specific new development project to be undertaken, does set forth transportation projects which may receive funding if the tax ordinance obtains voter approval which projects will likely not have a reasonably foreseeable negative impact on public services, other than potential minor delays during construction phases. Overall, the project should shorten response times for emergency services and have other similar benefits for public services, such as enhancing access to schools and parks.

Projects which are eligible to receive funding are either categorically exempt from CEQA review, or the agency responsible for project implementation will conduct appropriate, project specific environmental review. It is impossible at this point to ascertain which projects will ultimately receive available funding. The tax ordinance and expenditure plan set forth a framework where funding may be made available for costs necessary for the approval and implementation of potential projects by the agency (state or local) responsible for the improvements. That agency is responsible for specific environmental review, if required, on the proposed project.

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

Impact Discussion: The subject proposal, although it does not cause a specific new development project to be undertaken, does set forth transportation projects which may receive funding if the tax ordinance obtains voter approval which projects are unlikely to have reasonably foreseeable negative impacts on recreational resources. The project does not include expansion of recreational resources and is not designed to increase recreational resource use.

Projects which are eligible to receive funding are either categorically exempt from CEQA review, or the agency responsible for project implementation will conduct appropriate, project specific environmental review. It is impossible at this point to ascertain which projects will ultimately receive available funding. The tax ordinance and expenditure plan set forth a framework where funding may be made available for costs necessary for the approval and implementation of potential projects by the agency (state or local) responsible for the improvements. That agency is responsible for specific environmental review, if required, on the proposed project.

	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporation	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
XV. <b>TRANSPORTATION/TRAFFIC.</b> Would the project:				
a) Cause an increase in traffic which is substantial in relation to the existing traffic load and capacity of the street system (i.e., result in a substantial increase in either the number of vehicle trips, the volume to capacity ratio on roads, or congestion at intersections)?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
b) Exceed, either individually or cumulatively, a level of service standard established by the county congestion management agency for designated roads or highways?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input 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 checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
e) Result in inadequate emergency access?	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
f) Result in inadequate parking capacity?	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
g) Conflict with adopted policies, plans, or programs supporting alternative transportation (e.g., bus turnouts, bicycle racks)?	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>

Impact Discussion: The subject proposal, although it does not cause a specific new development project to be undertaken, does set forth transportation projects which may receive funding if the tax ordinance obtains voter approval which projects may have impacts on transportation/traffic. Such impacts may include, depending on the design, location and use of the projects, subcategories of transportation/traffic as set forth in subsections d - g, above.

Projects which are eligible to receive funding are either categorically exempt from CEQA review, or the agency responsible for project implementation will conduct appropriate, project specific environmental review. It is impossible at this point to ascertain which projects will ultimately receive available funding. The tax ordinance and expenditure plan set forth a framework where funding may be made available for costs necessary for the approval and implementation of potential projects by the agency (state or local) responsible for the improvements. That agency is responsible for specific environmental review, if required, on the proposed project. As it is unknown what specific transportation projects will be undertaken in association with subject proposal, it is impossible to ascertain with any precision what environmental impacts might occur to transportation/traffic as set forth in subsection a - g, above, and the preparation of a Program EIR is appropriate.

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

Impact Discussion: The subject proposal, although it does not cause a specific new development project to be undertaken, does set forth transportation projects which may receive funding if the tax ordinance obtains voter approval which projects are unlikely to have negative impacts on utilities and service systems. The project does not include expansion of facilities that would require the expansion of water or wastewater treatment facilities nor is it likely to create large volumes of solid waste.

Projects which are eligible to receive funding are either categorically exempt from CEQA review, or the agency responsible for project implementation will conduct appropriate, project specific environmental review. It is impossible at this point to ascertain which projects will ultimately receive available funding. The tax ordinance and expenditure plan set forth a framework where funding may be made available for costs necessary for the approval and implementation of potential projects by the agency (state or local) responsible for the improvements. That agency is responsible for specific environmental review, if required, on the proposed project.

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

Impact Discussion: The subject proposal, although it does not cause a specific new development project to be undertaken, does set forth transportation projects which may receive funding if the tax ordinance obtains voter approval which projects may have impacts on the items in this category. Such impacts may include, depending on the design, location and use of the projects, all subcategories as set forth in subsections a-c, above

**Project Name:** Adoption of the Napa Valley Transportation Authority Sales Tax Ordinance and Transportation Improvement Expenditure Plan

Projects which are eligible to receive funding are either categorically exempt from CEQA review, or the agency responsible for project implementation will conduct appropriate, project specific environmental review. It is impossible at this point to ascertain which projects will ultimately receive available funding. The tax ordinance and expenditure plan set forth a framework where funding may be made available for costs necessary for the approval and implementation of potential projects by the agency (state or local) responsible for the improvements. That agency is responsible for specific environmental review, if required, on the proposed project. As it is unknown what specific transportation projects will be undertaken in association with subject proposal, it is impossible to ascertain with any precision what environmental impacts might occur in relation subsections a - c, above, and the preparation a Program EIR is appropriate.

## **B. Special Status Species Tables**

---

**Table B-1  
Special status plant species and sensitive habitats found within Napa County**

Species Name	Status <sup>1</sup>				Habitat
	Federal	State	CDFG <sup>2</sup>	CNPS <sup>3</sup>	
<b>Plants</b>					
Clara Hunt's milk-vetch <i>Astragalus claranus</i>	Endangered	Threatened	None	1B	Cismontane woodland, valley and foothill grassland, chaparral.
Tiburon Indian Paintbrush <i>Castilleja affinis ssp. neglecta</i>	Endangered	Threatened	None	1B	Valley and foothill grassland.
Soft Bird's Beak <i>Cordylanthus mollis ssp. mollis</i>	Endangered	Rare	None	1B	Coastal Salt Marsh.
Contra Costa Goldfields <i>Lasthenia conjugens</i>	Endangered Critical Habitat	None	None	1B	Valley and foothill grassland, vernal pools, cismontane woodland, extirpated from most of its range, extremely endangered.
Mason's Lilaepsis <i>Lilaeopsis masonii</i>	None	Rare	None	1B	Freshwater and brackish marshes, riparian scrub.
Sebastopol Meadowfoam <i>Limnanthes vincularis</i>	Endangered	Endangered	None	1B	Mesic meadows, vernal pools, valley and foothill grassland.
Few-flowered Navarretia <i>Navarretia leucocephala ssp. pauciflora</i>	Endangered	Threatened	None	1B	Vernal pools.
Calistoga Popcorn-flower <i>Plagiobothrys strictus</i>	Endangered	Threatened	None	1B	Broadleafed upland forest, meadows and seeps, valley and foothill grassland, vernal pools.
Napa Bluegrass <i>Poa napensis</i>	Endangered	Threatened	None	1B	Meadows and seeps, valley and foothill grassland.
Showy Indian Clover <i>Trifolium amoenum</i>	Endangered	None	None	1B	Valley and foothill grassland, coastal bluff scrub.
Napa False Indigo <i>Amorpha californica var. napensis</i>	Species of Local Concern	None	None	1B	Broadleafed upland forest, chaparral, cismontane woodland.
Bent-flowered Fiddleneck <i>Amsinckia lunaris</i>	Species of Local Concern	None	None	1B	Cismontane woodland, valley and foothill grassland.
Suisun Marsh Aster <i>Aster lentus</i>	Special Concern	None	None	1B	Marshes and swamps (brackish and freshwater).

**Table B-1 (continued)**  
**Special status plant species and sensitive habitats found within Napa County**

Species Name	Status <sup>1</sup>				Habitat
	Federal	State	CDFG <sup>2</sup>	CNPS <sup>3</sup>	
<b>Plants</b>					
Jepson's Milk-vetch <i>Astragalus rattanii</i> var. <i>jepsonianus</i>	Species of Local Concern	None	None	1B	Cismontane woodland, valley and foothill grassland, chaparral.
Alkali Milk-vetch <i>Astragalus tener</i> var. <i>tener</i>	Special Concern	None	None	1B	Alkali playa, valley and foothill grassland, vernal pools.
San Joaquin Spearscale <i>Atriplex joaquiniana</i>	Special Concern	None	None	1B	Chenopod scrub, alkali meadow, valley and foothill grassland.
Big-scale Balsamroot <i>Balsamorhiza macrolepis</i> var. <i>macrolepis</i>	Species of Local Concern	None	None	1B	Cismontane woodland, valley and foothill grassland.
Narrow-anthered California Brodiaea <i>Brodiaea californica</i> var. <i>leptandra</i>	Species of Local Concern	None	None	1B	Broadleafed upland forest, chaparral, lower montane coniferous forest.
Mt. Saint Helena Morning-glory <i>Calystegia colina</i> ssp. <i>oxyphylla</i>	Species of Local Concern	None	None	4	Serpentine soils on well-drained slopes and hillsides within chaparral habitats.
Salt Marsh Owl's Clover <i>Castilleja ambigua</i> ssp. <i>ambigua</i>	Species of Local Concern	None	None	N/A	Coastal salt marsh areas.
Pink Creamsacs <i>Castilleja rubicundula</i> ssp. <i>Rubicundula</i>	Species of Local Concern	None	None	1B	Chaparral, meadows and seeps, foothill and valley grassland.
Rincon Ridge Ceanothus <i>Ceanothus confusus</i>	Special Concern	None	None	1B	Closed-cone coniferous forest, chaparral, cismontane woodland, volcanic or serpentine soils.
Calistoga Ceanothus <i>Ceanothus divergens</i>	Special Concern	None	None	1B	Chaparral, cismontane woodland, rocky, volcanic or serpentine soils.
Holly-leaved Ceanothus <i>Ceanothus purpureus</i>	Species of Local Concern	None	None	1B	Chaparral, cismontane woodland, rocky, volcanic soils.

**Table B-1 (continued)**  
**Special status plant species and sensitive habitats found within Napa County**

Species Name	Status <sup>1</sup>				Habitat
	Federal	State	CDFG <sup>2</sup>	CNPS <sup>3</sup>	
<b>Plants</b>					
Sonoma Ceanothus <i>Ceanothus Sonomensis</i>	Special Concern	None	None	1B	Chaparral, usually in sandy, serpentine or volcanic soils.
Pappose Tarplant <i>Centromadia parryi ssp. parryi</i>	None	None	None	1B	Coastal prairie, meadows and seeps, valley and foothill grasslands.
Serpentine (=Cleveland's) Crypthantha <i>Crypthantha clevelandii var. dissita</i>	Species of Local Concern	None	None	1B	Chaparral, serpentine outcrops.
Dwarf Downingia <i>Downingia pusilla</i>	None	None	None	2	Valley and foothill grasslands, vernal pools.
Narrow-leaved Daisy <i>Erigeron angustatus</i>	Species of Local Concern	None	None	1B	Chaparral, in serpentine and volcanic substrates, generally in shrubby vegetation.
Tiburon Buckwheat <i>Eriogonum caninum</i>	Species of Local Concern	None	None	3	Chaparral, coastal prairie, valley and foothill grassland, in serpentinite soils.
Snow Mountain Buckwheat <i>Eriogonum nervulosum</i>	Special Concern	None	None	1B	Chaparral, usually on dry serpentine outcrops, balds, and barrens.
St. Helena Fawn Lily <i>Erythronium helenae</i>	Species of Local Concern	None	None	4	Chaparral, cismontane woodland, lower montane coniferous forest, valley and foothill grassland, in volcanic or serpentine soils.
Round-leaved Filaree <i>Erodium macrophyllum</i>	None	None	None	2	Cismontane woodland, valley and foothill grassland, in clay soils.
Adobe lily <i>Fritillaria pluriflora</i>	Special Concern	None	None	1B	Chaparral, cismontane woodland, valley and foothill grassland, usually on clay soils, some on serpentine.
Hall's Harmonia <i>Harmonia hallii</i>	None	None	None	1B	Chaparral, located on serpentine hills and ridges, and open rocky areas within the chaparral.
Two-carpellate Dwarf-flax (=Western Flax) <i>Hesperolinon bicarpellatum</i>	Special Concern	None	None	1B	Located in serpentine barrens at edge of chaparral.
Brewer's Dwarf-flax	Special	None	None	1B	Chaparral, cismontane woodland, valley and foothill grassland.

**Table B-1 (continued)**  
**Special status plant species and sensitive habitats found within Napa County**

Species Name	Status <sup>1</sup>				Habitat
	Federal	State	CDFG <sup>2</sup>	CNPS <sup>3</sup>	
<b>Plants</b>					
<i>Hesperolinon breweri</i>	Concern				
Drymaria Dwarf-flax <i>Hesperolinon drymarioides</i>	Special Concern	None	None	1B	Closed-cone coniferous forest, Chaparral, cismontane woodland, valley and foothill grassland, on serpentine soils.
Napa Western Flax <i>Hesperolinon serpentinum</i>	Special Concern	None	None	1B	Mostly found in serpentine chaparral.
Northern California Black Walnut <i>Juglans californica var. hindsii</i>	Special Concern	None	None	1B	Riparian forest, riparian woodland, in deep alluvial soil associated with a creek or stream.
Delta Tule Pea <i>Lathyrus jepsonii var. jepsonii</i>	Special Concern	None	None	1B	Freshwater and brackish marshes.
Colusa Layia <i>Layia septentrionalis</i>	Species of Local Concern	None	None	1B	Chaparral, cismontane woodland, valley and foothill grassland.
Legenere <i>Legenere limosa</i>	Special Concern	None	None	1B	Vernal pools.
Jepson's Leptosiphon <i>Leptosiphon jepsonii</i>	None	None	None	1B	Chaparral, cismontane woodland.
Mason's Lilaepsis <i>Lilaepsis masonii</i>	Special Concern	None	None	1B	Marshes and swamps, riparian scrub.
Jepson's Linanthus <i>Linthus jepsonii</i>	Species of Local Concern	None	None	1B	Chaparral, cismontane woodland, usually volcanic soils.
Cobb Mountain Lupine <i>Lupinus sericatus</i>	Species of Local Concern	None	None	1B	Chaparral, cismontane woodland, lower montane coniferous forest.
Hall's Madia <i>Madia hallii</i>	Special Concern	None	None	1B	Chaparral, serpentine soils.
Robust Monardella <i>Monardella villosa ssp. globosa</i>	Species of Local Concern	None	None	1B	Broadleafed upland forest, chaparral, cismontane woodland, valley and foothill grassland.
Konocti Manzanita	None	None	None	1B	chaparral, cismontane woodland, lower montane coniferous forest, in

**Table B-1 (continued)**  
**Special status plant species and sensitive habitats found within Napa County**

Species Name	Status <sup>1</sup>				Habitat
	Federal	State	CDFG <sup>2</sup>	CNPS <sup>3</sup>	
<b>Plants</b>					
<i>Arctostaphylos manzanita</i> ssp. <i>elegans</i>					volcanic soils.
Baker's Navarretia <i>Navarretia leucocephala</i> ssp. <i>bakeri</i>	Special Concern	None	None	1B	Vernal pools and swales on adobe or alkaline soils in a variety of vegetative habitats.
Marin County Navarretia <i>Navarretia rosulata</i>	Species of Local Concern	None	None	1B	Closed cone coniferous forest, chaparral, often in dry, open rocky places.
Sonoma Beardtongue <i>Penstemon newberryi</i> var. <i>sonomensis</i>	None	None	None	1B	Crevices in talus slopes and rocky outcrops in chaparral.
Gairdner's Yampah <i>Perideridia gairdneri</i> ssp. <i>gairdneri</i>	Special Concern	None	None	4	Broadleaved upland forest, chaparral, valley and foothill grasslands, and vernal pools.
Marin Knotweed <i>Polygonum marinense</i>	Species of Local Concern	None	None	3	Coastal salt and brackish marshes.
California Beaked-rush <i>Rhynchospora californica</i>	None	None	None	1B	Bogs and fens, lower montane coniferous forest, meadows and seeps, marshes and swamps.
Marin Checkerbloom <i>Sidalcea hickmanii</i> ssp. <i>viridis</i>	Species of Local Concern	None	None	1B	Chaparral, in serpentine or volcanic soils, sometimes appears after burns.
Marsh Checkerbloom <i>Sidalcea oregano</i> ssp. <i>hydrophila</i>	Special Concern	None	None	1B	Meadows and seeps, riparian forest, in wet soil of streambanks, meadows.
Pacific (= California) Cordgrass <i>Spartina foliosa</i>	Species of Local Concern	None	None		
Socrates Mine Jewelflower <i>Streptanthus brachiatus</i> ssp. <i>brachiatus</i>	Special Concern	None	None	1B	Chaparral, closed conifer forest, in serpentine areas and serpentine chaparral.
Green Jewelflower <i>Streptanthus breweri</i> var.	Species of Local	None	None	1B	Chaparral, cismontane woodland, in openings on serpentine or rocky

**Table B-1 (continued)**  
**Special status plant species and sensitive habitats found within Napa County**

Species Name	Status <sup>1</sup>				Habitat
	Federal	State	CDFG <sup>2</sup>	CNPS <sup>3</sup>	
<b>Plants</b>					
<i>hesperidis</i>	Concern				sites.
Three Peaks Jewelflower <i>Streptanthus morrisonii ssp. elatus</i>	Special Concern	None	None	1B	Chaparral.
Kruckeberg's Jewelflower <i>Streptanthus morrisonii ssp. kruckebergii</i>	Special Concern	None	None	1B	Cismontane woodland.
Saline Clover <i>Trifolium depauperatum var. hydrophilum</i>	Special Concern	None	None	1B	Marshes and swamps, valley and foothill grassland, vernal pools, in mesic, alkaline sites.
Oval-leaved Viburnum <i>Viburnum ellipticum</i>	None	None	None	2	Chaparral, cismontane woodland, lower montane coniferous forest.
<b>Sensitive Habitats</b>					
Coastal Brackish Marsh	None	S2.1	None	N/A	
Northern Coastal Salt Marsh	None	S3.2	None	N/A	
Northern Vernal Pool	None	S2.1	None	N/A	
Wildflower Field	None	S3.1	None	N/A	
Serpentine Bunchgrass	None	S2.2	None	N/A	
Coastal and Valley Freshwater Marsh	None	S2.1	None	N/A	
Northern Interior Cypress Forest	None	S2.2	None	N/A	

**Footnotes:**

- <sup>1</sup> Endangered and threatened are a species status under the California or Federal Endangered Species Act, Federal species of concern and candidate species do not receive any statutory protection under the Federal ESA.
- <sup>2</sup> California Department of Fish and Game. Species designated as Species of Concern by CDFG are to be mitigated for under CEQA. A protected designation indicates that these species are fully protected under the Fish and Game Code and cannot be taken or possessed without a permit from the Fish and Game Commission or CDFG.
- <sup>3</sup> California Native Plant Society. Species on List 1A are believed to be extinct within California. Species on List 1B are rare or endangered in California and elsewhere in their range. List 2 species are considered rare, threatened or endangered in California but more numerous elsewhere.

**Table B-1 (continued)**  
**Special status plant species and sensitive habitats found within Napa County**

**Element Rankings, California Department of Fish and Game, 1993:**

- S2.1 Very Threatened in California
- S2.2 Very Threatened in California
- S3.1 Very Threatened in California
- S3.2 Threatened in California

**Table B-2**  
**Special status animal species found within Napa County**

Species Name	Status <sup>1</sup>				Habitat
	Federal	State	CDFG <sup>2</sup>	CNPS <sup>3</sup>	
<b>Invertebrates</b>					
Conservancy Fairy Shrimp <i>Branchinecta conservatio</i>	Endangered	None	None	N/A	Vernal pools.
Vernal Pool Fairy Shrimp <i>Branchinecta lynchi</i>	Threatened Critical Habitat	None	None	N/A	Vernal pools.
California Freshwater Shrimp <i>Syncaris pacifica</i>	Endangered	Endangered	None	N/A	Found in low elevation, low-gradient streams where riparian cover is moderate to heavy: specifically in shallow pools away from main stream flow. Winter: undercut banks with exposed roots. Summer: leafy branches touching water.
California Linderiella Fairy Shrimp <i>Linderiella occidentalis</i>	Special Concern	None	None	N/A	Tend to live in large, fairly clear <u>vernal pools</u> and lakes.
Valley Elderberry Longhorn Beetle <i>Desmocerus californicus dimorphus</i>	Threatened	None	None	N/A	Occurs on blue elderberry plants in riparian forests.
Callippe Silverspot Butterfly <i>Speyeria callippe callippe</i>	Endangered	None	None	N/A	Sagebrush, chaparral, dry woodland, prairie hills. Females lay their eggs on the dry remains of the larval food plant, Johnny jump-up ( <i>Viola pedunculata</i> ), or on the surrounding debris.
Sonoma Arctic Skipper <i>Carterocephalus palaemon ssp.</i>	Special Concern	None	None	N/A	Glades and openings in heavily forested woods, moist meadows, and streamsides
Ricksecker's Water Scavenger Beetle <i>Hydrochara rickseckeri</i>	Special Concern	None	None	N/A	Found in freshwater ponds, shallow water of streams marshes. and lakes
<b>Fish</b>					
River Lamprey <i>Lampetra ayresi</i>	Special Concern	None	Special Concern	N/A	Needs clean, gravelly riffles in permanent streams for spawning, while the ammocoetes require sandy backwaters or stream edges in which to bury themselves, where water quality is continuously high and temperatures do not exceed 25 C, occurs in the Napa river.
Pacific Lamprey <i>Lampetra tridentata</i>	Special Concern	None	None	N/A	Spawning adults are found in gravel riffles and runs of clear coastal streams; feeding adults usually in the ocean.

**Table B-2 (continued)**  
**Special status animal species found within Napa County**

Species Name	Status <sup>1</sup>				Habitat
	Federal	State	CDFG <sup>2</sup>	CNPS <sup>3</sup>	
Tidewater Goby <i>Eucyclogobius newberryi</i>	Endangered	None	Special Concern	N/A	Most common in cool brackish coastal lagoons.
Green Sturgeon <i>Acipenser medirostris</i>	Proposed Threatened	None	Special Concern	N/A	Adults spawn in large rivers where eggs are broadcast and adhere to the substrates. The Sacramento River supports the southern most known population.
Delta Smelt <i>Hypomesus transpacificus</i>	Threatened	Threatened	None	N/A	Sacramento-San Joaquin Delta as salinities less than 2 PPM. Generally not found in smaller freshwater streams.
Coho salmon-central California coast <i>Oncorhynchus kisutch</i>	Endangered Critical Habitat	Endangered	None	N/A	Coastal rivers and streams with slow moving water and fine gravel; ocean.
Steelhead-Central California Coast ESU <i>Oncorhynchus mykiss</i>	Threatened Critical Habitat	None	Special Concern	N/A	Coastal streams with stable water supply, clean gravels, and good quality riparian habitat.
Central Valley spring-run Chinook salmon <i>Oncorhynchus tshawytscha</i>	Threatened	Threatened	Special Concern	N/A	Central Valley streams with stable water supply, clean gravels, and good quality riparian habitat.
Winter-run Chinook salmon, Sacramento River <i>Oncorhynchus tshawytscha</i>	Endangered Critical Habitat	Endangered	Special Concern	N/A	Central Valley streams with stable water supply, clean gravels, and good quality riparian habitat.
Chinook Salmon-Central Valley Fall/Late Fall-run ESU <i>Oncorhynchus tshawytscha</i>	Candidate Proposed Critical Habitat	None	Special Concern	N/A	Central Valley streams with stable water supply, clean gravels, and good quality riparian habitat.
Sacramento Splittail <i>Pogonichthys macrolepidotus</i>	Special Concern	None	Special Concern	N/A	Slow moving rivers and sloughs often associated with flooded vegetation.
Longfin Smelt <i>Spirinchus thaleichthys</i>	Special Concern	None	Special Concern	N/A	Sacramento-San Joaquin Delta at salinities less than 2 PPM. Generally not found in smaller freshwater streams. Historically present in the southern portions of San Francisco Bay.

**Table B-2 (continued)**  
**Special status animal species found within Napa County**

Species Name	Status <sup>1</sup>				Habitat
	Federal	State	CDFG <sup>2</sup>	CNPS <sup>3</sup>	
<b>Reptiles and Amphibians</b>					
California Tiger Salamander <i>Ambystoma californiense</i>	Threatened Critical Habitat Proposed	None	Special Concern	N/A	Annual grasslands and understory of hardwood habitats. Breeding typically associated with temporary pools and ponds (Jennings and Hayes 1994).
California Red-legged Frog <i>Rana aurora draytonii</i>	Threatened Critical Habitat Proposed	None	Special Concern	N/A	Pools in slow-moving streams and ponds with well-developed emergent freshwater marsh vegetation (Jennings and Hayes 1994).
Northern red-legged frog <i>Rana aurora aurora</i>	Special Concern	None	Special Concern	N/A	Found in humid forests, woodlands, grasslands, and streamsides with plant cover. Breeding habitat is in permanent water sources; lakes, ponds, reservoirs, slow streams, marshes, bogs, and swamps.
Giant garter snake <i>Thamnophis gigas</i>	Threatened	Threatened	None	N/A	Requires habitat that offers permanent or summer water with vegetative cover, and higher elevation uplands not subject to flooding.
Foothill yellow-legged frog <i>Rana boylei</i>	Special Concern	None	Special Concern	N/A	Partly-shaded, shallow streams & riffles with a rocky substrate in a variety of habitats.
Western Spadefoot Toad <i>Spea (=Scaphiopus) hammondii</i>	Special Concern	None	Special Concern	N/A	Grasslands with shallow temporary pools.
Northwestern Pond Turtle <i>Clemmys marmorata marmorata</i>	Special Concern	None	Special Concern	N/A	Streams, ponds and lakes. Often associated with aquatic vegetation and riparian habitats.
California horned lizard <i>Phrynosoma coronatum frontale</i>	Special Concern	None	Special Concern	N/A	Sage scrub and chaparral in arid and semi-arid conditions, inn open areas of sandy or loose soil and low vegetation.
<b>Birds</b>					
Sharp-shinned hawk <i>Accipiter striatus</i>	None	None	Special Concern	N/A	Ponderosa pine, black oak, riparian deciduous, mixed conifer and Jeffrey pine habitats. North facing slopes, with plucking perches are critical requirements. Nests usually within 275 ft of water.
Tricolored Blackbird (nesting colony) <i>Agelaius tricolor</i>	None	None	Special Concern	N/A	Colonial nester that uses tules or bulrush for nesting. Also requires open water and nearby source of insects to prey on.

**Table B-2 (continued)**  
**Special status animal species found within Napa County**

Species Name	Status <sup>1</sup>				Habitat
	Federal	State	CDFG <sup>2</sup>	CNPS <sup>3</sup>	
Burrowing Owl (burrow sites) <i>Athene cunicularia</i>	Special Concern	None	Special Concern	N/A	Habitats with low-growing vegetation (grasslands, scrub, deserts). Subterranean nester. Dependent on burrowing mammals, especially California ground squirrels.
Western Snowy Plover (nesting) <i>Charadrius alexandrinus nivosus</i>	Threatened	None	Special Concern	N/A	Nests on sandy beaches of the ocean, bays, salt ponds, and larger lakes.
Bald Eagle <i>Haliaeetus leucocephalus</i>	Proposed for Delisting Threatened	Endangered	Fully Protected	N/A	Shorelines, lakes, large rivers. Nests in large open trees.
California brown pelican <i>Pelecanus occidentalis californicus</i>	Endangered	None	None	N/A	Important roosting sites include offshore rocks and islands, river mouths with sand bars, breakwaters, pilings, and jetties along the Pacific Coast and San Francisco Bay.
California Clapper Rail <i>Rallus longirostris obsoletus</i>	Endangered	Endangered	None	N/A	Saltwater and brackish marshes often crossed by tidal sloughs in the San Francisco Bay. Closely associated with pickleweed.
California least tern(nesting colony) <i>Sterna antillarum browni</i>	Endangered	Endangered	Fully Protected	N/A	Sandy beaches and mudflats near the ocean and in San Francisco Bay.
Northern Spotted Owl <i>Strix occidentalis caurina</i>	Threatened	None	None	N/A	Mature coniferous forests or younger forests with groups of older trees.
Bell's sage sparrow <i>Amphispiza belli belli</i>	Special Concern	None	Special Concern	N/A	Chaparral.
Oak titmouse <i>Baelopholus inornatus</i>	Species of Local Concern	None	None	N/A	oak-savannah grassland and low altitude conifer forest
American bittern <i>Botaurus letiginosus</i>	Special Concern	None	None	N/A	Large freshwater and sometimes brackish marshes.
Ferruginous hawk <i>Buteo regalis</i>	Special Concern	None	Special Concern	N/A	Occurs in semiarid grasslands with scattered trees, rocky mounds or outcrops, and shallow canyons that overlook open valleys.
Vaux's Swift (nesting) <i>Chaetura vauxi</i>	Special Concern	None	Special Concern	N/A	Prefers redwood and Douglas fir habitats with nest-sites in large hollow trees and snags, especially tall, burned-out stubs.

**Table B-2 (continued)**  
**Special status animal species found within Napa County**

Species Name	Status <sup>1</sup>				Habitat
	Federal	State	CDFG <sup>2</sup>	CNPS <sup>3</sup>	
Mountain Plover (wintering) <i>Charadrius montanus</i>	Special Concern	None		N/A	Frequents open plains with low, herbaceous or scattered shrub vegetation.
Northern harrier <i>Circus cyaneus</i>	None	None	Special Concern	N/A	Nests on ground in shrubby vegetation usually at marsh's edge, and forages in grasslands.
Olive-sided flycatcher (nesting) <i>Contopus cooperi</i>	Special Concern	None	None	N/A	They prefer to live around the edges of mature coniferous forests.
Golden Eagle <i>Aquila chrysaetos</i>	None	None	Special Concern Fully Protected	N/A	Rolling foothills mountain areas—sage-juniper flats, nests in cliff-walled canyons and large trees in open areas.
Black Swift (nesting) <i>Cypseloides niger</i>	None	None	Special Concern	N/A	Nests on cliffs near waterfalls or surf, forages widely.
White-tailed kite <i>Elanus leucurus</i>	Special Concern	None	Fully Protected	N/A	Rolling foothills/valley margins and river bottom lands. Open meadows, grasslands, or marshes for foraging close to isolated, dense-topped trees for nesting and perching.
Little willow flycatcher <i>Empidonax traillii brewerii</i>	None	Endangered	None	N/A	Moist meadows with perennial streams; lowland riparian woodlands dominated by willows and cottonwoods.
Prairie falcon <i>Falco mexicanus</i>	None	None	Special Concern	N/A	Inhabits dry, open terrain. Breeding sites located on cliffs.
American peregrine falcon <i>Falco peregrinus anatum</i>	Delisted	Endangered		N/A	Nests near wetlands, lakes, rivers; on cliffs, banks, dunes, mounds and human-made structures.
Saltmarsh Common Yellowthroat <i>Geothlypis trichas sinuosa</i>	Special Concern	None	Special Concern	N/A	Requires thick and continuous cover to the water line in saltmarsh. Taller vegetation (tules and cat-tails) for nesting.
Loggerhead Shrike <i>Lanius ludovicianus</i>	Special Concern	None	Special Concern	N/A	Grasslands for foraging and associated riparian and scrub for nesting.
California Black Rail <i>Laterallus jamaicensis coturniculus</i>	None	Threatened	Fully Protected	N/A	Found in tidal salt marshes where pickleweed is the primary vegetation. Also found in fresh water and brackish marshes at low elevations.

**Table B-2 (continued)**  
**Special status animal species found within Napa County**

Species Name	Status <sup>1</sup>				Habitat
	Federal	State	CDFG <sup>2</sup>	CNPS <sup>3</sup>	
Marbled godwit <i>Limosa fedoa</i>	Special Concern	None	None	N/A	Breeds on grassy plains, wet meadows and prairie sloughs, usually near rivers or streams. In the winter it can be found in estuaries, salt marshes, tidal creeks, mudflats and ocean beaches.
San Pablo Song Sparrow <i>Melospiza melodia samuelis</i>	Special Concern	None	Special Concern	N/A	Tidal sloughs vegetated with pickleweed along the north side of San Francisco and San Pablo Bays.
Long-billed Curlew (nesting) <i>Numenius americanus</i>	Special Concern	None	Special Concern	N/A	Upland short-grass prairies and wet meadows are used for nesting; coastal estuaries, open grasslands, and croplands are used in winter.
Whimbrel <i>Numenius phaeopus</i>	Special Concern	None	None	N/A	Coastal wetlands
Double-crested Cormorant <i>Phalacrocorax auritus</i>	<i>None</i>	None	Special Concern	N/A	Nests in trees along lake margins and on coastal cliffs.
White-faced ibis <i>Plegadis chihi</i>	Special Concern	None	Special Concern	N/A	Freshwater marshes.
Purple martin (nesting) <i>Progne subis</i>	None	None	Special Concern	N/A	Inhabits woodlands, low elevation coniferous forest of Douglas fir, ponderosa pine, & Monterey pine.
Rufous Hummingbird <i>Selasphorus rufus</i>	Special Concern	None	None	N/A	Coniferous forest, thickets and brushy slopes, forages in adjacent meadows,
Allen's Hummingbird <i>Selasphorus sasin</i>	Special Concern	None	None	N/A	Chaparral, thickets, brushy slopes, and open coniferous forest.
California Thrasher <i>Toxostoma redivivum</i>	Special Concern	None	None	N/A	Chaparral and riparian areas with relatively abundant insects.
<b>Mammals</b>					
Pallid bat <i>Antrozous pallidus</i>	None	None	Special Concern	N/A	Deserts, grasslands, shrublands, woodlands, and forests. Most common in open, dry habitats with rocky areas for roosting.
Townsend's big-eared bat <i>Corynorhinus townsendii</i>	Special Concern	None	Special Concern	N/A	Well distributed throughout a variety of habitats (coniferous forests, oak woodlands, broad-leaf forests, grasslands, etc). Roosts in caves, buildings, tunnels, and other human structures

**Table B-2 (continued)**  
**Special status animal species found within Napa County**

Species Name	Status <sup>1</sup>				Habitat
	Federal	State	CDFG <sup>2</sup>	CNPS <sup>3</sup>	
Greater western mastiff-bat <i>Eumops perotis californicus</i>	Special Concern	None	Special Concern	N/A	Roosts in cliff-face crevices, and is severely limited by available drinking water.
Long-eared myotis bat <i>Myotis evotis</i>	Special Concern	None	None	N/A	Coniferous forest
Fringed myotis bat <i>Myotis thysanodes</i>	Special Concern	None	None	N/A	Habitats range from mountainous pine, oak, and pinyon-juniper to desert scrub, but seems to prefer grassland areas at intermediate elevations. Roost in caves and other crevices.
Long-legged myotis bat <i>Myotis volans</i>	Special Concern	None	None	N/A	Wooded habitats from pinon- juniper to coniferous forests, usually at elevations of 4,000 to 9,000 feet.
Yuma myotis bat <i>Myotis yumanensis</i>	Special Concern	None	None	N/A	Riparian habitats and forested areas near permanent water sources.
San Joaquin pocket mouse <i>Perognathus inornatus</i>	Special Concern	None	None	N/A	Occurs in dry, open grasslands or scrub areas.
Suisun Ornate Shrew <i>Sorex ornatus sinuosus</i>	Special Concern	None	Special Concern	N/A	Found in dense, low cover above high tide line of tidal marshes of San Pablo and Suisun Bays.
Salt-marsh Harvest Mouse <i>Reithrodontomys raviventris</i>	Endangered	Endangered	Fully Protected	N/A	Found only in emergent salt marsh habitats of San Francisco Bay where pickleweed is the primary vegetation.
American badger <i>Taxidea taxus</i>	None	None	Special Concern	N/A	Most abundant in drier open stages of most shrub, forest, and herbaceous habitats, with friable soils.

**Footnotes:**

- <sup>1</sup> Endangered and threatened are a species status under the California or Federal Endangered Species Act, Federal species of concern and candidate species do not receive any statutory protection under the Federal ESA.
- <sup>2</sup> California Department of Fish and Game. Species designated as Species of Concern by CDFG are to be mitigated for under CEQA. A protected designation indicates that these species are fully protected under the Fish and Game Code and cannot be taken or possessed without a permit from the Fish and Game Commission or CDFG.
- <sup>3</sup> California Native Plant Society. Species on List 1A are believed to be extinct within California. Species on List 1B are rare or endangered in California and elsewhere in their range.

**Table B-2**  
**Special status animal species found within Napa County**

**References:**

CNDDDB (California Natural Diversity Data Base), 2005. Commercial version 3.0.5, information dated July 1, 2005. California Department of Fish and Game

Jennings, M.R. and M.P. Hayes, 1994. Amphibian and reptile species of Special Concern in California. Final Report, Inland Fisheries Division, California Department of Fish and Game. 255 pp.

Williams, D.F., 1986. Mammal species of Special Concern in California. Administrative Report 86-1, Wildlife Management Division, California Department of Fish and Game. 112 pp.

## **C. USFWS Species List Letter**

---



**United States Department of the Interior**  
**FISH AND WILDLIFE SERVICE**



Sacramento Fish and Wildlife Office  
2800 Cottage Way, Room W-2605  
Sacramento, California 95825

October 7, 2005

Document Number: 051007122100

Demian Ebert  
EIP Associates  
353 Sacramento Street, Suite 1000  
San Francisco, CA 94111

Subject: Species List for Napa County Transportation EIR (11049-00)

Dear: Mr. Ebert

We are sending this official species list in response to your October 7, 2005 request for information about endangered and threatened species. The list covers the California counties and/or U.S. Geological Survey 7½ minute quad or quads you requested. You have stated that this list is not for consultation with the Fish & Wildlife Service.

Our database was developed primarily to assist Federal agencies that are consulting with us. Therefore, our lists include all of the sensitive species that have been found in a certain area *and also ones that may be affected by projects in the area*. For example, a fish may be on the list for a quad if it lives somewhere downstream from that quad. Birds are included even if they only migrate through an area. In other words, we include all of the species we want people to consider when they do something that affects the environment.

Please read Important Information About Your Species List (below). It explains how we made the list and describes your responsibilities under the Endangered Species Act.

Our database is constantly updated as species are proposed, listed and delisted. If you address proposed, candidate and special concern species in your planning, this should not be a problem. However, we recommend that you get an updated list every 90 days. That would be January 05, 2006.

Please contact us if your project may affect endangered or threatened species or if you have any questions about the attached list or your responsibilities under the Endangered Species Act. A list of Endangered Species Program contacts can be found at [sacramento.fws.gov/es/branches.htm](http://sacramento.fws.gov/es/branches.htm).

Endangered Species Division



**Federal Endangered and Threatened Species that Occur in  
or may be Affected by Projects in the Counties and/or  
U.S.G.S. 7 1/2 Minute Quads you requested**

Document Number: 051006122903  
Database Last Updated: September 30, 2005

**CRITICAL HABITAT:**

On August 11, 2005, the Service published a revised critical habitat designation for vernal pool species. It did not specify critical habitat locations on a species by species basis. If there are species on the list(s) below that were covered under the rule, they are shown because we believe that they are present in the area or may be affected by projects in the area, not because it has specifically been designated as critical habitat for them.

**Quad Lists**

**No quad species lists requested.**

---

**County Lists**

**Napa County**

**Listed Species**

***Invertebrates***

- Branchinecta conservatio* - Conservancy fairy shrimp (E)  
*Branchinecta lynchi* - Critical habitat, vernal pool fairy shrimp (X)  
*Branchinecta lynchi* - vernal pool fairy shrimp (T)  
*Desmocerus californicus dimorphus* - valley elderberry longhorn beetle (T)  
*Speyeria callippe callippe* - callippe silverspot butterfly (E)  
*Syncaris pacifica* - California freshwater shrimp (E)

***Fish***

- Eucyclogobius newberryi* - tidewater goby (E)  
*Hypomesus transpacificus* - delta smelt (T)  
*Oncorhynchus kisutch* - coho salmon - central CA coast (E)  
*Oncorhynchus kisutch* - Critical habitat, coho salmon - central CA coast (X)  
*Oncorhynchus mykiss* - Central California Coastal steelhead (T)  
*Oncorhynchus mykiss* - Critical habitat, Central California coastal steelhead (X)  
*Oncorhynchus tshawytscha* - Central Valley spring-run chinook salmon (T)  
*Oncorhynchus tshawytscha* - Critical habitat, winter-run chinook salmon (X)  
*Oncorhynchus tshawytscha* - winter-run chinook salmon, Sacramento River (E)

***Amphibians***

- Ambystoma californiense* - California tiger salamander, central population (T)  
*Rana aurora draytonii* - California red-legged frog (T)

**Reptiles**

*Thamnophis gigas* - giant garter snake (T)

**Birds**

*Charadrius alexandrinus nivosus* - western snowy plover (T)

*Haliaeetus leucocephalus* - bald eagle (T)

*Pelecanus occidentalis californicus* - California brown pelican (E)

*Rallus longirostris obsoletus* - California clapper rail (E)

*Sterna antillarum* (=albifrons) *browni* - California least tern (E)

*Strix occidentalis caurina* - northern spotted owl (T)

**Mammals**

*Reithrodontomys raviventris* - salt marsh harvest mouse (E)

**Plants**

*Astragalus clarianus* - Clara Hunt's milk-vetch (E)

*Castilleja affinis* ssp. *neglecta* - Tiburon paintbrush (E)

*Cordylanthus mollis* ssp. *mollis* - soft bird's-beak (E)

*Lasthenia conjugens* - Contra Costa goldfields (E)

*Lasthenia conjugens* - Critical habitat, Contra Costa goldfields (X)

*Navarretia leucocephala* ssp. *pauciflora* - few-flowered navarretia (E)

*Plagiobothrys strictus* - Calistoga allocarya (popcorn-flower) (E)

*Poa napensis* - Napa bluegrass (E)

**Proposed Species****Fish**

*Acipenser medirostris* - green sturgeon (P)

**Amphibians**

*Rana aurora draytonii* - Critical habitat, California red-legged frog (PX)

**Candidate Species****Fish**

*Oncorhynchus tshawytscha* - Central Valley fall/late fall-run chinook salmon (C)

*Oncorhynchus tshawytscha* - Critical habitat, Central Valley fall/late fall-run chinook (C)

**Species of Concern**

**Invertebrates**

- Carterocephalus palaemon ssp.* - Sonoma arctic skipper (SC)  
*Hydrochara rickseckeri* - Ricksecker's water scavenger beetle (SC)  
*Linderiella occidentalis* - California linderiella fairy shrimp (SC)

**Fish**

- Lampetra ayresi* - river lamprey (SC)  
*Lampetra tridentata* - Pacific lamprey (SC)  
*Pogonichthys macrolepidotus* - Sacramento splittail (SC)  
*Spirinchus thaleichthys* - longfin smelt (SC)

**Amphibians**

- Rana aurora aurora* - Northern red-legged frog (SC)  
*Rana boylei* - foothill yellow-legged frog (SC)  
*Spea hammondi* (was *Scaphiopus h.*) - western spadefoot toad (SC)

**Reptiles**

- Clemmys marmorata marmorata* - northwestern pond turtle (SC)  
*Phrynosoma coronatum frontale* - California horned lizard (SC)

**Birds**

- Agelaius tricolor* - tricolored blackbird (SC)  
*Amphispiza belli belli* - Bell's sage sparrow (SC)  
*Athene cunicularia hypugaea* - western burrowing owl (SC)  
*Baeolophus inornatus* - oak titmouse (SLC)  
*Botaurus lentiginosus* - American bittern (SC)  
*Buteo regalis* - ferruginous hawk (SC)  
*Chaetura vauxi* - Vaux's swift (SC)  
*Charadrius montanus* - mountain plover (SC)  
*Contopus cooperi* - olive-sided flycatcher (SC)  
*Elanus leucurus* - white-tailed (=black shouldered) kite (SC)  
*Empidonax traillii brewsteri* - little willow flycatcher (CA)  
*Falco peregrinus* - Critical habitat, peregrine falcon (D)  
*Falco peregrinus anatum* - American peregrine falcon (D)  
*Geothlypis trichas sinuosa* - saltmarsh common yellowthroat (SC)  
*Lanius ludovicianus* - loggerhead shrike (SC)  
*Laterallus jamaicensis coturniculus* - black rail (CA)  
*Limosa fedoa* - marbled godwit (SC)  
*Melospiza melodia samuelis* - San Pablo song sparrow (SC)  
*Numenius americanus* - long-billed curlew (SC)  
*Numenius phaeopus* - whimbrel (SC)  
*Plegadis chihi* - white-faced ibis (SC)

*Selasphorus rufus* - rufous hummingbird (SC)  
*Selasphorus sasin* - Allen's hummingbird (SC)  
*Toxostoma redivivum* - California thrasher (SC)

### **Mammals**

*Corynorhinus (=Plecotus) townsendii townsendii* - Pacific western big-eared bat (SC)  
*Eumops perotis californicus* - greater western mastiff-bat (SC)  
*Myotis evotis* - long-eared myotis bat (SC)  
*Myotis thysanodes* - fringed myotis bat (SC)  
*Myotis volans* - long-legged myotis bat (SC)  
*Myotis yumanensis* - Yuma myotis bat (SC)  
*Perognathus inornatus* - San Joaquin pocket mouse (SC)  
*Sorex ornatus sinuosus* - Suisun ornate shrew (SC)

### **Plants**

*Amorpha californica var. napensis* - Napa false indigo (SLC)  
*Amsinckia lunaris* - bent-flowered fiddleneck (SLC)  
*Aster lentus* - Suisun Marsh aster (SC)  
*Astragalus rattanii var jepsonianus* - Jepson's milk-vetch (SLC)  
*Astragalus tener var. tener* - alkali milk-vetch (SC)  
*Atriplex joaquiniana* - San Joaquin spearscale (=saltbush) (SC)  
*Balsamorhiza macrolepis var macrolepis* - big-scale (=California) balsamroot (SLC)  
*Brodiaea californica var leptandra* - narrow-anthered California brodiaea (SLC)  
*Calystegia collina ssp. oxyphylla* - Mt. Saint Helena morning-glory (SLC)  
*Castilleja ambigua ssp. ambigua* - salt marsh owl's clover (=johnny-nip) (SLC)  
*Castilleja rubicundula ssp. rubicundula* - pink creamsacs (SLC)  
*Ceanothus confusus* - Rincon Ridge ceanothus (SC)  
*Ceanothus divergens* - Calistoga ceanothus (SC)  
*Ceanothus purpureus* - holly-leaved ceanothus (SLC)  
*Ceanothus sonomensis* - Sonoma ceanothus (SC)  
*Cryptantha clevelandii* - serpentine (=Cleveland's) cryptantha (SLC)  
*Erigeron angustatus* - narrow-leaved daisy (=serpentine fleabane) (SLC)  
*Eriogonum caninum* - Tiburon buckwheat (SLC)  
*Eriogonum nervulosum* - Snow Mountain buckwheat (SC)  
*Erythronium helenae* - St. Helena fawn lily (SLC)  
*Fritillaria pluriflora* - adobe lily (SC)  
*Hesperolinon bicarpellatum* - two-carpeled dwarf-flax (=western flax) (SC)  
*Hesperolinon breweri* - Brewer's dwarf-flax (=western flax) (SC)  
*Hesperolinon drymarioides* - drymaria dwarf-flax (=western flax) (SC)  
*Hesperolinon serpentinum* - Napa western flax (SC)  
*Juglans californica var. hindsii* - Northern California black walnut (SC)  
*Lathyrus jepsonii var. jepsonii* - delta tule-pea (SC)  
*Layia septentrionalis* - Colusa layia (=Colusa tidytips) (SLC)  
*Legenere limosa* - legenere (SC)

*Lilaeopsis masonii* - Mason's lilaeopsis (SC)  
*Linanthus jepsonii* - Jepson's linanthus (SLC)  
*Lupinus sericatus* - Cobb Mountain lupine (SLC)  
*Madia hallii* (= *Harmonia hallii*) - Hall's madia (=Hall's harmonia) (SC)  
*Monardella villosa ssp. globosa* - robust monardella (=robust coyote mint) (SLC)  
*Navarretia leucocephala ssp. bakeri* - Baker's narvarretia (SC)  
*Navarretia rosulata* - Marin County navarretia (=San Anselmo navarretia) (SLC)  
*Perideridia gairdneri ssp. gairdneri* - Gairdner's yampah (SC)  
*Polygonum marinense* - Marin knotweed (SLC)  
*Sidalcea hickmanii ssp. viridis* - Marin checkermallow (=checkerbloom) (SLC)  
*Sidalcea oregana ssp. hydrophila* - water-loving checkermallow (=marsh checkerbloom) (SC)  
*Spartina foliosa* - Pacific cordgrass (=California cordgrass) (SLC)  
*Streptanthus brachiatus ssp. brachiatus* - Contact (Socrates) Mine jewelflower (SC)  
*Streptanthus breweri var hesperidis* (= *S. hesperidi*) - green (=serpentine) jewel-flower (SLC)  
*Streptanthus morrisonii ssp. elatus* - Three Peaks jewelflower (SC)  
*Streptanthus morrisonii ssp. kruckebergii* - Kruckeberg's jewelflower (SC)  
*Trifolium depauperatum var. hydrophilum* - water sack (=saline) clover (SC)

#### Key:

- (E) *Endangered* - Listed (in the Federal Register) as being in danger of extinction.
- (T) *Threatened* - Listed as likely to become endangered within the foreseeable future.
- (P) *Proposed* - Officially proposed (in the Federal Register) for listing as endangered or threatened.
- (NMFS) Species under the Jurisdiction of the National Marine Fisheries Service. Consult with them directly about these species.
- Critical Habitat* - Area essential to the conservation of a species.
- (PX) *Proposed Critical Habitat* - The species is already listed. Critical habitat is being proposed for it.
- (C) *Candidate* - Candidate to become a proposed species.
- (CA) Listed by the State of California but not by the Fish & Wildlife Service.
- (D) *Delisted* - Species will be monitored for 5 years.
- (SC) *Species of Concern*/(SLC) Species of Local Concern - Other species of concern to the Sacramento Fish & Wildlife Office.
- (V) Vacated by a court order. Not currently in effect. Being reviewed by the Service.
- (X) *Critical Habitat* designated for this species

## Important Information About Your Species List

### How We Make Species Lists

We store information about endangered and threatened species lists by U.S. Geological Survey 7½ minute quads. The United States is divided into these quads, which are about the size of San Francisco.

The animals on your species list are ones that occur within, or may be affected by projects within, the quads covered by the list.

- Fish and other aquatic species appear on your list if they are in the same watershed as your quad or if water use in your quad might affect them.
- Amphibians will be on the list for a quad or county if pesticides applied in that area may be carried to their habitat by air currents.
- Birds are shown regardless of whether they are resident or migratory. Relevant birds on the county list should be considered regardless of whether they appear on a quad list.

## Plants

Any plants on your list are ones that have actually been observed in the quad or quads covered by the list. Plants may exist in an area without ever having been detected there. You can find out what's in the nine surrounding quads through the California Native Plant Society's online [Inventory of Rare and Endangered Plants](#).

## Surveying

Some of the species on your list may not be affected by your project. A trained biologist or botanist, familiar with the habitat requirements of the species on your list, should determine whether they or habitats suitable for them may be affected by your project. We recommend that your surveys include any proposed and candidate species on your list.

For plant surveys, we recommend using the [Guidelines for Conducting and Reporting Botanical Inventories](#). The results of your surveys should be published in any environmental documents prepared for your project.

## State-Listed Species

If a species has been listed as threatened or endangered by the State of California, but not by us nor by the National Marine Fisheries Service, it will appear on your list as a Species of Concern. However you should contact the California Department of Fish and Game [Wildlife and Habitat Data Analysis Branch](#) for official information about these species.

## Your Responsibilities Under the Endangered Species Act

All plants and animals identified as listed above are fully protected under the Endangered Species Act of 1973, as amended. Section 9 of the Act and its implementing regulations prohibit the take of a federally listed wildlife species. Take is defined by the Act as "to harass, harm, pursue, hunt, shoot, wound, kill, trap, capture, or collect" any such animal.

Take may include significant habitat modification or degradation where it actually kills or injures wildlife by significantly impairing essential behavioral patterns, including breeding, feeding, or shelter (50 CFR §17.3).

### Take incidental to an otherwise lawful activity may be authorized by one of two procedures:

- If a Federal agency is involved with the permitting, funding, or carrying out of a project that may result in take, then that agency must engage in a formal [consultation](#) with the Service.

During formal consultation, the Federal agency, the applicant and the Service work together to avoid or minimize the impact on listed species and their habitat. Such consultation would result in a biological opinion by the Service addressing the anticipated effect of the project on listed and proposed species. The opinion may authorize a limited level of incidental take.

- If no Federal agency is involved with the project, and federally listed species may be taken as part of the project, then you, the applicant, should apply for an incidental take permit. The Service may issue such a permit if you submit a satisfactory conservation plan for the species that would be affected by your project.

Should your survey determine that federally listed or proposed species occur in the area and are likely to be affected by the project, we recommend that you work with this office and the California Department of Fish and Game to develop a plan that minimizes the project's direct and indirect impacts to listed species and compensates for project-related loss of habitat. You should include the plan in any environmental documents you file.

### **Critical Habitat**

When a species is listed as endangered or threatened, areas of habitat considered essential to its conservation may be designated as critical habitat. These areas may require special management considerations or protection. They provide needed space for growth and normal behavior; food, water, air, light, other nutritional or physiological requirements; cover or shelter; and sites for breeding, reproduction, rearing of offspring, germination or seed dispersal.

Although critical habitat may be designated on private or State lands, activities on these lands are not restricted unless there is Federal involvement in the activities or direct harm to listed wildlife.

If any species has proposed or designated critical habitat within a quad, there will be a separate line for this on the species list. Boundary descriptions of the critical habitat may be found in the Federal Register. The information is also reprinted in the Code of Federal Regulations (50 CFR 17.95). See our [critical habitat page](#) for maps.

### **Candidate Species**

We recommend that you address impacts to candidate species. We put plants and animals on our candidate list when we have enough scientific information to eventually propose them for listing as threatened or endangered. By considering these species early in your planning process you may be able to avoid the problems that could develop if one of these candidates was listed before the end of your project.

### **Species of Concern**

Your list may contain a section called Species of Concern. This is an informal term that refers to those species that the Sacramento Fish and Wildlife Office believes might be in need of concentrated conservation actions. Such conservation actions vary depending on the health of the populations and degree and types of threats. At one extreme, there may only need to be periodic monitoring of populations and threats to the species and its habitat. At the other extreme, a species may need to be listed as a Federal threatened or endangered species. Species of concern receive no legal protection and the use of the term does not necessarily mean that the species will eventually be proposed for listing as a threatened or endangered species.

### **Wetlands**

If your project will impact wetlands, riparian habitat, or other jurisdictional waters as defined by section 404 of the Clean Water Act and/or section 10 of the Rivers and Harbors Act, you will need to obtain a permit from the U.S. Army Corps of Engineers. Impacts to wetland habitats require site specific mitigation and monitoring. For questions regarding wetlands, please contact Mark Littlefield of this office at (916) 414-6580.

### **Updates**

Our database is constantly updated as species are proposed, listed and delisted. If you address proposed, candidate and special concern species in your planning, this should not be a problem. However, we recommend that you get an updated list every 90 days. That would be January 04, 2006.

## **D. Glossary of Terms used in Geology and Seismicity Analysis**

---

## Glossary of Terms used in Geology and Seismicity Analysis

**Alquist-Priolo Earthquake Fault Zone:** In 1972 the State of California began delineating special studies zones (called Earthquake Fault Zones since January 1994) around active and potentially active faults in the state. The zones are revised periodically, and extend 200 to 500 feet on either side of identified fault traces. No structures for human occupancy may be built across an identified active fault trace. An area of 50 feet on either side of an active fault trace is assumed to be underlain by the fault, unless proven otherwise. Proposed construction in the Earthquake Fault Zone is permitted only following the completion of a fault location report prepared by a California Registered Geologist.

**Characteristic Earthquake:** Characteristic earthquakes are repeat earthquakes that have the same faulting mechanism, magnitude, rupture length, location, and, in some cases, the same epicenter and direction of rupture propagation as earlier shocks. As used in this report, the moment magnitude ( $M_w$ ) of the “characteristic earthquake” indicates the scale of the seismic event considered representative of a particular fault segment, based on seismologic observations and statistical analysis of the probability that a larger earthquake would not be generated during a given time frame (often 50 or 100 years). In the Bay Area, the characteristic earthquake for the Peninsula segment of the San Andreas fault has a  $M_w$  of 7.3; the Northern and Southern segments of the Hayward fault, a  $M_w$  of 6.9; and the Calaveras fault,  $M_w$  6.2. The term “characteristic earthquake” replaces the term “maximum credible earthquake” as a more reliable descriptor of future fault activity (Working Group on California Earthquake Probabilities, 2003).

**Ground Acceleration:** The speed at which soil or rock materials are displaced by seismic waves. It is measured as a percentage of the acceleration of gravity ( $0.5g = 50$  percent of 32 feet per second squared, expressed as a vertical or horizontal force). Peak ground acceleration is the maximum acceleration expected from the characteristic earthquake predicted to affect a given area. Repeatable acceleration refers to the acceleration resulting from multiple seismic shocks. Sustained acceleration refers to the acceleration produced by continuous seismic shaking from a single, long-duration event.

**Maximum Credible Earthquake (MCE):** The largest Richter magnitude ( $M$ ) seismic event that appears to be reasonably capable of occurring under the conditions of the presently known geological framework. This term has been replaced by “characteristic earthquake,” which is considered a better indicator of probable seismic activity on a given fault segment in a specific time frame.

**Modified Mercalli Intensity (MMI) Scale:** A 12-point scale of earthquake intensity based on local effects experienced by people, structures, and earth materials. Each succeeding step on the scale describes a progressively greater amount of damage at a given point of observation. Effects range from those which are detectable only by seismicity recording instruments (I) to total destruction (XII). Most people will feel Intensity IV ground motion indoors and Intensity V outside. Intensity VII frightens most people, and Intensity IX causes alarm approaching panic. The scale was developed in 1902 by Giuseppe Mercalli for European conditions, adapted in 1931 by American seismologists Harry Wood and Frank Neumann for conditions in North America, and modified in 1958 by Dr. Charles F. Richter to accommodate modern structural design features.

**Moment Magnitude ( $M_w$ ):** A logarithmic scale introduced by Hiroo Kanamori in 1977 that is used by modern seismologists to measure the total amount of energy released by an earthquake. For the purposes of describing this energy release (i.e., the “size” of an earthquake on a particular fault segment for which seismic-resistant construction must be designed) the moment magnitude ( $M_w$ ) of the characteristic earthquake for that segment has replaced the concept of a maximum credible earthquake of a particular Richter magnitude. This has become necessary because the Richter scale “saturates” at the higher magnitudes; that is, the Richter scale has difficulty differentiating among the sizes of earthquakes above  $M$  7.5. To correct for this effect, the formula used for the  $M_w$  scale incorporates parameters associated with the rock types at the seismic source and the area of the fault surface involved in the earthquake. Thus, the moment magnitude is related to the length and width of the fault rupture. It reflects the amount of “work” (in the sense of classical physics) done by the earthquake. The relationship between Richter and moment magnitudes is not linear (i.e., moment magnitude is not a set

percentage of Richter magnitude): the two values are derived using different formulae. The four well-know earthquakes listed below exemplify this relationship.

<b>Comparison of Richter Magnitude with Moment Magnitude</b>			
<b>Location</b>	<b>Date</b>	<b>Richter Magnitude</b>	<b>Moment Magnitude</b>
New Madrid MO	1812	8.7	8.1
San Francisco CA	1906	8.3	7.7
Anchorage AK	1964	8.4	9.2
Northridge CA	1994	6.4	6.7

Source: EIP Associates, 2005.

Although some of the values shown on the  $M_w$  scale appear lower than those of the traditional Richter magnitudes, they convey more precise (and more useable) information to geologic and structural engineers.

**Near-Source Factors:** California Building Code Section 1629.4.2 and Tables 16-S and 16-T define the areas in which Seismic Zone 4 Near-Source Factors apply. The zones extend as far as 15 kilometers (9.3 miles) from the ground surface projection of a known active fault plane. The Near-Source Factors and, therefore, the standards for seismic-resistant design, increase as the distance from a construction site to the fault trace decreases. Seismic Source Type A is described by CBC Table 16-U as “Faults that are capable of producing large magnitude events and that have a high rate of seismic activity,” and defined by a maximum moment magnitude of  $M_w / 7.0$ .

**Richter Magnitude Scale:** The Richter Magnitude Scale is a logarithmic scale developed during 1935 and 1936 by Dr. Charles F. Richter and Dr. Beno Gutenberg to measure earthquake magnitude ( $M$ ) by the amount of energy released, as opposed to earthquake intensity as determined by local effects on people, structures, and earth materials (as in the Modified Mercalli Intensity Scale). Each whole number on the Richter scale represents a 10-fold increase in amplitude of the waves recorded on a seismogram and about a 32-fold increase in the amount of energy released by the earthquake. Because the Richter scale tends to saturate above approximately  $M 7.5$ , it is being replaced in modern seismologic investigations by the moment magnitude ( $M_w$ ) scale.