

This Final Environmental Impact Report (FEIR) was prepared in accordance with the California Environmental Quality Act (CEQA) and the State CEQA Guidelines (Section 15132). The County of Napa is the lead agency for the environmental review of the proposed Napa County General Plan Update and has the principal responsibility for approving the project. This FEIR provides responses to comments received on the Draft EIR, incorporates the analysis of the Draft EIR, and provides minor edits and clarifications to the Draft EIR.

1.1 BACKGROUND AND PURPOSE OF THE EIR

OVERVIEW OF CEQA REQUIREMENTS FOR PREPARATION OF AN EIR

The County of Napa (County), serving as the lead agency, has prepared an EIR to provide the public and responsible and trustee agencies with information about the potential environmental effects of the proposed General Plan Update. As set forth in the provisions of CEQA and implementing regulations, public agencies are charged with the duty to consider the environmental impacts of proposed development and to minimize these impacts where feasible while carrying out an obligation to balance a variety of public objectives, including economic, environmental, and social factors.

State CEQA Guidelines Section 15121(a) states that an EIR is an informational document for decision-makers and the general public that analyzes the significant environmental effects of a project, identifies possible ways to minimize significant effects, and describes reasonable alternatives to the project that could reduce or avoid its adverse environmental impacts. Public agencies with discretionary authority are required to consider the information in the EIR, along with any other relevant information, in making decisions on the project.

CEQA requires the preparation of an environmental impact report prior to approving any project which may have a significant effect on the environment. For the purposes of CEQA, the term "project" refers to the whole of an action which has the potential for resulting in a direct physical change or a reasonably foreseeable indirect physical change in the environment (CEQA Guidelines Section 15378[a]). With respect to the proposed Napa County General Plan Update, the County has determined that the proposed General Plan Update is a "project" within the definition of CEQA.

1.2 OVERVIEW OF THE GENERAL PLAN AND ENVIRONMENTAL REVIEW PROCESS

GENERAL PLAN UPDATE PROCESS OVERVIEW

The County of Napa adopted their first General Plan in 1969. Since then, the General Plan has been periodically reviewed and updated to reflect changing conditions and to remain timely and useful. The County adopted a major update to the General Plan in 1983. The Napa County General Plan Update was initiated in 2005 to conduct an overall update of the document with minimal changes to the overall policy direction of the current General Plan. In July 2005, the County established a Steering Committee which conducted monthly meetings as well as special meetings that provided input and direction on the development of the proposed General Plan Update policy document. In addition to these Steering Committee meetings, numerous public workshops and meetings before the Napa County Planning Commission and Board of Supervisors have been held since July 2005 to assist in the development of the General Plan Update.

1.0 EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

As part of the development of the General Plan Update, a series of potential alternatives for the General Plan Update were developed for evaluation in the Draft EIR. As a result of public and agency responses to the Notice of Preparation (NOP), as well as further input from the Steering Committee, the Planning Commission, and the Board of Supervisors in January and February of 2006, seven initial alternatives were further refined and combined into the following five principal alternatives (in addition to the No Project Alternative as required for evaluation under CEQA). The reader is referred to Draft EIR Section 3.0, Project Description, and Section 6.0, Project Alternatives, for a further description of Alternatives A, B, C, and E, and to FEIR Section 3.0, Master Response 3.4.2, The Range of Alternatives Considered, for a further description of Alternative D.

- **Alternative A, the Existing Plan Alternative¹:** This alternative would involve retention of the existing General Plan with minor edits and updates that would bring the General Plan up to date, but no substantive policy changes would occur. Between years 2005 and 2030, there would be an estimated 2,235 new dwelling units (5,013 persons) and an estimated 10,832 new jobs added to the County under this alternative. There could be an estimated 10,000 to 12,500 acres of additional vineyard development county-wide.
- **Alternative B, the Plan Update Alternative²:** This alternative would re-designate existing industrial lands for residential use (at the Boca and Pacific Coast sites) and commercial mixed use (at the Napa Pipe site). Jamieson Canyon would be widened to four lanes, and Flosden/Newell Road would be extended north to Green Island Road. The Hess Vineyard north of American Canyon would remain a vineyard and would be re-designated from "industrial" to agriculture. The land use map of Angwin would be modified to better reflect existing zoning and land uses, although no changes would occur outside the area currently designated as "urban residential" (i.e., the current "urban bubble"). The alternative would also include policies calling for a streamlined approval process for environmentally superior vineyard projects, necessitating modifications to the County's conservation regulations (County Code Chapter 18.108). Incentives would be offered for on-site farmworker housing, and consistent with the City of Napa's General Plan, the County would support increased residential density within downtown Napa and encourage consideration of publicly owned sites within the City for mixed use (including housing). Between years 2005 and 2030, there would be an estimated 3,885 new dwelling units (9,029 persons) and an estimated 11,053 new jobs added to the unincorporated County under this alternative. There would be an estimated 10,000 to 12,500 acres of new vineyards added county-wide.
- **Alternative C, the Plan Update Alternative²³:** This alternative would include all the same changes as Alternative B, but would also include General Plan and zoning changes required to re-designate some land adjacent to the City of Napa and the City of American Canyon for more housing. A Rural Urban Limit (RUL) line would be shown for the City of American Canyon, expressing the limits of that city's potential future growth from the County's perspective. This alternative would also provide incentives for the reuse of historic buildings, adjust the urban boundaries of Angwin, and re-designate a small area at the Pope Valley crossroads (i.e., near the store and farm center) for non-agricultural use. The changes to Angwin and Pope Valley would require a Measure J vote. Between years 2005 and 2030, there would be an estimated 7,635 new dwelling

¹ Derived from NOP Alternative 2.

² Derived from NOP Alternative 3.

³ Derived from NOP Alternative 4 combined with NOP Alternative 6

units (18,063 persons) and an estimated 8,603 new jobs added to the unincorporated County under this alternative. There would be an estimated 10,000 to 12,500 new acres of vineyards added county-wide.

- **Alternative D, the Resource Preservation Alternative⁴:** This alternative would be the most restrictive of the five principal alternatives considered. The area currently designated as Agricultural Watershed Open Space (AWOS) would be split into two zones – one primarily devoted to agriculture and one primarily devoted to open space. One dwelling unit per parcel would still be allowed, but minimum parcel sizes could increase, so that little new development would occur and major infrastructure improvements would not be feasible. There would be no changes to the amount of land currently allowed for industrial use. The existing policy provisions of the 1983 General Plan would largely remain intact, except additional policies would be developed to achieve greater forest protection, riparian habitat preservation, and water quality improvements than envisioned under the current plan. Such policies could result in zoning to prohibit timber conversions in Watershed Open Space areas, inclusion of expanded riparian buffers in the Conservation Regulation, along with adoption of an oak woodland preservation ordinance, and erosion control plan requirements for vineyards on less than 5% slope. Current rural designated areas adjacent to Berryessa Estates, the City of Calistoga, and the City of Napa would be reduced or eliminated, while urban designated areas in Pope Creek would be re-designated rural residential. All other urban and rural residential areas would also be reduced in size to eliminate agriculturally zoned land from these areas (i.e., from the “bubbles”). Hess Vineyard would remain in vineyard use, but would be re-designated as Agricultural Open Space. Urban designations in the unincorporated community of Angwin would be modified to include a mix of urban residential and institutional uses; no expansion of the so-called “urban bubble” would occur. This alternative would result in an increase of 1,951 dwelling units and an increase of 9,713 new jobs between years 2005 and 2030. The minimum parcel size for wineries would increase from 10 to 40 acres. Vineyards would be required to place a greater emphasis on habitat preservation and be specifically designed to protect sensitive biotic communities and oak woodlands. Groundwater restrictions similar to those in place in the Milliken-Sarco-Tulucay (MST) basin would be established in other areas, including Pope Valley, Chiles Valley, Capell Valley, and Carneros Valley. With these new restrictions, Alternative D could result in 7,500 acres of new vineyards county-wide by 2030.
- **Alternative E, the Jobs/Housing Balance Alternative⁵:** Alternative E would be the most intense of all the alternatives analyzed, but for that reason would provide the best balance of jobs and housing and the greatest likelihood that residents and employees would find transit feasible as an alternative to the private automobile. Alternative E would provide for enhanced transportation improvements and expansions of sewer and water infrastructure. Urban and rural development opportunities would be expanded in several areas of the County. More hillside development would be permitted – probably by reducing minimum parcel sizes in the AWOS district from 160 to 40 acres. A Measure J vote would be required. Current rural designated areas adjacent to Berryessa Estates, the City of Calistoga, and the City of Napa would be reduced or eliminated, while urban designated areas in Pope Creek would be re-designated rural residential. Similar to Alternative C, a new RUL would be established for the City of American Canyon. Napa

⁴ Derived from NOP Alternative 1.

⁵ Derived from NOP Alternative 5 combined with NOP Alternative 7.

1.0 EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

Pipe would be re-designated as commercial mixed-use and may include development of a hotel and conference center. At Napa Pipe, no new dwelling units would be constructed, but 2,048 jobs would be created. The Pacific Coast/Boca site would be re-designated as residential mixed-use (high density residential with neighborhood-serving retail and public open space). Hess Vineyard would retain its current industrial land use designations and would be converted to industrial use. Angwin would be developed with more residential and business uses and would involve the expansion of urban and/or rural land use designations to reflect actual development conditions in the area. Other agricultural areas would see minimum parcel sizes decreased in the AWOS, which would allow additional residential development potential. The County-owned sites in the City of Napa could result in 700 new dwelling units. This alternative would result in an increase of 6,535 residential units and an increase of 14,376 new jobs between years 2005 and 2030. The minimum parcel size for wineries would be decreased from 10 acres to an as yet to be determined size in some areas. Erosion control plans would become ministerial with BMPs, and vineyards would be allowed on slopes of up to 35% (instead of 30%) without a use permit. Vineyard development scenario 4 specifically evaluates this option, which consists of 15,000 acres of new vineyard development by year 2030 with an emphasis on lands between 30% and 35% slope.

The public draft of the proposed General Plan Update policy document was released on February 16, 2007. The proposed General Plan Update consists of the following elements that provide policy direction for the County for several topics:

- Agricultural Preservation and Land Use
- Circulation
- Recreation and Open Space
- Safety
- Community Character
- Conservation
- Economic Development

Public comments on the General Plan Update and its associated Draft EIR were solicited and received from February 16, 2007, to June 18, 2007, which included comments received at public meetings held during the review period (the reader is referred to Section 3.0 of this document regarding the comments received on the General Plan Update). Starting at the June 25, 2007, Steering Committee meeting, the County began revisions to the General Plan Update elements, based on public, agency, and Steering Committee input. In addition, a "Preferred Plan" for the General Plan Update land use map was developed based on the alternatives evaluated in the Draft EIR. As further described in Section 2.0 of this document, the development potential under the Preferred Plan would consist of 2,935 new dwelling units and 8,259 new jobs between 2005 and 2030.

OVERVIEW OF ENVIRONMENTAL REVIEW PROCESS OF THE GENERAL PLAN UPDATE

The following is an overview of the environmental review process for the Napa County General Plan Update that has led to the preparation of this FEIR.

Notice of Preparation and Initial Study

In accordance with Section 15082 of the State CEQA Guidelines, the County prepared a Notice of Preparation (NOP) of an EIR for the proposed project on October 21, 2005. The County was identified as the lead agency for the proposed project. This notice was circulated to the State

Clearinghouse, the public, local, state, and federal agencies, and other interested parties to solicit comments on the proposed project. Two scoping meetings were held to receive comments on the DEIR. One scoping meeting was held on November 9, 2005, in the City of St. Helena, and one additional meeting was held on November 10, 2005, in the City of Napa. Concerns raised in response to the NOP were considered during preparation of the Draft EIR. The NOP and responses by interested parties are presented in Appendix A of the Draft EIR.

Draft EIR

The Draft EIR (DEIR), which consisted of two volumes, was released for public and agency review on February 16, 2007. The Draft EIR was published for review for a comment review period that was initially extended to April 17, 2007. At the April 3, 2007, General Plan Workshop, the Napa County Board of Supervisors further extended the Draft EIR public comment period to June 18, 2007.

The DEIR contains a description and analysis of five General Plan Update alternatives, description of the environmental setting, identification of the project alternative impacts, and mitigation measures for impacts found to be significant. **Table 1.0-1** provides a summary of project impacts and mitigation measures as well as a summary of the extent of these impacts by alternative.

Final EIR

The County received 221 comment letters and testimony from agencies, interest groups, and the public regarding the Draft EIR and the General Plan Update. This document responds to the written comments received as required by CEQA. This document also contains text changes to the Draft EIR, which are included in Section 4.0, Text Changes to the Draft EIR. This document constitutes the FEIR.

Certification of the Final EIR/Project Consideration

The County will review and consider the FEIR. If the County finds that the FEIR is "adequate and complete," the County may certify the FEIR. The rule of adequacy generally holds that the EIR can be certified if it (1) shows a good faith effort at full disclosure of environmental information, and (2) provides sufficient analysis to allow decisions to be made regarding the project in contemplation of its environmental consequences.

Upon review and consideration of the Final EIR, the County may take action to adopt, revise, or reject the proposed Napa County General Plan Update. A decision to adopt the General Plan Update would be accompanied by written findings in accordance with State CEQA Guidelines Section 15091 and Section 15093. Public Resources Code Section 21081.6 also requires lead agencies to adopt a reporting and mitigation monitoring and reporting program to describe measures that have been adopted or made a condition of project approval in order to mitigate or avoid significant effects on the environment.

1.3 ORGANIZATION AND SCOPE OF THE FINAL EIR

This document is organized in the following manner:

1.0 EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

SECTION 1.0 - EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

Section 1.0 provides an overview of the General Plan Update and EIR process to date. This section also provides a new Impact and Mitigation Measure Summary Table based on Draft EIR Table 2.0-1. However, this version of the summary table contains a summary of alternatives evaluated in the EIR as well as an evaluation of the impacts by alternative (see **Table 1.0-1**). This section is in Volume 1 of the Final EIR.

SECTION 2.0 – PREFERRED PLAN

Section 2.0 provides a description of the proposed General Plan Update Preferred Plan as well as an analysis of the environmental effects of the Preferred Plan in relation to the alternatives evaluated in the Draft EIR. The section provides substantial evidence demonstrating that the consideration of the Preferred Plan would not constitute new significant information that would warrant recirculation of the Draft EIR pursuant to State CEQA Guidelines Section 15088.5. This section is in Volume I of the Final EIR.

Section 3.0 - COMMENTS AND RESPONSES TO COMMENTS ON THE DRAFT EIR

Section 3.0 provides a list of commenters, meeting transcripts, master responses, and copies of written comments (coded for reference), and the responses to those written comments made on the Draft EIR. Given the size of this section, it is in Volume II of the Final EIR.

SECTION 4.0 – TEXT CHANGES TO THE DRAFT EIR

This section consists of the text changes to the Draft EIR that are a result of responses to comments, as well as staff-initiated edits that do not change the intent or content of the analysis or mitigation measures. Revisions appear in ~~strikethrough~~ and underline and are listed by page number. This section is in Volume I of the Final EIR.

Section 5.0 - REFERENCES

Section 5.0 provides a list of reference materials cited in the Final EIR.

1.4 SUMMARY OF ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACTS

Table 1.0-1 displays a summary of impacts and mitigation measures and comparison of the project alternatives including the Preferred Plan for the proposed General Plan Update. For detailed discussions of all impacts and mitigation measures and of the proposed General Plan Update and the alternatives evaluated, the reader is referred to the appropriate environmental topic section in the Draft EIR (i.e., Sections 4.1 through 4.14).

**TABLE 1.0-1
NAPA COUNTY GENERAL PLAN UPDATE IMPACT AND MITIGATION/ALTERNATIVES COMPARISON**

Alternative Summary	Preferred Plan ¹	Alternative A ³	Alternative B	Alternative C	Alternative D ²	Alternative E
New Dwelling Units	2,935	2,235	3,885	7,635	1,951	6,535
Population Increase	7,514	5,013	9,029	18,063	4,390	15,075
New Non-Residential Development	11,200,000 sq ft	16,014,000 sq ft	14,636,000 sq ft	12,990,000 sq ft	16,300,000 sq ft	19,600,000 sq ft
New Jobs	8,259	10,832	11,053	8,603	9,713	14,376
New Vineyard Acres	10,000-12,500	10,000 – 12,500	10,000 – 12,500	10,000 – 12,500	7,500	15,000 (development allowed on slopes up to 35%)
Infrastructure Improvements	Roadway and recycled water improvements in southern portion of County.	None	Roadway and recycled water improvements in southern portion of County.	Roadway and recycled water improvements in southern portion of County.	None	Roadway and recycled water improvements in southern portion of County.

¹ The reader is referred to Section 2.0 for further description and impact analysis.

² The reader is referred to Section 3.0 and 4.0 for refinements to Alternative D since release of the Draft EIR.

³ As identified on Draft EIR page 6.0-4, the No Project Alternative would result in the same impacts as Alternative A. Thus, a separate column for the No Project Alternative was not provided.

Impact	Mitigation Measure	Preferred Plan Impact Summary	Alternative A Impact Summary	Alternative B Impact Summary	Alternative C Impact Summary	Alternative D Impact Summary	Alternative E Impact Summary
Agriculture							
4.1.1 – Conversion of State Designated Important Farmland	MM 4.1.1a – Avoidance of conversions of farmlands MM 4.1.1b – Long-term preservation of farmlands (see page 4.1-27 of DEIR for full text of mitigation measures)	Significant and Mitigable The Preferred Plan could result in the conversion of farmlands of concern under CEQA (up to 3,695 acres), although as discussed above, the overall trend in the County is likely to be toward increased farmlands.	Significant and Mitigable This alternative could result in the conversion of farmlands of concern under CEQA (up to 2,049 acres), although as discussed above, the overall trend in the County is likely to be toward increased farmlands.	Significant and Mitigable This alternative could result in the conversion of farmlands of concern under CEQA (up to 1,797 acres), which would be less than Alternative A.	Significant and Mitigable This alternative could result in the conversion of farmlands of concern under CEQA (up to 2,046 acres), which would be less than Alternative A.	Significant and Mitigable This alternative would result in the least extent conversion of farmlands of concern under CEQA from implementation of its land use plan, given the removal of rural designations adjacent to the cities of Calistoga and Napa.	Significant and Mitigable This alternative would result in similar impacts to Alternative C regarding the conversion of farmlands of concern under CEQA from implementation of its land use plan.
4.1.2 – Loss of County Designated Agricultural Land	Implementation of mitigation measures MM 4.1.1a and b	Significant and Unavoidable/Less Than Significant The Preferred Plan could result in a net increase in General Plan designated agricultural land by including re-designation of land areas resulting in net increase of 635 acres resulting in a less than significant impact. However, should the Measure J vote for the new growth boundary for American Canyon and re-designation of lands near	Less Than Significant This alternative would result in no changes to the location or amount of land designated in the current General Plan Land Use Map for agricultural use.	Less Than Significant This alternative would be similar to Alternative A, except that it would increase the amount of land designated for agricultural use by re-designating the approximately 365-acre Hess Vineyard from “Industrial” to “Agriculture, Watershed and Open Space” on the General Plan land use map.	Significant and Unavoidable Alternative C would also establish a new Rural Urban Limit (RUL) line around the City of American Canyon, which consists of 4,086 acres (see Section 3.0, Project Description, for further discussion of the RUL). The annexation and subsequent development by the City of American Canyon could result in the loss of agricultural land as designated by the current General Plan Land Use Map.	Less Than Significant This alternative would have the least impact of the alternatives evaluated. This alternative would increase General Plan designated agricultural lands from modifications to the land use map.	Significant and Unavoidable This alternative would establish the RUL for the City of American Canyon and roadway and infrastructure improvements identified in the above impact discussion. This alternative would likely result in the highest loss of County-designated agricultural lands.

1.0 EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

Impact	Mitigation Measure	Preferred Plan Impact Summary	Alternative A Impact Summary	Alternative B Impact Summary	Alternative C Impact Summary	Alternative D Impact Summary	Alternative E Impact Summary
		Angwin be successful, there would be a net loss of 45 acres. This would be a significant and unavoidable impact.					
4.1.3 – Agricultural/ Urban Interface Conflicts	None required	<p>Less Than Significant</p> <p>The Preferred Plan would result in new urban/rural land use interfaces with agricultural areas. However, these interfaces would not result in substantial land use conflicts. The plan would perpetuate the County's "right-to-farm" policy with the aid of a more explicit definition of "agriculture."</p>	<p>Less Than Significant</p> <p>This alternative would involve the continued placement of residential and other non-agricultural land uses adjacent to agricultural uses that could result in the conflicts identified above. The potential for land use conflicts would be moderated by the County's Right-to-Farm Ordinance.</p>	<p>Less Than Significant</p> <p>In addition to the interfaces under Alternative A, this alternative also includes the provision of trail and recreation activities near agricultural uses. The County's Right-to-Farm Ordinance and County Code Section 18.104.340 would support continued agricultural activities in areas where potential conflicts could occur.</p>	<p>Less Than Significant</p> <p>In addition to the interfaces under Alternative A, this alternative also includes the provision of trail and recreation activities near agricultural uses and the expansion of urban and rural uses in Angwin and American Canyon. The County's Right-to-Farm Ordinance and County Code Section 18.104.340 would support continued agricultural activities in areas where potential conflicts could occur.</p>	<p>Less Than Significant</p> <p>This alternative would not result in any new rural or urban interfaces with designated agricultural areas. This alternative would also have the least conflict impact given its reduction of designated non-agricultural uses.</p>	<p>Less Than Significant</p> <p>In addition to the interfaces under Alternative A, this alternative also includes the provision of trail and recreation activities near agricultural uses and the expansion of urban and rural uses in Angwin, American Canyon, Hess Vineyard and changes to AWOS designation. The County's Right-to-Farm Ordinance and County Code Section 18.104.340 would support continued agricultural activities in areas where potential conflicts could occur. This alternative would have the largest extent of urban/rural interface with agricultural uses.</p>
4.1.4 – Conflicts with Agricultural Zoning and Williamson Act Contracts	Implementation of mitigation measures MM 4.1.1a and b.	<p>Significant and Unavoidable</p> <p>The Preferred Plan would largely perpetuate the existence of agriculturally zoned land in areas designated for non-agricultural uses on the Land Use Map in some areas, and it would not preclude rezoning and redevelopment of land that is zoned agricultural. It would remedy this situation for two "bubbles" (Angwin and Berryessa Estates) for approximately 335 acres. However, the establishment of a new growth boundary would incorporate areas zoned for agricultural uses.</p>	<p>Significant and Unavoidable</p> <p>This alternative would not allow development in conflict with current Williamson Act contracts; however, the potential that development could occur on agriculturally zoned parcels within the so called "urban bubbles."</p>	<p>Significant and Unavoidable</p> <p>This alternative would not result in any conflicts with current Williamson Act contracts. This alternative would not preclude agriculturally zoned parcels within the so-called "urban bubbles" from being rezoned and developed. Though variations of the Angwin bubble could reduce this impact.</p>	<p>Significant and Unavoidable</p> <p>This alternative would not result in any new land use designations that would conflict with current Williamson Act contracts; it would allow re-zoning of agricultural land both within areas designated for non-agricultural use and within areas designated for agricultural use on the current General Plan Land Use Map. In addition, Alternative C would allow for opportunities for additional conflicts with agricultural zoning associated with Angwin "bubble" modifications and establishment of an RUL for the City of American Canyon.</p>	<p>Less Than Significant</p> <p>Alternative D would rectify this situation by shrinking the "bubbles" to eliminate agriculturally zoned land. It would preclude rezoning and redevelopment of land that is zoned agricultural. This alternative would have the least impact.</p>	<p>Significant and Unavoidable</p> <p>This alternative would not result in any new land use designations that would conflict with current Williamson Act contracts; it would allow re-zoning of agricultural land both within areas designated for non-agricultural use and within areas designated for agricultural use on the current General Plan Land Use Map. In addition, Alternative E would allow for opportunities for additional conflicts with agricultural zoning associated with Angwin "bubble" modifications, establishment of an RUL for the City of American Canyon, and re-designation of the Hess Vineyard. This alternative would have the largest extent</p>

Impact	Mitigation Measure	Preferred Plan Impact Summary	Alternative A Impact Summary	Alternative B Impact Summary	Alternative C Impact Summary	Alternative D Impact Summary	Alternative E Impact Summary
							of impact of the alternatives evaluated.
Land Use							
4.2.1 – Division of Established Communities and Land Use Conflicts	MM 4.2.1 – Buffering and Visual Screening Mitigation (Applies to Alternative B, C and E only) (see page 4.2-21 of DEIR for full text of mitigation measure)	Less Than Significant The Preferred Plan would maintain the County's general land use pattern and would not include policy changes or infrastructure improvements that would divide an existing community. The Napa Pipe site and the Boca/Pacific Coast site would remain in industrial use and industrial zoning, and would be subject to further study (and require further General Plan amendments) before any non-industrial uses could be introduced.	Less Than Significant This alternative would retain the existing land use pattern of the County and would not introduce any new land use or other physical feature that would result in the division of any of the communities in the County. In addition, this alternative would not introduce any new land uses that would conflict with existing land uses in the County or adjoining communities.	Significant and Mitigable This alternative would locate residential uses on the Pacific Coast/Boca and the Napa Pipe sites adjacent to the industrial uses and Syar quarry could result in land use conflicts if residents are disturbed by truck traffic, noise, dust, or vibration.	Significant and Mitigable This alternative would locate residential uses on the Pacific Coast/Boca and the Napa Pipe sites adjacent to the industrial uses and Syar quarry could result in land use conflicts if residents are disturbed by truck traffic, noise, dust, or vibration.	Less Than Significant This alternative would retain the existing land use pattern of the County and would not introduce any new land use or other physical feature that would result in the division of any of the communities in the County. In addition, this alternative would not introduce any new land uses that would conflict with existing land uses in the County or adjoining communities.	Significant and Mitigable This alternative would locate residential uses on the Pacific Coast/Boca and the Napa Pipe sites adjacent to the industrial uses and Syar quarry could result in land use conflicts if residents are disturbed by truck traffic, noise, dust, or vibration.
4.2.2 – Conflicts with Relevant Land Use Plans, Policies, or Regulations	MM 4.2.2 – Compatibility with Airport Land Use Compatibility Plan (Applies to Alternative B, C and E only) (see page 4.2-25 of DEIR for full text of mitigation measure)	Less Than Significant The Preferred Plan would not conflict with any applicable land use plan and would not re-designate land in such a way as to increase the likelihood of development that is inconsistent with applicable airport land use compatibility plans.	Less Than Significant This alternative would not introduce new land uses or designations adjacent to the cities, federal lands, state lands and the adjoining counties that would result in a conflict with their applicable plans.	Significant and Mitigable This alternative would place development of residential uses at the Napa Pipe site, which could potentially conflict with the Napa County Airport Land Use Compatibility Plan. The southern portion of the Napa Pipe site is within Zone D of the Napa County Airport Land Use Compatibility Plan, which prohibits residential uses.	Significant and Mitigable This alternative would place development of residential uses at the Napa Pipe site, which could potentially conflict with the Napa County Airport Land Use Compatibility Plan. The southern portion of the Napa Pipe site is within Zone D of the Napa County Airport Land Use Compatibility Plan, which prohibits residential uses.	Less Than Significant This alternative would not introduce new land uses or designations adjacent to the cities, federal lands, state lands and the adjoining counties that would result in a conflict with their applicable plans.	Significant and Mitigable This alternative would place development of residential lodging uses at the Napa Pipe site, which could potentially conflict with the Napa County Airport Land Use Compatibility Plan. The southern portion of the Napa Pipe site is within Zone D of the Napa County Airport Land Use Compatibility Plan, which prohibits residential uses.
Population and Housing							
4.3.1 – Population, Housing and Employment Increases	MM 4.3.1 – Multi-Family Residential Project Approval Process for Additional Housing. (Applies to the Preferred Plan, Alternative B, C, and E only) (see Page 4.3-13 of DEIR for full text of mitigation measure)	Significant and Unavoidable The projected increase in housing and population from the Preferred Plan would be consistent with the County's growth management system, similar to Alternative A. However, similar to all of the	Significant and Unavoidable The population and employment growth under Alternative A would be consistent with the County's growth management system, but would exceed regional projections of ABAG.	Significant and Unavoidable This alternative is projected to result in population and employment growth in excess of regional projections and the County's growth management system.	Significant and Unavoidable This alternative is projected to result in population and employment growth in excess of regional projections and the County's growth management system to a higher extent than Alternative B.	Significant and Unavoidable This alternative's growth would be lowest of the alternatives considered and would be consistent with the Housing Allocation Program, but would exceed ABAG's growth projections.	Significant and Unavoidable This alternative would exceed regional growth projections by ABAG as well as exceed the County's Housing Allocation Program, given the growth projections under this alternative (6,535 dwelling units and 14,376 jobs).

1.0 EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

Impact	Mitigation Measure	Preferred Plan Impact Summary	Alternative A Impact Summary	Alternative B Impact Summary	Alternative C Impact Summary	Alternative D Impact Summary	Alternative E Impact Summary
		alternatives, the plan's projected increase in housing, population, and employment would exceed regional projections prepared by the Association of Bay Area Governments (ABAG).					
4.3.2 – Job-Housing Balance	MM 4.3.2 – Employee Housing Requirements (Applies to Alternative A and D) (see page 4.3-15 of DEIR for full text of mitigation measure)	Less Than Significant The Preferred Plan would permit continued development of new housing and new jobs, and would result in a projected 12,579 dwelling units in the unincorporated County and 31,309 jobs by 2030, for a ratio of about 2.5 to 1. The resulting ratio of jobs to housing, or “jobs housing balance” of 2.5 would be the same as ABAG reported for Napa County in 2005.	Significant and Unavoidable This alternative would result in the highest ratio of jobs to housing. The projected ratio of jobs to housing in the unincorporated area would be approximately three to one (2.9/1). This would represent an increase from the existing ratio of 2.5/1. This alternative would result in the most severe impact of the alternatives considered.	Less Than Significant Under this alternative, the projected job growth is nearly three times the number of new housing units. The resulting ratio of jobs to housing would be approximately two and a half to one (2.5/1). This would maintain the existing ratio of jobs to housing in the County.	Less Than Significant Under this alternative, the projected job growth is nearly equal to the number of new housing units. The ratio of jobs to housing would be approximately two to one (1.8/1). Alternative C would result in a decrease in the ratio of jobs to housing from 2.5 to 1.8. Although an imbalance would continue, the new ratio would constitute a significant improvement from the existing imbalance. This alternative would have least impact of the alternatives considered.	Significant and Unavoidable This alternative is projected to have the lowest growth of dwelling units (1,951 units between 2005 and 2030) out of all alternatives. However, employment opportunities would continue to increase under this alternative (9,713 jobs between 2005 and 2030), to have a resulting jobs/housing balance of 2.8/1.	Less Than Significant This alternative is projected to have 6,535 dwelling units (between 2005 and 2030) and 14,376 jobs (between 2005 and 2030). This alternative would result in a resulting jobs/housing balance of 2.3/1, which is improved over current conditions.
4.3.3 – Displacement of a Substantial Number of Persons or Housing	None required	Less Than Significant The Preferred Plan would largely retain the County's land use pattern. While this alternative would involve new infrastructure and recreation improvements, these features would not result in a substantial displacement of existing residential communities.	Less Than Significant Implementation of this alternative would retain the existing land use pattern of the County and would not introduce any new land use or other physical feature that would result in a substantial displacement of existing residential communities.	Less Than Significant This alternative would include roadway improvements (associated with the proposed General Plan Update Circulation Element), extension of recycled water to Coombsville and Carneros, as well as policy provisions for trails and public open space (proposed Recreation and Open Space Element in the General Plan Update). These improvements (in addition to development) are not expected to require the substantial displacement of existing residential communities.	Less Than Significant This alternative would include the same roadway, infrastructure and recreation improvements as Alternative B. However, this alternative would include alteration of the Angwin “bubble” as well as establishment of a RUL for the City of American Canyon. These improvements and development would not result in a substantial displacement of existing residential communities.	Less Than Significant This alternative would have the least potential for displacement of residences, given the lack of infrastructure improvements and minimal development potential.	Less Than Significant This alternative would include the same roadway, infrastructure and recreation improvements as Alternative B. However, this alternative would include alteration of the Angwin “bubble,” establishment of a RUL for the City of American Canyon and re-designation of the Hess Vineyard. These improvements and development would not result in a substantial displacement of existing residential communities.
Transportation							
4.4.1 – Travel Demand	MM 4.4.1a - Standards for adequate level of service MM 4.4.1b – Preparation of a traffic analysis prior to approval of the project MM 4.4.1c – Payment of fair share of countywide traffic	Significant and Unavoidable The Preferred Plan would include widening of Jamieson Canyon from two to four lanes and associated improvements at SR 29 and	Significant and Unavoidable This alternative and associated growth of the incorporated cites and regional traffic growth would result in traffic increases that would significantly impact 39	Significant and Unavoidable This alternative and associated growth of the incorporated cites and regional traffic growth would result in traffic increases that would significantly impact 37 roadway segments with deficient	Significant and Unavoidable This alternative and associated growth of the incorporated cites and regional traffic growth would result in traffic increases that would significantly impact 39 roadway segments with deficient level of	Significant and Unavoidable While this alternative would generate the least amount of traffic of the alternatives evaluated, it is anticipated it would have similar traffic	Significant and Unavoidable This alternative and associated growth of the incorporated cites and regional traffic growth would result in traffic increases that would significantly impact 39

Impact	Mitigation Measure	Preferred Plan Impact Summary	Alternative A Impact Summary	Alternative B Impact Summary	Alternative C Impact Summary	Alternative D Impact Summary	Alternative E Impact Summary
	<p>improvements</p> <p>MM 4.4.1d - Support transit services and development of pedestrian and bicycle facilities</p> <p>MM 4.4.1e – Reductions of single-occupant vehicle use and support for alternative forms of transportation</p> <p>MM 4.4.1f - Support for alternative forms of transportation for Napa County employees</p> <p>MM 4.4.1g – Provisions of transit facilities for certain future developments</p> <p>MM 4.4.1h – Provision of bicycle lanes during roadway improvements.</p> <p>MM4.4.1i – Reuse of abandoned rail right-of-way for alternative forms of transportation</p> <p>MM 4.4.1j – Integration of pedestrian and bicycle access parking lots</p> <p>(see page 4.4-50 and -51 of DEIR for full text of mitigation measures)</p>	<p>Airport Boulevard (i.e., “the interchange”) and SR 29 and SR 221 (“the flyover”). The plan also calls for widening of SR 29 from four lanes to six lanes all the way from SR 37 to SR 12, extension of Flosden/Newell from its current terminus to Green Island Road, completion of Devlin Road on the other side of SR 29. The Preferred Plan would result in an increase in PM peak hour vehicle trips of between 21,000 and 23,000 trips (an increase of between 37% and 39%), which is within the range vehicle trips anticipated to be generated under Alternative A and B. In turn, it is anticipated that the Preferred Plan would result in 36 to 39 roadway segments operating with a deficient level of service (in combination with city and regional traffic growth).</p>	<p>roadway segments with deficient level of service.</p>	<p>level of service (without proposed roadway improvements) and 36 roadway segments (with proposed roadway improvements).</p>	<p>service (without proposed roadway improvements) and 42 roadway segments (with proposed roadway improvements). This alternative would result in the most severe traffic impacts.</p>	<p>impacts as Alternative A.</p>	<p>roadway segments with deficient level of service</p>
4.4.2 – Roadway Safety and Emergency Access	<p>Implementation of mitigation measures MM 4.9.4 and MM 4.13.1.1a and b.</p> <p>(see DEIR page references below for each of these mitigation measures)</p>	<p>Significant and Mitigable</p> <p>The Preferred Plan includes policies emphasizing traffic safety and local access rather than roadway capacity enhancements in most parts of the County. New development would be required to meet current County roadway standards; however, increased traffic could constrain emergency access.</p>	<p>Significant and Mitigable</p> <p>This alternative would not include the proposed General Plan Update roadway improvements. New development would be required to meet current County roadway standards; however, increased traffic could constrain emergency access.</p>	<p>Significant and Mitigable</p> <p>This alternative does include the proposed General Plan Update roadway improvements that would provide additional access routes in the southern portion of the County. The contribution of traffic could result in emergency access constraints.</p>	<p>Significant and Mitigable</p> <p>This alternative does include the proposed General Plan Update roadway improvements that would provide additional access routes in the southern portion of the County. The contribution of traffic could result in emergency access constraints.</p>	<p>Significant and Mitigable</p> <p>This alternative would not include the proposed General Plan Update roadway improvements. New development would be required to meet current County roadway standards; however, increased traffic could constrain emergency access, though this alternative is anticipated to generate the least traffic.</p>	<p>Significant and Mitigable</p> <p>This alternative does include the proposed General Plan Update roadway improvements that would provide additional access routes in the southern portion of the County. The contribution of traffic could result in emergency access constraints.</p>
4.4.3 – Conflicts with Existing Alternative Transportation Policies and Programs	<p>Implementation of mitigation measure MM 4.4.1d</p>	<p>Significant and Mitigable</p> <p>The Preferred Plan includes policies emphasizing the use of alternative modes of</p>	<p>Significant and Mitigable</p> <p>Most of the development under this alternative would occur in existing rural and</p>	<p>Significant and Mitigable</p> <p>This alternative would include development and densification of residential uses at Pacific</p>	<p>Significant and Mitigable</p> <p>This alternative would include development and densification of residential uses at Pacific</p>	<p>Significant and Mitigable</p> <p>The increase in population under this alternative would place further demand on</p>	<p>Significant and Mitigable</p> <p>This alternative would include development and densification of residential</p>

1.0 EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

Impact	Mitigation Measure	Preferred Plan Impact Summary	Alternative A Impact Summary	Alternative B Impact Summary	Alternative C Impact Summary	Alternative D Impact Summary	Alternative E Impact Summary
		transportation and addressing other strategies for reducing traffic in peak periods. These policies combined with projected increases in traffic congestion will place an increasing demand on transit services and other alternative transportation services and facilities.	urban areas. However, the increase in population would place further demand on transit services and the need for additional transit facilities as well as pedestrian and bicycle facilities.	Coast/Boca, Napa Pipe and County-owned sites in the City of Napa, in addition to land use patterns similar to Alternative A. This increase of development and density would place further demand on transit services and the need for additional transit facilities as well as pedestrian and bicycle facilities.	Coast/Boca, Napa Pipe and County-owned sites in the City of Napa, in addition to land use patterns similar to Alternative A. In addition, establishment of the RUL for the City of American Canyon would add to this demand. This increase of development and density would place further demand on transit services and the need for additional transit facilities as well as pedestrian and bicycle facilities.	transit services and the need for additional transit facilities as well as pedestrian and bicycle facilities. However, this alternative would have the least impact given the reduced development expected.	uses at Pacific Coast/Boca, Napa Pipe and County-owned sites in the City of Napa, as well as increased development potential in the AWOS. In addition, establishment of the RUL for the City of American Canyon would add to this demand. This increase of development and density would place further demand on transit services and the need for additional transit facilities as well as pedestrian and bicycle facilities. This alternative would also include the opportunity for ferry and rail service between the cities of Napa and Vallejo and Fairfield.
4.4.4 – Create Additional Demand for Parking Facilities	MM 4.4.4a - Require adequate parking to meet parking demand MM 4.4.4b - Require replacement parking (see Page 4.4-56 of DEIR for full text of mitigation measures)	Significant and Mitigable The limited development projected under the Preferred Plan that could occur would increase the demand for parking near housing and employment (2,935 new dwelling units and 11,200,000 square feet of non-residential uses). However, the roadway changes called for in the plan could result in the loss of parking spaces in some areas. This increase in development would require new parking facilities and inadequate capacity if these facilities are not constructed.	Significant and Mitigable Under this alternative, between the year 2005 and 2030, it is projected that there would be an additional 2,235 dwelling units and 16,014,000 square feet of non-residential uses in the unincorporated portion of the County. This increase in development would require new parking facilities and inadequate capacity if these facilities are not constructed. Potential loss of parking from roadway improvements in the southern portion of the County would not occur under this alternative.	Significant and Mitigable Under this alternative, between the year 2005 and 2030, it is projected that there would be an additional 3,885 dwelling units and 14,636,000 square feet of non-residential uses in the unincorporated portion of the County. This alternative also includes roadway improvements (proposed under the General Plan Update Circulation Element) that may result in the loss of existing parking at sites in the southern portion of the County.	Significant and Mitigable Under this alternative, between the year 2005 and 2030, it is projected that there would be an additional 3,885 dwelling units and 14,636,000 square feet of non-residential uses in the unincorporated portion of the County. This alternative also includes roadway improvements (proposed under the General Plan Update Circulation Element) that may result in the loss of existing parking at sites in the southern portion of the County.	Significant and Mitigable Under this alternative, between the year 2005 and 2030, it is projected that there would be an additional 1,951 dwelling units and 16,279,000 square feet of non-residential uses in the unincorporated portion of the County. This increase in development would require new parking facilities and inadequate capacity if these facilities are not constructed. Potential loss of parking from roadway improvements in the southern portion of the County would not occur under this alternative.	Significant and Mitigable Under this alternative, between the year 2005 and 2030, it is projected that there would be an additional 6,535 dwelling units and 19,574,000 square feet of non-residential uses in the unincorporated portion of the County. This alternative also includes roadway improvements (proposed under the General Plan Update Circulation Element) that may result in the loss of existing parking at sites in the southern portion of the County.
Biological Resources							
4.5.1 – Disturbance or Loss of Special-Status Plants and Animal Species	MM 4.5.1a - Biological resources evaluation MM 4.5.1b – Avoidance of impacts to special-status species MM 4.5.1c - Noxious Weed Ordinance (see page 4.5-62 and -63 of DEIR for full text of mitigation)	Significant and Mitigable The Preferred Plan contains a substantial number of policies related to protection of open space, wildlife habitat, and sensitive plant and animal species, although it would	Significant and Mitigable This alternative would result in a reduced extent of potential impact to special-status species and their associated habitats based on the analysis of potential urban/rural development and the fact that	Significant and Mitigable This alternative would include similar land disturbance from development (rural, urban and vineyard) as Alternative A, but would also include roadway improvements, extension of recycled water infrastructure, as	Significant and Mitigable This alternative would have similar impacts as Alternative B, but would also include potential expansion of the Angwin “bubble” as well the establishment of the RUL for the City of American Canyon.	Significant and Mitigable This alternative would result in the least impact given the reduced non-agricultural development potential associated with its land use map and that the AWOS designation would be split	Significant and Mitigable This alternative would be similar to Alternative B, but would also include potential expansion of the Angwin “bubble”, the establishment of the RUL for the City of American Canyon, further

Impact	Mitigation Measure	Preferred Plan Impact Summary	Alternative A Impact Summary	Alternative B Impact Summary	Alternative C Impact Summary	Alternative D Impact Summary	Alternative E Impact Summary
	measures)	not prohibit continued vineyard development, development of urban and rural uses, and roadway, infrastructure, and recreation improvements. The County estimates that up to an additional 12,500 acres of vineyards could be developed, resulting in additional conversions of forests, native and non-native grasslands, and other habitats to agricultural production. This alternative's impact would generally be within the range of impacts for alternatives B and C.	this alternative would not include roadway improvements identified for Alternatives B, C and E. However, Alternative A would experience continued vineyard development (up to 12,500 acres).	well as policy provisions for trails and public open space.		into two districts: AOS and WOS, with the latter including areas where policies would be developed to achieve greater forest protection, riparian habitat preservation, and water quality improvements than envisioned under the current General Plan. In addition, vineyard development would be restricted in sensitive biotic communities and reduced to 7,500 acres.	development allowed in the AWOS designation, and changes to County Code allowing for vineyard development on slopes up to 35% resulting in 15,000 acres of new vineyard development. This alternative would have the most severe impact of the alternatives considered.
4.5.2 – Loss of Sensitive Biotic Communities	MM 4.5.2a - Standards for mitigation of impacts to all sensitive biotic communities and oak woodlands MM 4.5.2b – Avoidance/mitigation of impacts to wetlands MM 4.5.2c – Stream setback requirements (see page 4.5-64 and -65 of DEIR for full text of mitigation measures)	Significant and Unavoidable The Preferred Plan contains a substantial number of policies related to protection of open space, wildlife habitat, and sensitive plant and animal species, although it would not prohibit continued vineyard development (up to 12,500 acres), development of urban and rural uses, and roadway, infrastructure, and recreation improvements.	Significant and Unavoidable This alternative would result in a reduced extent of potential impact to land cover types that could contain sensitive biotic communities as compared to Alternative C (approximately 300-acre reduction in impact). In addition, this alternative would avoid impacts associated with roadway, infrastructure and recreation improvements. However, this alternative would include impacts from vineyard development (up to 12,500 acres).	Significant and Unavoidable This alternative would result in a reduced extent of potential impact to land cover types that could contain sensitive biotic communities as compared to Alternative C (approximately 300 acre reduction in impact). However, this alternative would result impacts associated with roadway, infrastructure and recreation improvements. This alternative would include impacts from vineyard development (up to 12,500 acres).	Significant and Unavoidable This alternative would have similar impacts as Alternative B associated with development, public improvements and vineyard development, but would also include potential expansion of the Angwin “bubble” as well the establishment of the RUL for the City of American Canyon, which would result in greater impacts than Alternative B.	Significant and Mitigable This alternative would result in the least impact (of the alternatives under consideration) given the reduced non-agricultural development potential associated with its land use map and that the AWOS designation would be split into two districts: AOS and WOS, with the latter including areas where policies would be developed to achieve greater habitat protection and preservation, and water quality improvements than envisioned under the current General Plan. This alternative's impact would be reduced by policy provisions that would lead to zoning prohibiting timber conversions in Watershed Open Space areas and adoption of an oak woodland preservation ordinance (in combination with the mitigation measures identified). In addition, vineyard development would be restricted in sensitive biotic communities and	Significant and Unavoidable This alternative would be similar to Alternative C, but would also include further development allowed in the AWOS designation, and changes to County Code allowing for vineyard development on slopes up to 35% resulting in 15,000 acres of new vineyard development. This alternative would have the most severe impact of the alternatives considered.

1.0 EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

Impact	Mitigation Measure	Preferred Plan Impact Summary	Alternative A Impact Summary	Alternative B Impact Summary	Alternative C Impact Summary	Alternative D Impact Summary	Alternative E Impact Summary
						reduced to 7,500 acres.	
4.5.3 – Loss of Wildlife Movement and Plant Dispersal Opportunities	MM 4.5.3a – Retention of wildlife movement corridors MM 4.5.3b - Fencing requirements for vineyard development (see page 4.5-67 of DEIR for full text of mitigation measures and Section 4.0 of this document for minor modifications to MM 4.5.3b)	Significant and Mitigable The Preferred Plan would include substantial protections for significant natural resources, but could result in loss of wildlife movement and plant dispersal due to vineyard development (up to 12,500 acres), changes to the land use map, rural residential development, and roadway, infrastructure, and recreation improvements.	Significant and Mitigable This alternative would retain the existing land use designations under the current General Plan Land Use Map that would allow for additional urban, rural, and vineyard development (up to 12,500 acres of new vineyards). This development could contribute to direct and indirect impacts to wildlife movement and plant dispersal opportunities.	Significant and Mitigable This alternative would have similar urban, rural, and vineyard development impacts as Alternative A. However, this alternative includes roadway improvements, extension of recycled water, as well as policy provisions for trails and public open space that could further impact movement corridors.	Significant and Mitigable This alternative would be similar to Alternative B impacts, but would also include potential expansion of the Angwin “bubble” as well the establishment of the RUL for the City of American Canyon, which would result in greater impacts than Alternative B regarding wildlife movement.	Significant and Mitigable This alternative would result in the least impact to wildlife movement given the reduced non-agricultural development potential associated with its land use map and that the AWOS designation would be split into two districts: AOS and WOS, with the latter including areas where policies would be developed to achieve greater forest protection, riparian habitat preservation, and water quality improvements than envisioned under the current General Plan. In addition, vineyard development would be restricted in sensitive biotic communities and reduced to 7,500 acres.	Significant and Mitigable This alternative would be similar to Alternative C, but would also include further development allowed in the AWOS designation, and changes to County Code allowing for vineyard development on slopes up to 35% resulting in 15,000 acres of new vineyard development. This alternative would have the most severe impact to wildlife movement of the alternatives considered.
4.5.4 – Conflict with Biological Resource Plans, Ordinances, or Policies	Implementation of mitigation measures MM 4.5.1a through c, MM 4.5.2a through c, MM 4.6.5a through c, MM 4.11.2a and b, MM 4.11.3a and b, MM 4.11.4 and MM 4.11.5e. (see DEIR page references above and below for each of these mitigation measures)	Significant and Mitigable The Preferred Plan contains a substantial number of policies related to protection of open space, wildlife habitat, and sensitive plant and animal species, although it would not prohibit continued vineyard development, development of urban and rural uses, and roadway, infrastructure, and recreation improvements. The County estimates that up to an additional 12,500 acres of vineyards could be developed, resulting in additional conversions of forests, native and non-native grasslands, and other habitats to agricultural production.	Significant and Mitigable This alternative would result in a reduced extent of potential impact to special-status species and their associated habitats based on the analysis of potential urban/rural development and the fact that this alternative would not include roadway improvements identified for Alternatives B, C and E. However, Alternative A would experience continued vineyard development (up to 12,500 acres).	Significant and Mitigable This alternative would include similar land disturbance from development (rural, urban and vineyard) as Alternative A, but would also include roadway improvements, extension of recycled water infrastructure, as well as policy provisions for trails and public open space.	Significant and Mitigable This alternative would generally result in similar movement corridor impacts as Alternative B. However, this alternative would include the establishment of a new RUL for the City of American Canyon would include land areas within core areas associated with the California red-legged frog and the Tiburon paintbrush.	Significant and Mitigable This alternative would result in the least impact given the reduced non-agricultural development potential associated with its land use map and that the AWOS designation would be split into two districts: AOS and WOS, with the latter including areas where policies would be developed to achieve greater forest protection, riparian habitat preservation, and water quality improvements than envisioned under the current General Plan. In addition, vineyard development would be restricted in sensitive biotic communities and reduced to 7,500 acres.	Significant and Mitigable This alternative would be similar to Alternative C, but would also include further development allowed in the AWOS designation, and changes to County Code allowing for vineyard development on slopes up to 35% resulting in 15,000 acres of new vineyard development. This alternative would have the most severe impact of the alternatives considered.

Impact	Mitigation Measure	Preferred Plan Impact Summary	Alternative A Impact Summary	Alternative B Impact Summary	Alternative C Impact Summary	Alternative D Impact Summary	Alternative E Impact Summary
Fisheries							
4.6.1 – Sedimentation Impacts to Fisheries	MM 4.6.1a – Fishery Monitoring Program MM 4.6.1b – Restrictions for construction activities (see page 4.6-25 of DEIR for full text of mitigation measures)	Significant and Mitigable The Preferred Plan contains a substantial number of policies related to protection of water quality and fisheries, although it would not prohibit continued vineyard development (up to 12,500 acres), development of urban and rural uses, and roadway, infrastructure, and recreation improvements.	Significant and Mitigable This alternative would result in a reduced extent of impact based on the extent of potential urban/rural development and the fact that this alternative would not include roadway improvements identified for Alternatives B, C, and E. However, development under Alternative A would still contribute to soil erosion from development activities (including up to 12,500 acres of new vineyard development) and result in sediment/siltation of streams and rivers, though to a lesser extent than Alternatives B, C, and E.	Significant and Mitigable This alternative would include similar land disturbance from development (rural, urban and vineyard) as Alternative A, but would also include roadway improvements, extension of recycled water infrastructure, as well as policy provisions for trails and public open space. This development would result in sediment/siltation of streams and rivers.	Significant and Mitigable This alternative would be similar to Alternative B impacts, but would also include potential expansion of the Angwin “bubble” as well the establishment of the RUL for the City of American Canyon. This development could contribute to soil erosion from development activities described above and result in sediment/siltation of streams and rivers.	Significant and Mitigable This alternative would result in the least impact given the reduced non-agricultural development potential associated with its land use map and that the AWOS designation would be split into two districts: AOS and WOS, with the latter including areas where policies would be developed to achieve greater forest protection, riparian habitat preservation, and water quality improvements than envisioned under the current General Plan. In addition, vineyard development would be restricted in sensitive biotic communities and reduced to 7,500 acres.	Significant and Mitigable This alternative would be similar to Alternative C, but would also include further development allowed in the AWOS designation, and changes to County Code allowing for vineyard development on slopes up to 35% resulting in 15,000 acres of new vineyard development. This alternative would have the most severe impact of the alternatives considered.
4.6.2 – Other Water Quality Impacts to Fisheries	Implementation of mitigation measures MM 4.11.3b, MM 4.11.2a, MM 4.6.1a, and MM 4.11.4 (see DEIR page references above and below for each of these mitigation measures)	Significant and Mitigable The Preferred Plan contains a substantial number of policies related to protection of water quality and fisheries, although it would not prohibit continued vineyard development (up to 12,500 acres), development of urban and rural uses, and roadway, infrastructure, and recreation improvements.	Significant and Mitigable This alternative would result in a reduced extent of potential impact to fisheries from water quality impacts as a result of reduced development potential (as compared to Alternatives B, C, and E) and the fact that this alternative would not include roadway improvements identified for Alternatives B, C, and E. However, development under Alternative A would still result in water quality impacts from development activities (including up to 12,500 acres of vineyard development), though to a lesser extent than Alternatives B, C, and E.	Significant and Mitigable This alternative would include similar land disturbance from development (rural, urban and vineyard) as Alternative A, but would involve more extensive residential and non-residential development. This alternative also includes roadway improvements, extension of recycled water infrastructure, as well as policy provisions for trails and public open space. This development would contribute water quality impacts to streams and rivers.	Significant and Mitigable This alternative would be similar to Alternative B impacts, but would also include potential expansion of the Angwin “bubble” as well the establishment of the RUL for the City of American Canyon. This development would contribute water quality impacts to streams and rivers.	Significant and Mitigable This alternative would result in the least impact given the reduced non-agricultural development potential associated with its land use map and that the AWOS designation would be split into two districts: AOS and WOS, with the latter including areas where policies would be developed to achieve greater forest protection, riparian habitat preservation, and water quality improvements than envisioned under the current General Plan. In addition, vineyard development would be restricted in sensitive biotic communities and reduced to 7,500 acres.	Significant and Mitigable This alternative would be similar to Alternative C, but would also include further development allowed in the AWOS designation, and changes to County Code allowing for vineyard development on slopes up to 35% resulting in 15,000 acres of new vineyard development. This alternative would have the most severe impact of the alternatives considered.

1.0 EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

Impact	Mitigation Measure	Preferred Plan Impact Summary	Alternative A Impact Summary	Alternative B Impact Summary	Alternative C Impact Summary	Alternative D Impact Summary	Alternative E Impact Summary
4.6.3 – Hydrologic Alteration Impacts to Fisheries	Implementation of mitigation measures MM 4.11.3a, MM 4.11.3b, and MM 4.11.9 (see DEIR page references below for each of these mitigation measures)	Significant and Mitigable The Preferred Plan contains a substantial number of policies related to protection of water resources and fisheries, although it would not prohibit continued vineyard development (up to 12,500 acres), development of urban and rural uses, and roadway, infrastructure, and recreation improvements. These activities would result in drainage impacts from the alteration of drainage patterns and features that could impact fisheries and associated habitat in County waterways.	Significant and Mitigable This alternative would result in a reduced extent of potential impact to fisheries from water quality impacts as a result of reduced development potential (as compared to Alternatives B, C, and E) and the fact that this alternative would not include roadway improvements identified for Alternatives B, C, and E. However, development under Alternative A would still result in drainage impacts from the alteration of drainage patterns and features that could impact fisheries and associated habitat in County waterways.	Significant and Mitigable This alternative would include similar land disturbance from development (rural, urban and vineyard) as Alternative A, but would involve more extensive residential and non-residential development. This alternative also includes roadway improvements, extension of recycled water infrastructure, as well as policy provisions for trails and public open space. These activities would result in drainage impacts from the alteration of drainage patterns and features that could impact fisheries and associated habitat in County waterways.	Significant and Mitigable This alternative would be similar to Alternative B impacts, but would also include potential expansion of the Angwin “bubble” as well the establishment of the RUL for the City of American Canyon. These activities would result in drainage impacts from the alteration of drainage patterns and features that could impact fisheries and associated habitat in County waterways.	Significant and Mitigable This alternative would result in the least impact given the reduced non-agricultural development potential associated with its land use map and that the AWOS designation would be split into two districts: AOS and WOS, with the latter including areas where policies would be developed to achieve greater forest protection, riparian habitat preservation, and water quality improvements than envisioned under the current General Plan. In addition, vineyard development would be restricted in sensitive biotic communities and reduced to 7,500 acres.	Significant and Mitigable This alternative would be similar to Alternative C, but would also include further development allowed in the AWOS designation, and changes to County Code allowing for vineyard development on slopes up to 35% resulting in 15,000 acres of new vineyard development. This alternative would have the most severe drainage impact on fisheries of the alternatives considered.
4.6.4 – Groundwater Interactions With Surface Water Flows	Implementation of mitigation measures MM 4.11.5e and MM 4.11.4 (see DEIR page references below for each of these mitigation measures)	Significant and Mitigable The Preferred Plan contains a substantial number of policies related to protection of water resources and fisheries, although it would not prohibit continued vineyard development (up to 12,500 acres) and development of urban and rural uses. The Preferred Plan would include recycled water infrastructure that would provide additional water supply options. This development would contribute to further demand for groundwater supply that could impact surface water flows that provide habitat for fisheries.	Significant and Mitigable This alternative would result in a reduced extent of potential impact to fisheries from water quality impacts as a result of reduced development potential (as compared to Alternatives B, C, and E). However, development under Alternative A would still result in further demand for groundwater supply that could impact surface water flows that provide habitat for fisheries.	Significant and Mitigable This alternative would include similar land disturbance from development (rural, urban and vineyard) as Alternative A, but would involve more extensive residential and non-residential development. This alternative also includes recycled water infrastructure that would provide additional water supply options. This development would contribute to further demand for groundwater supply that could impact surface water flows that provide habitat for fisheries.	Significant and Mitigable This alternative would be similar to Alternative B impacts, but would also include potential expansion of the Angwin “bubble” as well the establishment of the RUL for the City of American Canyon. This development would contribute to further demand for groundwater supply that could impact surface water flows that provide habitat for fisheries.	Significant and Mitigable This alternative would result in the least impact given the reduced non-agricultural development potential associated with its land use map and that the AWOS designation would be split into two districts: AOS and WOS, with the latter including areas where policies would be developed to achieve greater forest protection, riparian habitat preservation, and water quality improvements than envisioned under the current General Plan. In addition, vineyard development would be restricted in sensitive biotic communities and reduced to 7,500 acres. Alternative D would also extend groundwater restrictions that currently apply in the MST area to other areas where groundwater deficiencies are thought to exist. Restrictions	Significant and Mitigable This alternative would be similar to Alternative C, but would also include further development allowed in the AWOS designation, and changes to County Code allowing for vineyard development on slopes up to 35% resulting in 15,000 acres of new vineyard development. This alternative would have the most severe groundwater/ surface impact on fisheries of the alternatives considered, as a result of having the highest water demand that would be primarily served by groundwater.

Impact	Mitigation Measure	Preferred Plan Impact Summary	Alternative A Impact Summary	Alternative B Impact Summary	Alternative C Impact Summary	Alternative D Impact Summary	Alternative E Impact Summary
						would effectively require “no net increase” in groundwater use associated with discretionary projects requiring County approval in these areas.	
4.6.5 – Direct Impacts to Habitat	<p>MM 4.6.5a – Protection of riparian vegetation and the restoration of historic riparian vegetation</p> <p>MM 4.6.5b - Standards for removal of gravel and restoration</p> <p>MM 4.6.5c – Construction restrictions in waterway containing special-status fish species habitat</p> <p>(see page 4.6-32 of DEIR for full text of mitigation measures and Section 4.0 of this document for minor modifications to MM 4.6.5c).</p>	<p>Significant and Mitigable</p> <p>The Preferred Plan contains a substantial number of policies related to protection of water resources and fisheries, although it would not prohibit continued vineyard development (up to 12,500 acres), development of urban and rural uses, and roadway, infrastructure, and recreation improvements. These activities could result in the loss of riparian habitat as well as loss of instream rearing habitat features.</p>	<p>Significant and Mitigable</p> <p>This alternative would result in a reduced extent of potential impact to fisheries from water quality impacts as a result of reduced development potential (as compared to Alternatives B, C, and E) and the fact that this alternative would not include roadway improvements identified for Alternatives B, C, and E. However, development under Alternative A could still result in the loss of riparian habitat as well as loss of instream rearing habitat features.</p>	<p>Significant and Mitigable</p> <p>This alternative would include similar land disturbance from development (rural, urban and vineyard) as Alternative A, but would involve more extensive residential and non-residential development. This alternative also includes roadway improvements, extension of recycled water infrastructure, as well as policy provisions for trails and public open space. These activities could result in the loss of riparian habitat as well as loss of instream rearing habitat features.</p>	<p>Significant and Mitigable</p> <p>This alternative would be similar to Alternative B impacts, but would also include potential expansion of the Angwin “bubble” as well the establishment of the RUL for the City of American Canyon. These activities could result in the loss of riparian habitat as well as loss of instream rearing habitat features.</p>	<p>Significant and Mitigable</p> <p>This alternative would result in the least impact given the reduced non-agricultural development potential associated with its land use map and that the AWOS designation would be split into two districts: AOS and WOS, with the latter including areas where policies would be developed to achieve greater forest protection, riparian habitat preservation, and water quality improvements than envisioned under the current General Plan. In addition, vineyard development would be restricted in sensitive biotic communities and reduced to 7,500 acres.</p>	<p>Significant and Mitigable</p> <p>This alternative would be similar to Alternative C, but would also include further development allowed in the AWOS designation, and changes to County Code allowing for vineyard development on slopes up to 35% resulting in 15,000 acres of new vineyard development. This alternative would have the most severe riparian habitat and instream rearing habitat impacts of the alternatives considered.</p>
4.6.6 – Interfere Substantially with Movement or Migratory Corridors	<p>MM 4.6.6 – Avoidance of impacts to bed and bank of waterways</p> <p>(see page 4.6-34 of DEIR for full text of mitigation measures)</p>	<p>Significant and Mitigable</p> <p>The Preferred Plan contains a substantial number of policies related to protection of water resources and fisheries, although it would not prohibit continued vineyard development (up to 12,500 acres), development of urban and rural uses, and roadway, infrastructure, and recreation improvements. These activities could result in the creation of barriers for fish passage.</p>	<p>Significant and Mitigable</p> <p>This alternative would result in a reduced extent of potential impact to fisheries from water quality impacts as a result of reduced development potential (as compared to Alternatives B, C, and E) and the fact that this alternative would not include roadway improvements identified for Alternatives B, C, and E. However, development under Alternative A could result in the creation of barriers for fish passage.</p>	<p>Significant and Mitigable</p> <p>This alternative would include similar land disturbance from development (rural, urban and vineyard) as Alternative A, but would involve more extensive residential and non-residential development. This alternative also includes roadway improvements, extension of recycled water infrastructure, as well as policy provisions for trails and public open space. These activities could result in the creation of barriers for fish passage.</p>	<p>Significant and Mitigable</p> <p>This alternative would be similar to Alternative B impacts, but would also include potential expansion of the Angwin “bubble” as well the establishment of the RUL for the City of American Canyon. These activities could result in the creation of barriers for fish passage.</p>	<p>Significant and Mitigable</p> <p>This alternative would result in the least impact given the reduced non-agricultural development potential associated with its land use map and that the AWOS designation would be split into two districts: AOS and WOS, with the latter including areas where policies would be developed to achieve greater forest protection, riparian habitat preservation, and water quality improvements than envisioned under the current General Plan. In addition, vineyard development would be restricted in sensitive biotic communities and reduced to 7,500 acres.</p>	<p>Significant and Mitigable</p> <p>This alternative would be similar to Alternative C, but would also include further development allowed in the AWOS designation, and changes to County Code allowing for vineyard development on slopes up to 35% resulting in 15,000 acres of new vineyard development. This alternative would have the potential to result in the impacts associated with the creation of barriers for fish passage.</p>

1.0 EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

Impact	Mitigation Measure	Preferred Plan Impact Summary	Alternative A Impact Summary	Alternative B Impact Summary	Alternative C Impact Summary	Alternative D Impact Summary	Alternative E Impact Summary
Noise							
4.7.1 – Noise and Land Use Compatibility	<p>MM 4.7.1a - Noise-related compatibility criteria</p> <p>MM 4.7.1b - Notification of agricultural-related noises</p> <p>MM 4.7.1c - Evaluation the potential for noise-related land use conflicts (Applies to the Preferred Plan, Alternative B, C, and E)</p> <p>(see page 4.7-25 and -26 of DEIR for full text of mitigation measures)</p>	<p>Significant and Mitigable</p> <p>The Preferred Plan would maintain the County’s general land use pattern that could place new noise sensitive land uses in areas that could exceed County noise standards. The Napa Pipe site and the Boca/Pacific Coast site would remain in industrial use and industrial zoning, and would be subject to further study (and require further General Plan amendments) before any non-industrial uses could be introduced that could conflict with County noise standards.</p>	<p>Significant and Mitigable</p> <p>This alternative would retain the existing land use pattern of the County and would not introduce any new land use conflict from current land use designations. However, development consistent with existing General Plan designations could place new noise sensitive land uses in areas that could exceed County noise standards.</p>	<p>Significant and Mitigable</p> <p>This alternative would result in the development of new residential uses that would occur in areas currently designated for residential use, similar to Alternative A. However, this alternative would also re-designate some areas to include residential land uses, as well as provide for expanded development opportunities for second units, and develop additional residences at the Pacific Coast/Boca site, which lie in proximity to the Syar Quarry, Imola Avenue and Soscol Avenue. In addition, some live/work units could be located at the Napa Pipe site, which is traversed by a freight railroad line with low operations.</p>	<p>Significant and Mitigable</p> <p>This alternative would be similar to Alternative B impacts, but would also include potential expansion of the Angwin “bubble” as well the establishment of the RUL for the City of American Canyon. This alternative would potentially expose new residents to local noise sources resulting in significant noise-related land use conflicts.</p>	<p>Significant and Mitigable</p> <p>This alternative would result in the least impact given its reduced residential development potential (1,951 new dwelling units) as compared to the alternatives evaluated.</p>	<p>Significant and Mitigable</p> <p>This alternative would be similar to Alternative C, but would also include further development allowed in the AWOS designation. This alternative would have the most severe noise impact as a result of this alternative having the highest residential development potential (6,535 new dwelling units).</p>
4.7.2 – New Development Exposure to Groundborne Vibration	<p>MM 4.7.2a - Vibration sensitive development mitigation</p> <p>MM 4.7.2b - Vibration sensitive development mitigation for Syar Quarry</p> <p>(Applies to the Preferred Plan, Alternative B, C, and E)</p> <p>(see page 4.7-27 of DEIR for full text of mitigation measures)</p>	<p>Significant and Mitigable</p> <p>The Preferred Plan would maintain the County’s general land use pattern that could place new noise sensitive land uses in areas that could placed adjacent in proximity to significant sources of groundborne vibrations. The Napa Pipe site and the Boca/Pacific Coast site would remain in industrial use and industrial zoning, and would be subject to further study (and require further General Plan amendments) before any non-industrial uses could be introduced that could conflict with County noise standards.</p>	<p>Less than Significant</p> <p>This alternative would not result in any new residential or vibration sensitive development in the vicinity of any known sources of groundborne vibration in the County, nor would they introduce any new sources of groundborne vibration, although cave excavation could occur, as it has in the past, in association with winery development in dispersed locations throughout agricultural areas of the County. Cave excavation is a temporary (rather than ambient) source of vibration.</p>	<p>Significant and Mitigable</p> <p>This alternative would generally not place new residential or vibration sensitive development in the vicinity of any known sources of groundborne vibration in the County. However, potential development of residential uses associated with the Napa Pipe site would be developed adjacent to an existing railroad line, while the Pacific Coast/Boca site is adjacent to the Syar Quarry (both potential sources of vibration). The only significant source of ground vibration associated with quarry activities is blasting, which has the potential to generate levels of vibration that would be perceptible to adjacent vibration sensitive uses.</p>	<p>Significant and Mitigable</p> <p>This alternative would be similar to Alternative B impacts, but would also include potential expansion of the Angwin “bubble” as well the establishment of the RUL for the City of American Canyon.</p>	<p>Less than Significant</p> <p>This alternative would not result in any new residential or vibration sensitive development in the vicinity of any known sources of groundborne vibration in the County, nor would they introduce any new sources of groundborne vibration, although cave excavation could occur, as it has in the past, in association with winery development in dispersed locations throughout agricultural areas of the County. Cave excavation is a temporary (rather than ambient) source of vibration.</p>	<p>Significant and Mitigable</p> <p>This alternative would be similar to Alternative C, but would also include further development allowed in the AWOS designation. This alternative would have the most severe vibration impact as a result of this alternative having the highest residential development potential (6,535 new dwelling units).</p>

Impact	Mitigation Measure	Preferred Plan Impact Summary	Alternative A Impact Summary	Alternative B Impact Summary	Alternative C Impact Summary	Alternative D Impact Summary	Alternative E Impact Summary
4.7.3 – Project-Generated Traffic Noise Volume Increases	Implementation of mitigation measures MM 4.7.1a and MM 4.7.4	Significant and Unavoidable Many projected traffic noise increases would occur whether or not the update of the General Plan occurs, since they are attributable to increases in traffic volumes that would occur even if there are no substantive changes in General Plan policy. The Preferred Plan together with anticipated growth of the incorporated cities and regional traffic growth would result in traffic noise increases ranging from 1 dB to 13 dB on County roadways over existing conditions and would likely exceed County noise standards on 27 to 29 roadway segments (similar to Alternatives A and B).	Significant and Unavoidable This alternative would significantly impact the least number of roadway segments of the three alternatives evaluated. This alternative together with anticipated growth of the incorporated cities and regional traffic growth would result in traffic noise increases ranging from 1 dB to 13 dB on County roadways over existing conditions. These increased traffic noise levels would exceed current County General Plan and Noise Ordinance standards and/or result in a substantial increase in existing noise traffic noise levels on 27 roadway segments.	Significant and Unavoidable Similar to Alternative A, the anticipated traffic noise increase from this alternative would range from 1 dB to 13 dB on County roadways over existing conditions. This alternative (along with associated growth of the incorporated cities and regional traffic growth) would significantly impact 28 roadway segments without the proposed General Plan Update Circulation Element roadway improvements and 29 roadway segments with these improvements.	Significant and Unavoidable Similar to Alternative A, the anticipated traffic noise increase under this alternative would range from 1 dB to 13 dB on County roadways over existing conditions. This alternative (along with associated growth of the incorporated cities and regional traffic growth) would significantly impact 27 roadway segments without the proposed General Plan Update Circulation Element roadway improvements and 30 roadway segments with these improvements.	Significant and Unavoidable This alternative would have the least impact, given that its traffic generation would be the lowest of the alternatives considered. This alternative together with anticipated growth of the incorporated cities and regional traffic growth would result in traffic noise increases ranging from 1 dB to 13 dB on County roadways over existing conditions. These increased traffic noise levels would exceed current County General Plan and Noise Ordinance standards and/or could result in a substantial increase in existing noise traffic noise levels on 27 roadway segments.	Significant and Unavoidable This alternative would be similar to Alternative C, but would also include further development allowed in the AWOS designation. This alternative (along with associated growth of the incorporated cities and regional traffic growth) would significantly impact 32 roadway segments, which would be the most severe of the alternatives evaluated.
4.7.4 – Roadway Improvement Impacts to Noise-Sensitive Uses	MM 4.7.4 - Requirement of noise analysis for roadway improvement projects (see page 4.7-34 of DEIR for full text of mitigation measures)	Significant and Unavoidable The Preferred Plan would include all of the transportation improvements summarized on p. 4.4-30 and in Table 4.4-16. These improvements, which include widening of Jamieson Canyon (State Route 12) to four lanes and the extension of Newell/Flosden Road, could result in additional noise increase to occur as traffic is moved closer to existing noise-sensitive uses. The Preferred Plan would affect the seven residences noted for Alternative B that are in close proximity to State Route 12 (Jamieson Canyon) that would be exposed to further traffic noise increases from potential placement of the roadway	Less than Significant This alternative would not include these roadway improvements that could improve impacts to noise-sensitive land uses.	Significant and Unavoidable This alternative includes roadway improvements such as widening of Jamieson Canyon to four lanes and extension of Newell/Flosden Road to Green Island Road. There are approximately seven residences in close proximity to State Route 12 in Jamieson Canyon that would be exposed to further traffic noise increases from potential placement of the roadway in closer proximity (in addition to the traffic noise increases expected from year 2030 traffic volumes).	Significant and Unavoidable This alternative would result in the same impact as Alternative B.	Less than Significant This alternative would not include these roadway improvements that could improve impacts noise-sensitive land uses.	Significant and Unavoidable This alternative would result in the same impact as Alternative B, as well as improvements to SR 29 between St. Helena and Calistoga.

1.0 EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

Impact	Mitigation Measure	Preferred Plan Impact Summary	Alternative A Impact Summary	Alternative B Impact Summary	Alternative C Impact Summary	Alternative D Impact Summary	Alternative E Impact Summary
		(in addition to the traffic noise increases expected from year 2030 traffic volumes).					
4.7.5 – Project-Generated Non-Transportation Noise Sources	None required	Less than Significant The Preferred Plan may result in new industrial, commercial and agricultural lands that could expose existing residences to increased noise levels. However, provisions under the County Noise Ordinance and Right-to-Farm Ordinance would adequately address such issues.	Less than Significant This alternative would retain current land use designations and patterns set forth in the current General Plan. Subsequent development would result in the development and operation of new agricultural, commercial and industrial uses that could become substantial new stationary noise sources and impact existing residential and other noise-sensitive land uses. However, provisions under the County Noise Ordinance and Right-to-Farm Ordinance would adequately address such issues.	Less than Significant This alternative would retain current land use designations and patterns set forth in the current General Plan that could result in the development and operation of new agricultural, commercial and industrial uses that could become substantial new stationary noise sources. However, provisions under the County Noise Ordinance and Right-to-Farm Ordinance would adequately address such issues.	Less than Significant While this alternative would consist of more non-residential development potential than Alternative B, it would result in a similar impact.	Less than Significant Subsequent development under this alternative could result in the development and operation of new agricultural, commercial and industrial uses that could become substantial new stationary noise sources and impact existing residential and other noise-sensitive land uses. However, provisions under the County Noise Ordinance and Right-to-Farm Ordinance would adequately address such issues.	Less than Significant This alternative would consist of most non-residential development of the alternatives evaluated (19,574,000 square feet) that could result in new stationary noise sources. However, provisions under the County Noise Ordinance and Right-to-Farm Ordinance would adequately address such issues.
4.7.6 – Project-Generated Construction Noise	None required	Less than Significant The Preferred Plan would result in new development activity that would generate construction noise that could temporarily impact noise-sensitive land uses. However, implementation of the County Noise Ordinance would limit construction activities to daytime hours and limit noise levels.	Less than Significant While this alternative would generate temporary construction noise from development, the Napa County Noise Ordinance specifies noise limits for construction activities and limits construction to daytime hours, which avoids temporary noise conflicts with noise-sensitive land uses.	Less than Significant While this alternative would provide for additional development potential beyond Alternative A, it would have a similar impact as Alternative A.	Less than Significant While this alternative would provide for additional development potential beyond Alternative A and B, it would have a similar impact as Alternatives A and B.	Less than Significant This alternative would likely generate the least amount of temporary construction noise as a result of its reduced development potential. However, impacts and implementation of the County Noise Ordinance would address this impact.	Less than Significant This alternative would result in the most amount of temporary construction noise as a result of its development being the highest of the alternatives evaluated. However, impacts and implementation of the County Noise Ordinance would address this impact.
4.7.7 – Noise and Land Use Compatibility (Aircraft)	MM 4.7.7 - Aviation Easements (see page 4.7-38 of DEIR for full text of mitigation measures)	Significant and Mitigable Under the Preferred Plan, 300 of the 800 acres available for development in the Airport Industrial Area would be available for annexation to the City of	Significant and Mitigable This alternative would retain current land use designations and patterns set forth in the current General Plan. Near Angwin-Virgil O Parrett Field in Angwin, there are parcels	Significant and Mitigable This alternative could result in similar noise compatibility issues with aircraft operations at Angwin-Virgil O Parrett Field as Alternative A.	Significant and Mitigable This alternative could result in similar noise compatibility issues with aircraft operations at Angwin-Virgil O Parrett Field as Alternatives A and B. In addition, potential urban development within the expanded	Significant and Mitigable This alternative could result in similar noise compatibility issues with aircraft operations at Angwin-Virgil O Parrett Field as Alternative A and B.	Significant and Mitigable This alternative could result in similar noise compatibility issues with aircraft operations at Angwin-Virgil O Parrett Field as Alternative A and B. In addition, potential urban

Impact	Mitigation Measure	Preferred Plan Impact Summary	Alternative A Impact Summary	Alternative B Impact Summary	Alternative C Impact Summary	Alternative D Impact Summary	Alternative E Impact Summary
		American Canyon. Near Angwin-Virgil O Parrett Field in Angwin, there are parcels within the proximity of the airport that would permit residential uses (one house per parcel plus a second unit), although they are within land use compatibility zones that would normally preclude residential use. Future residential uses could also be exposed to noise impacts from single event noise from individual aircraft	within proximity of the airport that would permit residential uses (one house per parcel plus a second unit), even though they are within land use compatibility zones that would normally preclude residential use. No potential noise conflicts with the Napa County Airport would occur under this alternative.		City of American Canyon RUL could result in conflicts with the Napa County Airport Land Use Compatibility Plan; however, the potential extent of this impact is not known given the uncertainty of the future mix of land use.		development within the expanded City of American Canyon RUL could result in conflicts with the Napa County Airport Land Use Compatibility Plan; however, the potential extent of this impact is not known given the uncertainty of the future mix of land use.
Air Quality							
4.8.1 – Consistency with Air Quality Regulations	MM 4.8.1a – Incentives for energy efficient forms of transportation MM 4.8.1b - Support for stringent tailpipe emissions standards MM 4.8.1c – Evaluation of potential project-specific air quality impacts MM 4.8.1d - Standards for emission standards for County vehicles (see pages 4.8-22 and -23 of DEIR for full text of mitigation measures)	Significant and Unavoidable and The Preferred Plan is projected to result in 2,935 new dwelling units between the year 2005 and 2030, which would exceed ABAG growth projections. The increase in vehicle miles traveled under the Preferred Plan would range between Alternative A and B (129 to 158% increase) by year 2030. This would exceed MTC projection of 42%.	Significant and Unavoidable This alternative would retain current land use designations and patterns set forth in the current General Plan and would not include roadway improvements in the southern portion of the County. However, this growth would still exceed ABAG projections and increase vehicle miles traveled by 145% by year 2030. This would exceed MTC projection of 42%.	Significant and Unavoidable This alternative would allow development in areas currently designated for urban and rural use similar to Alternative A. However, this alternative would also re-designate some areas to include residential land uses, as well as provide for expanded development opportunities for second units, and develop additional residences at the Pacific Coast/Boca and Napa Pipe sites. This alternative would also include potential roadway improvements in the southern portion of the County. This alternative would exceed ABAG growth projections. The increase in vehicle miles traveled under this alternative (129 to 158%) by year 2030 would exceed MTC projection of 42%.	Significant and Unavoidable This alternative would allow development and roadway improvements similar to Alternative B. However, this alternative would also include more residential development, expansion of the bubble in Angwin and establishment of the RUL for the City of American Canyon. This alternative would exceed ABAG growth projections. The increase in vehicle miles traveled under this alternative (135 to 168%) by year 2030 would exceed MTC projection of 42%. This alternative would have the greatest impact of the alternatives evaluated.	Significant and Unavoidable This alternative would likely result in the least extent of conflict as a result of its reduced development potential. However, this alternative would exceed ABAG growth projections. The increase in vehicle miles traveled under this alternative is anticipated to be similar to Alternative A (145%) by year 2030 would exceed MTC projection of 42%.	Significant and Unavoidable This alternative would result in similar impacts as Alternative C, given its exceedance of ABAG growth projections and increase in vehicle miles traveled (162%) by year 2030 that would exceed MTC projection of 42%.
4.8.2 – Conflicts with Particulate Matter Attainment Efforts	MM 4.8.2 – Reduction of PM mitigation Implementation of MM 4.8.1a and c (see pages 4.8-22 through -26 of DEIR for full text of	Significant and Unavoidable and The Preferred Plan would result in 2,935 new dwelling units by 2030, which would be a total of 12,579 dwelling units in the Unincorporated County area. The PM ₁₀ average	Significant and Unavoidable PM10 emissions under this alternative would be for annual emissions: 0.21 tons/day, and the average winter day emissions would be approximately 0.92 tons/day.	Significant and Unavoidable PM10 emissions under this alternative would be for annual emissions: 0.24 tons/day, and the average winter day emissions would be approximately 1.05 tons/day.	Significant and Unavoidable PM10 emissions under this alternative would be for annual emissions: 0.30 tons/day, and the average winter day emissions would be approximately 1.34 tons/day. This alternative would have the most severe impact of the alternatives	Significant and Unavoidable PM10 emissions under this alternative would be for annual emissions: 0.20 tons/day, and the average winter day emissions would be approximately 0.90 tons/day. This alternative would have the least impact	Significant and Unavoidable PM10 emissions under this alternative would be for annual emissions: 0.28 tons/day, and the average winter day emissions would be approximately 1.25 tons/day.

1.0 EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

Impact	Mitigation Measure	Preferred Plan Impact Summary	Alternative A Impact Summary	Alternative B Impact Summary	Alternative C Impact Summary	Alternative D Impact Summary	Alternative E Impact Summary
	mitigation measures)	annual emissions would be 0.21 tons/day, which is the same as Alternative A. Additionally, the average winter day emissions would be approximately 0.96 tons/day, which is slightly more than Alternative A.				considered.	of the alternatives considered.
4.8.3 – Short-Term Emissions from Grading and Construction	<p>MM 4.8.3a – Dust control measures</p> <p>MM 4.8.3b – Demolition requirements for lead and asbestos</p> <p>MM 4.8.3c – Mapping of naturally occurring asbestos and mitigation in such areas</p> <p>MM 4.8.3d – Construction emission control measures</p> <p>(see pages 4.8-28 through -30 of DEIR for full text of mitigation measures)</p>	<p>Significant and Mitigable</p> <p>The Preferred Plan would allow continued vineyard development (up to 12,500 acres), development of urban and rural uses, and roadway, infrastructure, and recreation improvements.</p>	<p>Significant and Mitigable</p> <p>This alternative would result in a reduced extent of potential impact based on the analysis of potential urban/rural development and the fact that this alternative would not include roadway improvements identified for Alternatives B, C and E. However, Alternative A would experience continued vineyard development (up to 12,500 acres).</p>	<p>Significant and Mitigable</p> <p>This alternative would include similar land disturbance from development (rural, urban and vineyard) as Alternative A, but would also include re-development of the Napa Pipe, Pacific Coast/Boca, County-owned sites, roadway improvements, extension of recycled water infrastructure, as well as policy provisions for trails and public open space.</p>	<p>Significant and Mitigable</p> <p>This alternative would have similar impacts as Alternative B, but would also include potential expansion of the Angwin “bubble” as well the establishment of the RUL for the City of American Canyon.</p>	<p>Significant and Mitigable</p> <p>This alternative would result in the least impact given the reduced non-agricultural development potential associated with its land use map and that the AWOS designation would be split into two districts: AOS and WOS, with the latter including areas where policies would be developed to achieve greater forest protection, riparian habitat preservation, and water quality improvements than envisioned under the current General Plan. In addition, vineyard development would be restricted in sensitive biotic communities and reduced to 7,500 acres.</p>	<p>Significant and Mitigable</p> <p>This alternative would be similar to Alternative B, but would also include potential expansion of the Angwin “bubble”, the establishment of the RUL for the City of American Canyon, further development allowed in the AWOS designation, and changes to County Code allowing for vineyard development on slopes up to 35% resulting in 15,000 acres of new vineyard development. This alternative would have the most severe impact of the alternatives considered.</p>
4.8.4 – Odors	<p>MM 4.8.4 – Buffer and control requirements for odor.</p> <p>(see page 4.8-31 of DEIR for full text of mitigation measure)</p>	<p>Significant and Mitigable</p> <p>The Preferred Plan may result in existing and new sensitive receptors to odors from industrial, commercial and agricultural operations. However, provisions under the County Noise Ordinance and Right-to-Farm Ordinance would address agricultural odor issues.</p>	<p>Significant and Mitigable</p> <p>This alternative would retain current land use designations and patterns set forth in the current General Plan. Subsequent development could result in existing and new sensitive receptors to odors from industrial, commercial and agricultural operations. However, provisions under the County Noise Ordinance and Right-to-Farm Ordinance would address agricultural odor issues.</p>	<p>Significant and Mitigable</p> <p>This alternative would retain current land use designations and patterns set forth in the current General Plan as well as provide for further development and placement of residential uses in existing industrial areas (Napa Pipe and Pacific Coast/Boca). Subsequent development could result in existing and new sensitive receptors to odors from industrial, commercial and agricultural operations. However, provisions under the County Noise Ordinance and Right-to-Farm Ordinance would address agricultural odor issues.</p>	<p>Significant and Mitigable</p> <p>While this alternative would consist of more development potential than Alternative B, it would result in a similar impact.</p>	<p>Significant and Mitigable</p> <p>Subsequent development under this alternative (though less intense than the other alternatives evaluated in the Drat EIR) could result in existing and new sensitive receptors to odors from industrial, commercial and agricultural operations. However, provisions under the County Noise Ordinance and Right-to-Farm Ordinance would address agricultural odor issues.</p>	<p>Significant and Mitigable</p> <p>This alternative would consist of most non-residential development of the alternatives evaluated (19,574,000 square feet) that could expose existing and new sensitive receptors to odors. However, provisions under the County Noise Ordinance and Right-to-Farm Ordinance would address agricultural odor issues.</p>

Impact	Mitigation Measure	Preferred Plan Impact Summary	Alternative A Impact Summary	Alternative B Impact Summary	Alternative C Impact Summary	Alternative D Impact Summary	Alternative E Impact Summary
4.8.5 – Exposure to Air Toxic Contaminants	MM 4.8.5 – Buffer and mitigation requirements for Toxic Air Contaminants (TAC's) (see pages 4.8-32 and -33 of DEIR for full text of mitigation measure)	Significant and Unavoidable The Preferred Plan may result in existing and new sensitive receptors to TAC from industrial, commercial and agricultural operations. This impact could especially occur associated with the expansion of state highways in the County (e.g., State Route 12 to four lanes in Jamieson Canyon).	Significant and Mitigable This alternative would retain current land use designations and patterns set forth in the current General Plan. Subsequent development could result in existing and new sensitive receptors to TACs from industrial, commercial and agricultural operations. However, this alternative would avoid TAC exposure issues associated with roadway improvements in the southern portion of the County.	Significant and Unavoidable This alternative would retain current land use designations and patterns set forth in the current General Plan as well as provide for further development and placement of residential uses in existing industrial areas (Napa Pipe and Pacific Coast/Boca). Subsequent development could result in existing and new sensitive receptors to TACs from industrial, commercial and agricultural operations. This impact could especially occur associated with the expansion of state highways in the County (e.g., State Route 12 to four lanes in Jamieson Canyon).	Significant and Unavoidable While this alternative would consist of more development potential than Alternative B, it would result in a similar impact.	Significant and Mitigable Subsequent development under this alternative (though less intense than the other alternatives evaluated in the Drat EIR) could result in existing and new sensitive receptors to TACs from industrial, commercial and agricultural operations. However, this alternative would avoid TAC exposure issues associated with roadway improvements in the southern portion of the County.	Significant and Unavoidable This alternative would consist of most non-residential development of the alternatives evaluated (19,574,000 square feet) that could expose existing and new sensitive receptors to TACs. This impact could especially occur associated with the expansion of state highways in the County (e.g., State Route 12 to four lanes in Jamieson Canyon).
4.8.6 – Carbon Monoxide Concentrations along Roadways	None required	Less than Significant The Preferred Plan would result in increased development and traffic in the County that would generate CO emissions. The Preferred Plan is anticipated to result in CO 8-hour concentrations to range from 2.6 to 3.4 parts per million (range between Alternatives A and B), which would not exceed the 1-hour or 8-hour carbon monoxide standards of NAAQS or CAAQS.	Less than Significant Under this alternative, carbon monoxide concentrations along major roadways would range from 2.6 to 3.0 parts per million and not exceed the 1-hour or 8-hour carbon monoxide standards of NAAQS or CAAQS.	Less than Significant Under this alternative, carbon monoxide concentrations along major roadways would range from 2.6 to 3.4 parts per million and would not exceed the 1-hour or 8-hour carbon monoxide standards of NAAQS or CAAQS.	Less than Significant Under this alternative, carbon monoxide concentrations along major roadways would range from 2.6 to 3.4 parts per million and would not exceed the 1-hour or 8-hour carbon monoxide standards of NAAQS or CAAQS.	Less than Significant This alternative would likely have the least impact given its reduced development potential. Under this alternative, carbon monoxide concentrations along major roadways are expected to range from 2.6 to 3.0 parts per million (similar to Alternative A) and not exceed the 1-hour or 8-hour carbon monoxide standards of NAAQS or CAAQS.	Less than Significant This alternative would result in the most substantial extent of development of the alternatives evaluated. Under this alternative, carbon monoxide concentrations along major roadways are expected to range from 2.6 to 3.4 parts per million (similar to Alternative C) and would not exceed the 1-hour or 8-hour carbon monoxide standards of NAAQS or CAAQS.

1.0 EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

Impact	Mitigation Measure	Preferred Plan Impact Summary	Alternative A Impact Summary	Alternative B Impact Summary	Alternative C Impact Summary	Alternative D Impact Summary	Alternative E Impact Summary
4.8.7 – Potential Increase in Long-Term Atmospheric Greenhouse Gas Emissions	MM 4.8.7a – Greenhouse Gas Emissions Inventory and Reductions. Implementation of mitigation measures MM 4.8.1a through d (see page 4.8-38 of DEIR for full text of mitigation measure)	Significant and Unavoidable The Preferred Plan is projected to generate transportation CO ₂ emissions ranging from 380,459 to 412,952 metric tons annually (between 2005 and 2030), 56,939 metric tons annually of greenhouse gas (GHG) emissions from residential development (between 2005 and 2030) and 131,978 metric tons annually from non-residential uses.	Significant and Unavoidable This alternative is projected to generate 380,459 metric tons annually in transportation CO ₂ emissions, 43,392 metric tons annually of greenhouse gas (GHG) emissions from residential development (between 2005 and 2030) and 162,473 metric tons annually from non-residential uses.	Significant and Unavoidable This alternative is projected to generate 412,952 metric tons annually in transportation CO ₂ emissions, 75,426 metric tons annually of greenhouse gas (GHG) emissions from residential development (between 2005 and 2030) and 153,725 metric tons annually from non-residential uses.	Significant and Unavoidable This alternative is projected to generate 439,559 metric tons annually in transportation CO ₂ emissions, 148,231 metric tons annually of greenhouse gas (GHG) emissions from residential development (between 2005 and 2030) and 143,278 metric tons annually from non-residential uses.	Significant and Unavoidable This alternative is projected to generate approximately 380,459 metric tons annually in transportation CO ₂ emissions (similar to Alternative A), 37,878 metric tons annually of greenhouse gas (GHG) emissions from residential development (between 2005 and 2030) and 164,155 metric tons annually from non-residential uses. This alternative would have the least severe impact of the alternatives evaluated.	Significant and Unavoidable This alternative is projected to generate 424,419 metric tons annually in transportation CO ₂ emissions, 126,875 metric tons annually of greenhouse gas (GHG) emissions from residential development (between 2005 and 2030) and 185,070 metric tons annually from non-residential uses. This alternative would have the most severe impact of the alternatives evaluated.
Human Health/Risk of Upset							
4.9.1 – Routine Transport of Hazardous Materials	None required	Less than Significant The Preferred Plan may result in an increase in the transportation of hazardous materials from industrial, commercial and agricultural operations. This impact could result in changes in hauling routes with expansion of state highways in the County (e.g., State Route 12 to four lanes in Jamieson Canyon). The transportation of hazardous materials on area roadways is regulated by the California Highway Patrol, U.S. Department of Transportation (Hazardous Materials Transportation Act) and Caltrans, and use of these materials is regulated by the DTSC (22 Cal. Code Regs §§ 66001, et seq.).	Less than Significant This alternative may result in an increase in the transportation of hazardous materials from industrial, commercial and agricultural operations. The transportation of hazardous materials on area roadways is regulated by the California Highway Patrol, U.S. Department of Transportation (Hazardous Materials Transportation Act) and Caltrans, and use of these materials is regulated by the DTSC (22 Cal. Code Regs §§ 66001, et seq.).	Less than Significant This alternative may result in an increase in the transportation of hazardous materials from industrial, commercial and agricultural operations. This impact could result in changes in hauling routes with expansion of state highways in the County (e.g., State Route 12 to four lanes in Jamieson Canyon). The transportation of hazardous materials on area roadways is regulated by the California Highway Patrol, U.S. Department of Transportation (Hazardous Materials Transportation Act) and Caltrans, and use of these materials is regulated by the DTSC (22 Cal. Code Regs §§ 66001, et seq.).	Less than Significant This alternative would result in similar impacts as Alternative B., given its similarity in development pattern and roadway improvements.	Less than Significant This alternative may result in an increase in the transportation of hazardous materials from industrial, commercial and agricultural operations. The transportation of hazardous materials on area roadways is regulated by the California Highway Patrol, U.S. Department of Transportation (Hazardous Materials Transportation Act) and Caltrans, and use of these materials is regulated by the DTSC (22 Cal. Code Regs §§ 66001, et seq.).	Less than Significant This alternative would consist of most non-residential development of the alternatives evaluated (19,574,000 square feet) that may result in an increase in the transportation of hazardous materials from industrial, commercial and agricultural operations. This impact could result in changes in hauling routes with expansion of state highways in the County (e.g., State Route 12 to four lanes in Jamieson Canyon). The transportation of hazardous materials on area roadways is regulated by the California Highway Patrol, U.S. Department of Transportation (Hazardous Materials Transportation Act) and Caltrans, and use of these materials is regulated by the DTSC (22 Cal. Code Regs §§ 66001, et seq.).

Impact	Mitigation Measure	Preferred Plan Impact Summary	Alternative A Impact Summary	Alternative B Impact Summary	Alternative C Impact Summary	Alternative D Impact Summary	Alternative E Impact Summary
4.9.2 – Release and Exposure to Hazardous Materials	MM 4.9.2 – Review of development projects for known and unknown hazardous materials and remediation (see page 4.9-25 of DEIR for full text of mitigation measure)	Significant and Mitigable The Preferred Plan may result in existing and new sensitive receptors to be exposed to hazardous materials from residential, industrial, commercial, recreation and agricultural development, as well as infrastructure improvements (recycled water and roadway improvements in the southern portion of the County.	Significant and Mitigable This alternative would retain current land use designations and patterns set forth in the current General Plan. Subsequent development could result in existing and new sensitive receptors to be exposed to hazardous materials from residential, industrial, commercial, recreation and agricultural development. However, this alternative would avoid potential exposure issues associated with roadway and recycle water improvements in the southern portion of the County.	Significant and Mitigable This alternative would retain current land use designations and patterns set forth in the current General Plan as well as provide for further development and placement of residential uses in existing industrial areas (Napa Pipe and Pacific Coast/Boca). Subsequent development could result in existing and new sensitive receptors to be exposed to hazardous materials from residential, industrial, commercial, recreation and agricultural development. This impact could also occur associated with roadway and recycle water improvements in the southern portion of the County.	Significant and Mitigable This alternative would have similar impacts as Alternative B, but would also include potential expansion of the Angwin “bubble” as well the establishment of the RUL for the City of American Canyon.	Significant and Mitigable This alternative would result in the least impact given the reduced non-agricultural development potential associated with its land use map and that the AWOS designation would be split into two districts: AOS and WOS, with the latter including areas where policies would be developed to achieve greater forest protection, riparian habitat preservation, and water quality improvements than envisioned under the current General Plan. In addition, vineyard development would be restricted in sensitive biotic communities and reduced to 7,500 acres.	Significant and Mitigable This alternative would be similar to Alternative B, but would also include potential expansion of the Angwin “bubble”, the establishment of the RUL for the City of American Canyon, further development allowed in the AWOS designation, and changes to County Code allowing for vineyard development on slopes up to 35% resulting in 15,000 acres of new vineyard development. This alternative would have the most severe impact of the alternatives considered.
4.9.3 – Airport Hazards	Implementation of mitigation measure MM 4.2.2 (Applies to the Preferred Plan, Alternatives B, C, and E) (see Mitigation Measure MM 4.2.2 reference above)	Significant and Mitigable The Preferred Plan alternative would allow development to proceed under the existing 1983 General Plan, with the exception of the establishment of a new RUL for the City of American Canyon and the expansion of rural and urban uses in the unincorporated community of Angwin. Urban development within the expanded City of American Canyon RUL could result in conflicts with the Napa County Airport; however, the potential extent of this impact is not known given the uncertainty of the future mix of land uses.	Less than Significant This alternative would allow development to proceed under the existing 1983 General Plan. Planned growth would occur in already developed areas consistent with all existing adopted plans and policies. Thus, this alternative would not introduce new land uses or designations within the vicinity of Napa County Airport, Angwin-Parrett Field Airport or other private airstrips that would conflict with current County provisions that protect airports and would not result in new safety conflicts.	Significant and Mitigable This alternative would result development of residential uses at the Napa Pipe site, which could potentially conflict with the Napa County Airport Land Use Compatibility Plan.	Significant and Mitigable This alternative would have a similar land use map as Alternative B, with the exception of an increased development potential of the Napa Pipe site (an additional 2,500 dwelling units), expansion of the Angwin bubble and establishment of a new RUL for the City of American Canyon.	Less than Significant This alternative would not introduce new land uses or designations within the vicinity of Napa County Airport, Angwin-Parrett Field Airport or other private airstrips that would conflict with current County provisions that protect airports and would not result in new safety conflicts.	Significant and Mitigable This alternative would result in expansion of the Angwin bubble and establishment of a new RUL for the City of American Canyon that could conflict with airport operations.

1.0 EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

Impact	Mitigation Measure	Preferred Plan Impact Summary	Alternative A Impact Summary	Alternative B Impact Summary	Alternative C Impact Summary	Alternative D Impact Summary	Alternative E Impact Summary
4.9.4 – Interference with an Adopted Emergency Response or Evacuation Plan	MM 4.9.4 – Mitigation for adequate emergency access (Applies to the Preferred Plan, Alternative B, C, and E) (see page 4.9-31 of DEIR for full text of mitigation measure)	Significant and Mitigable The Preferred Plan would allow for additional expansion of urban/rural development within the unincorporated community of Angwin as well as the establishment of an RUL for the City of American Canyon. This intensification of growth could result in conflicts in emergency response.	Less than Significant This alternative would allow development to proceed under the existing 1983 General Plan and would not result in any substantial changes growth patterns or residential densities that would conflict with emergency response. The Napa OAHMP is a comprehensive mitigation plan that would cover any new development that could occur under this alternative.	Significant and Mitigable This alternative would have a similar land use pattern as Alternative A. However, this alternative would redesignate County sites adjacent (Napa Pipe and Pacific Coast/Boca sites) and within the City of Napa for mixed uses as well as residential development at densities higher than Alternative A. Additional expansion of urban/rural development could also occur within the unincorporated community of Angwin. This intensification of growth could result in conflicts in emergency response at these locations. This alternative would provide improvements to the County's roadway system in the southern portion of the County that could improve the ability to respond to emergencies as well as evacuate people.	Significant and Mitigable This alternative includes all the potential development and General Plan Update proposed roadway improvements as Alternative B, with the exception of an increased development potential (e.g., 7,635 new dwelling units by year 2030) and the expansion of rural and urban uses in the unincorporated community of Angwin and establishment of a new RUL for the City of American Canyon. Similar to Alternative B, This intensification of growth could result in conflicts in emergency response at these locations.	Less than Significant This alternative would not result in any substantial changes or growth patterns or residential densities that would conflict with emergency response. The Napa OAHMP is a comprehensive mitigation plan that would cover any new development that could occur under this alternative.	Significant and Mitigable This alternative would redesignate County sites adjacent (Napa Pipe and Pacific Coast/Boca sites) and within the City of Napa for mixed uses as well as residential development and would also establish a RUL for the City of American Canyon. This intensification of growth could result in conflicts in emergency response at these locations. This alternative would provide improvements to the County's roadway system in the southern portion of the County that could improve the ability to respond to emergencies as well as evacuate people.
4.9.5 – Wildland Fire	None required	Less than Significant The preferred plan alternative would allow development beyond the existing General Plan. Subsequent development would be subject to County Code and Public Resources Code provisions to provide development standards and	Less than Significant This alternative would allow development to proceed under the existing 1983 General Plan and would not result in any substantial changes growth patterns or residential densities. Subsequent development would be subject to County Code and Public	Less than Significant This alternative would have a similar land use pattern as Alternative A. However, this alternative would redesignate County sites adjacent (Napa Pipe and Pacific Coast/Boca sites) and within the City of Napa for mixed uses as well as residential development at densities higher	Less than Significant This alternative includes all the potential development and General Plan Update provisions associated with new trails and public access to open space as Alternative B, with the exception of an increased development potential (e.g., 7,635 new dwelling units by year 2030) and the expansion of rural and	Less than Significant This alternative would allow less development to proceed under the existing 1983 General Plan. Subsequent development would be subject to County Code and Public Resources Code provisions provide development standards and	Less than Significant This alternative would result in similar impacts as Alternative C, though it would place more residential development at potential risk than Alternative C.

Impact	Mitigation Measure	Preferred Plan Impact Summary	Alternative A Impact Summary	Alternative B Impact Summary	Alternative C Impact Summary	Alternative D Impact Summary	Alternative E Impact Summary
		<p>restrictions regarding structure design, fuel modification zone design, adequacy of emergency access, water for fire fighting and other associated standards, as well as the "Napa Firewise" program.</p>	<p>Resources Code provisions provide development standards and restrictions regarding structure design, fuel modification zone design, adequacy of emergency access, water for fire fighting and other associated standards, as well as the "Napa Firewise" program.</p>	<p>than Alternative A. Additional expansion of urban/rural development could also occur within the unincorporated community of Angwin. The creation of new trails and open space areas for public access associated with the proposed General Plan Update could place people in areas prone to wildland fires. Subsequent development would be subject to County Code and Public Resources Code provisions provide development standards and restrictions regarding structure design, fuel modification zone design, adequacy of emergency access, water for fire fighting and other associated standards, as well as the "Napa Firewise" program.</p>	<p>urban uses in the unincorporated community of Angwin and establishment of a new RUL for the City of American Canyon. Subsequent development would be subject to County Code and Public Resources Code provisions to provide development standards and restrictions regarding structure design, fuel modification zone design, adequacy of emergency access, water for fire fighting and other associated standards, as well as the "Napa Firewise" program.</p>	<p>restrictions regarding structure design, fuel modification zone design, adequacy of emergency access, water for fire fighting and other associated standards, as well as the "Napa Firewise" program.</p>	
Geology and Soils							
<p>4.10.1 – Seismic Ground Shaking</p>	<p>MM 4.10.1 -Geologic/seismic evaluation and mitigation. (see page 4.10-27 of DEIR for full text of mitigation measure)</p>	<p>Significant and Unavoidable</p> <p>The Preferred Plan, between the year 2005 and 2030, is projected that there would be an additional 2,935 dwelling units and 11,200,000 square feet of non-residential uses, new agricultural uses (up to 12,500 acres of new vineyards), potential expansion of the rural and urban uses in Angwin, new RUL for the City of American Canyon, and recycled water, recreation and roadway infrastructure improvements that could be adversely impacted by seismic events.</p>	<p>Significant and Unavoidable</p> <p>This alternative would retain the existing land use designations under the current General Plan Land Use Map as well as the policy guidance set forth under the existing General Plan. Between the year 2005 and 2030, it is projected that there would be an additional 2,235 dwelling units and 16,014,000 square feet of non-residential uses, new agricultural uses (up to 12,500 acres of new vineyards) that could be adversely impacted by seismic events.</p>	<p>Significant and Unavoidable</p> <p>This alternative would provide for additional growth within currently General Plan designated areas for rural and urban development (beyond Alternative A) as well as re-use of the Pacific Coast/Boca site and Napa Pipe site. Between the year 2005 and 2030, it is projected that there would be an additional 3,885 dwelling units and 14,636,000 square feet of non-residential uses in the unincorporated portion of the County, as well as additional agricultural development (up to 12,500 acres of new vineyard development). In addition, this alternative would include recycled water, recreation and roadway infrastructure improvements that could be adversely impacted by seismic events.</p>	<p>Significant and Unavoidable</p> <p>This alternative would be similar to Alternative B, but would provide for additional residential development. For this alternative, between the year 2005 and 2030, it is projected that there would be an additional 7,635 dwelling units and 12,990,000 square feet of non-residential uses, allow for expansion of the Angwin bubble for additional rural and urban and rural development, and establish a new RUL for the City of American Canyon. This development could be adversely impacted by seismic events. This alternative would have the most severe impact of the alternatives evaluated, given the extent of new residential development that would be exposed to seismic hazards.</p>	<p>Significant and Unavoidable</p> <p>This alternative would result in the least impact, given the reduced non-agricultural development potential associated with its land use map (1,951 new dwelling units and 16,300,000 square feet of non-residential uses between 2005 and 2030).</p>	<p>Significant and Unavoidable</p> <p>This alternative would result in the similar impacts to Alternatives C given its land use plan and development potential (6,535 new dwelling units and 19,600,000 square feet of non-residential uses between 2005 and 2030).</p>

1.0 EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

Impact	Mitigation Measure	Preferred Plan Impact Summary	Alternative A Impact Summary	Alternative B Impact Summary	Alternative C Impact Summary	Alternative D Impact Summary	Alternative E Impact Summary
4.10.2 – Seismic Related Ground Failure	MM 4.10.2 - No acceptance of dedication of roads in areas susceptible to seismic related ground-failure (see page 4.10-31 of DEIR for full text of mitigation measure)	Significant and Unavoidable The Preferred Plan, between the year 2005 and 2030, is projected that there would be an additional 2,935 dwelling units and 11,200,000 square feet of non-residential uses, new agricultural uses (up to 12,500 acres of new vineyards), potential expansion of the rural and urban uses in Angwin, new RUL for the City of American Canyon, and recycled water, recreation and roadway infrastructure improvements that could be adversely impacted by seismic related ground failure.	Significant and Unavoidable This alternative would retain the existing land use designations under the current General Plan Land Use Map as well as the policy guidance set forth under the existing General Plan. Between the year 2005 and 2030, it is projected that there would be an additional 2,235 dwelling units and 16,014,000 square feet of non-residential uses, new agricultural uses (up to 12,500 acres of new vineyards) that could be adversely impacted by seismic related ground failure.	Significant and Unavoidable This alternative would provide for additional growth within currently General Plan designated areas for rural and urban development (beyond Alternative A) as well as re-use of the Pacific Coast/Boca site and Napa Pipe site. Between the year 2005 and 2030, it is projected that there would be an additional 3,885 dwelling units and 14,636,000 square feet of non-residential uses in the unincorporated portion of the County, as well as additional agricultural development (up to 12,500 acres of new vineyard development). In addition, this alternative would include recycled water, recreation and roadway infrastructure improvements that could be adversely impacted by seismic related ground failure.	Significant and Unavoidable This alternative would be similar to Alternative B, but would provide for additional residential development. For this alternative, between the year 2005 and 2030, it is projected that there would be an additional 7,635 dwelling units and 12,990,000 square feet of non-residential uses, allow for expansion of the Angwin bubble for additional rural and urban and rural development, and establish a new RUL for the City of American Canyon. This development could be adversely impacted by seismic related ground failure.	Significant and Unavoidable This alternative would result in the least impact, given the reduced development potential associated with its land use map (1,951 new dwelling units, 16,300,000 square feet of non-residential uses and 7,500 acres of new vineyard development between 2005 and 2030).	Significant and Unavoidable This alternative would be similar to Alternative C, but would also include further development allowed in the AWOS designation, and changes to County Code allowing for vineyard development on slopes up to 35% resulting in 15,000 acres of new vineyard development. This alternative would have the most severe impact of the alternatives evaluated, given that it would allow development over a larger area that could be exposed to seismic related ground failure.
4.10.3 - Tsunamis and Seiches	None required	Less than Significant The Preferred Plan would not propose any new rural or rural uses in the southernmost portion of the County or near large reservoirs.	Less than Significant This alternative would not propose any new rural or rural uses in the southernmost portion of the County or near large reservoirs.	Less than Significant This alternative would not propose any new rural or rural uses in the southernmost portion of the County or near large reservoirs.	Less than Significant This alternative would not propose any new rural or rural uses in the southernmost portion of the County or near large reservoirs.	Less than Significant This alternative would not propose any new rural or rural uses in the southernmost portion of the County or near large reservoirs.	Less than Significant This alternative would not propose any new rural or rural uses in the southernmost portion of the County or near large reservoirs.
4.10.4 - Landslides	MM 4.10.4a – Planting of unstable slopes MM 4.10.4b - Grading requirements for slopes over 15% MM 4.10.4c – Hillside lot requirements (see page 4.10-34 of DEIR for full text of mitigation measure)	Significant and Unavoidable The Preferred Plan, between the year 2005 and 2030, is projected that there would be an additional 2,935 dwelling units and 11,200,000 square feet of non-residential uses, new agricultural uses (up to 12,500 acres of new vineyards), potential expansion of the rural and urban uses in Angwin, new	Significant and Unavoidable This alternative would retain the existing land use designations under the current General Plan Land Use Map as well as the policy guidance set forth under the existing General Plan. Between the year 2005 and 2030, it is projected that there would be an additional 2,235 dwelling units and 16,014,000 square feet of non-residential uses, new agricultural uses (up to	Significant and Unavoidable This alternative would provide for additional growth within currently General Plan designated areas for rural and urban development (beyond Alternative A) as well as re-use of the Pacific Coast/Boca site and Napa Pipe site. Between the year 2005 and 2030, it is projected that there would be an additional 3,885 dwelling units and 14,636,000 square feet of non-residential uses in the unincorporated portion of the	Significant and Unavoidable This alternative would be similar to Alternative B, but would provide for additional residential development. For this alternative, between the year 2005 and 2030, it is projected that there would be an additional 7,635 dwelling units and 12,990,000 square feet of non-residential uses, allow for expansion of the Angwin bubble for additional rural and urban and rural development, and establish a new RUL for the City of American Canyon. This	Significant and Unavoidable This alternative would result in the least impact, given the reduced development potential associated with its land use map (1,951 new dwelling units, 16,300,000 square feet of non-residential uses and 7,500 acres of new vineyard development between 2005 and 2030).	Significant and Unavoidable This alternative would be similar to Alternative C, but would also include further development allowed in the AWOS designation, and changes to County Code allowing for vineyard development on slopes up to 35% resulting in 15,000 acres of new vineyard development. This alternative would have the most severe impact of the

Impact	Mitigation Measure	Preferred Plan Impact Summary	Alternative A Impact Summary	Alternative B Impact Summary	Alternative C Impact Summary	Alternative D Impact Summary	Alternative E Impact Summary
		RUL for the City of American Canyon, and recycled water, recreation and roadway infrastructure improvements that could be adversely impacted from slope failure.	12,500 acres of new vineyards) that could be adversely impacted from slope failure.	County, as well as additional agricultural development (up to 12,500 acres of new vineyard development). In addition, this alternative would include recycled water, recreation and roadway infrastructure improvements that could be adversely impacted from slope failure.	development could be adversely impacted from slope failure.		alternatives evaluated, given that it would allow development over a larger area that could be exposed to potential slope failure.
4.10.5 - Subsidence and Settling	Implementation of mitigation measures MM 4.10.1 and MM 4.10.2 (see above for mitigation measure references in the DEIR)	Significant and Unavoidable The Preferred Plan, between the year 2005 and 2030, is projected that there would be an additional 2,935 dwelling units and 11,200,000 square feet of non-residential uses, new agricultural uses (up to 12,500 acres of new vineyards), potential expansion of the rural and urban uses in Angwin, new RUL for the City of American Canyon, and recycled water, recreation and roadway infrastructure improvements that could be adversely impacted from ground subsidence.	Significant and Unavoidable This alternative would retain the existing land use designations under the current General Plan Land Use Map as well as the policy guidance set forth under the existing General Plan. Between the year 2005 and 2030, it is projected that there would be an additional 2,235 dwelling units and 16,014,000 square feet of non-residential uses, new agricultural uses (up to 12,500 acres of new vineyards) that could be adversely impacted from ground subsidence.	Significant and Unavoidable This alternative would provide for additional growth within currently General Plan designated areas for rural and urban development (beyond Alternative A) as well as re-use of the Pacific Coast/Boca site and Napa Pipe site. Between the year 2005 and 2030, it is projected that there would be an additional 3,885 dwelling units and 14,636,000 square feet of non-residential uses in the unincorporated portion of the County, as well as additional agricultural development (up to 12,500 acres of new vineyard development). In addition, this alternative would include recycled water, recreation and roadway infrastructure improvements that could be adversely impacted from ground subsidence.	Significant and Unavoidable This alternative would be similar to Alternative B, but would provide for additional residential development. For this alternative, between the year 2005 and 2030, it is projected that there would be an additional 7,635 dwelling units and 12,990,000 square feet of non-residential uses, allow for expansion of the Angwin bubble for additional rural and urban and rural development, and establish a new RUL for the City of American Canyon. This development could be adversely impacted from ground subsidence.	Significant and Unavoidable This alternative would result in the least impact, given the reduced development potential associated with its land use map (1,951 new dwelling units, 16,300,000 square feet of non-residential uses and 7,500 acres of new vineyard development between 2005 and 2030).	Significant and Unavoidable This alternative would be similar to Alternative C, but would also include further development allowed in the AWOS designation, and changes to County Code allowing for vineyard development on slopes up to 35% resulting in 15,000 acres of new vineyard development.
4.10.6 - Expansive Soils	None required	Less than Significant The Preferred Plan, between the year 2005 and 2030, is projected that there would be an additional 2,935 dwelling units and 11,200,000 square feet of non-residential uses, new agricultural uses (up to 12,500 acres of new vineyards), potential expansion of the rural and urban uses in Angwin, new RUL for the City of American Canyon, and recycled water, recreation and roadway infrastructure	Less than Significant This alternative would retain the existing land use designations under the current General Plan Land Use Map as well as the policy guidance set forth under the existing General Plan. Between the year 2005 and 2030, it is projected that there would be an additional 2,235 dwelling units and 16,014,000 square feet of non-residential uses, new agricultural uses (up to 12,500 acres of new vineyards) that could be adversely impacted from	Less than Significant This alternative would provide for additional growth within currently General Plan designated areas for rural and urban development (beyond Alternative A) as well as re-use of the Pacific Coast/Boca site and Napa Pipe site. Between the year 2005 and 2030, it is projected that there would be an additional 3,885 dwelling units and 14,636,000 square feet of non-residential uses in the unincorporated portion of the County, as well as additional agricultural development (up to 12,500 acres of new vineyard	Less than Significant This alternative would be similar to Alternative B, but would provide for additional residential development. For this alternative, between the year 2005 and 2030, it is projected that there would be an additional 7,635 dwelling units and 12,990,000 square feet of non-residential uses, allow for expansion of the Angwin bubble for additional rural and urban and rural development, and establish a new RUL for the City of American Canyon. This development could be adversely impacted from expansive soils. However, County Code	Less than Significant This alternative would result in the least impact, given the reduced development potential associated with its land use map (1,951 new dwelling units, 16,300,000 square feet of non-residential uses and 7,500 acres of new vineyard development between 2005 and 2030). County Code requirements and adherence to the UBC and CBC would reduce the impacts of expansive soils on new development.	Less than Significant This alternative would be similar to Alternative C, but would also include further development allowed in the AWOS designation, and changes to County Code allowing for vineyard development on slopes up to 35% resulting in 15,000 acres of new vineyard development. County Code requirements and adherence to the UBC and CBC would reduce the impacts of expansive soils on new development.

1.0 EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

Impact	Mitigation Measure	Preferred Plan Impact Summary	Alternative A Impact Summary	Alternative B Impact Summary	Alternative C Impact Summary	Alternative D Impact Summary	Alternative E Impact Summary
		improvements that could be adversely impacted from expansive soils. However, County Code requirements and adherence to the UBC and CBC would reduce the impacts of expansive soils on new development.	expansive soils. However, County Code requirements and adherence to the UBC and CBC would reduce the impacts of expansive soils on new development.	development). In addition, this alternative would include recycled water, recreation and roadway infrastructure improvements that could be adversely impacted from expansive soils. However, County Code requirements and adherence to the UBC and CBC would reduce the impacts of expansive soils on new development.	requirements and adherence to the UBC and CBC would reduce the impacts of expansive soils on new development.		
4.10.7 – Septic System Operation	None required	<p>Less than Significant</p> <p>The Preferred Plan, between the year 2005 and 2030, is projected that there would be an additional 2,935 dwelling units and 11,200,000 square feet of non-residential uses, new agricultural uses (up to 12,500 acres of new vineyards), potential expansion of the rural and urban uses in Angwin. Some of this new development could require the use of septic systems. However, compliance with the provisions of Title 13, Division II of the County Code would ensure that septic systems are designed and operated adequately to avoid system failures.</p>	<p>Less than Significant</p> <p>This alternative would retain the existing land use designations under the current General Plan Land Use Map as well as the policy guidance set forth under the existing General Plan. Between the year 2005 and 2030, it is projected that there would be an additional 2,235 dwelling units and 16,014,000 square feet of non-residential uses, new agricultural uses (up to 12,500 acres of new vineyards) that could require the use of septic systems. However, compliance with the provisions of Title 13, Division II of the County Code would ensure that septic systems are designed and operated adequately to avoid system failures.</p>	<p>Less than Significant</p> <p>This alternative would provide for additional growth within currently General Plan designated areas for rural and urban development (beyond Alternative A) as well as re-use of the Pacific Coast/Boca site and Napa Pipe site. Between the year 2005 and 2030, it is projected that there would be an additional 3,885 dwelling units and 14,636,000 square feet of non-residential uses in the unincorporated portion of the County, as well as additional agricultural development (up to 12,500 acres of new vineyard development). Some of this new development could require the use of septic systems. However, compliance with the provisions of Title 13, Division II of the County Code would ensure that septic systems are designed and operated adequately to avoid system failures.</p>	<p>Less than Significant</p> <p>This alternative would be similar to Alternative B, but would provide for additional residential development. For this alternative, between the year 2005 and 2030, it is projected that there would be an additional 7,635 dwelling units and 12,990,000 square feet of non-residential uses, allow for expansion of the Angwin bubble for additional rural and urban and rural development, and establish a new RUL for the City of American Canyon. Some of this new development could require the use of septic systems. However, compliance with the provisions of Title 13, Division II of the County Code would ensure that septic systems are designed and operated adequately to avoid system failures.</p>	<p>Less than Significant</p> <p>This alternative would result in the least impact, given the reduced development potential associated with its land use map (1,951 new dwelling units, 16,300,000 square feet of non-residential uses and 7,500 acres of new vineyard development between 2005 and 2030). Some of this new development could require the use of septic systems. However, compliance with the provisions of Title 13, Division II of the County Code would ensure that septic systems are designed and operated adequately to avoid system failures.</p>	<p>Less than Significant</p> <p>This alternative would be similar to Alternative C, but would also include further development allowed in the AWOS designation, and changes to County Code allowing for vineyard development on slopes up to 35% resulting in 15,000 acres of new vineyard development. Some of this new development could require the use of septic systems. However, compliance with the provisions of Title 13, Division II of the County Code would ensure that septic systems are designed and operated adequately to avoid system failures.</p>
4.10.8 – Mineral Resources	None required	<p>Less than Significant</p> <p>The Preferred Plan would provide opportunities for additional rural and urban development beyond the current General Plan Land Use Map associated with expansion of rural and urban uses in the community of Angwin and the establishment of a RUL for the City of American Canyon (as well as recycled water, recreation and</p>	<p>Less than Significant</p> <p>This alternative would allow development as is allowed under the existing 1983 General Plan. This alternative would retain the current land use patterns and would not result in the expansion of substantial new rural or urban land uses in the County that would preclude future mineral extraction. Thus</p>	<p>Less than Significant</p> <p>This alternative would provide opportunities for additional rural and urban development beyond the current General Plan Land Use Map (as well as recycled water, recreation and roadway improvements). This alternative would largely retain the current land use patterns and would not result in the expansion of substantial new rural or urban land uses in the County that would preclude future mineral</p>	<p>Less than Significant</p> <p>This alternative would result in the same impacts as Alternative B, but would also provide opportunities for additional rural and urban development beyond the current General Plan Land Use Map associated with expansion of rural and urban uses in the community of Angwin and the establishment of a RUL for the City of American Canyon. This alternative would largely retain the current land use patterns and would not result in the</p>	<p>Less than Significant</p> <p>This alternative would largely retain the current land use patterns and would not result in the expansion of substantial new rural or urban land uses in the County that would preclude future mineral extraction. In addition, this alternative would further restrict development in the County beyond the current General Plan.</p>	<p>Less than Significant</p> <p>This alternative would be similar to Alternative C, though would allow additional development in areas designated AWOS. However, it would largely retain the current land use patterns and would not result in the expansion of substantial new rural or urban land uses in the County that would preclude future mineral extraction.</p>

Impact	Mitigation Measure	Preferred Plan Impact Summary	Alternative A Impact Summary	Alternative B Impact Summary	Alternative C Impact Summary	Alternative D Impact Summary	Alternative E Impact Summary
		roadway improvements). This alternative would largely retain the current land use patterns and would not result in the expansion of substantial new rural or urban land uses in the County that would preclude future mineral extraction.		extraction.	expansion of substantial new rural or urban land uses in the County that would preclude future mineral extraction.		
Hydrology and Water Quality							
4.11.1 – Nonpoint Source Pollution from Urban Runoff	None required	<p>Less than Significant</p> <p>The Preferred Plan, between the year 2005 and 2030, is projected that there would be an additional 2,935 dwelling units and 11,200,000 square feet of non-residential uses, new agricultural uses (up to 12,500 acres of new vineyards), potential expansion of the rural and urban uses in Angwin, new RUL for the City of American Canyon, and recycled water, recreation and roadway infrastructure improvements that could result in non-point sources of water quality impacts. However, subsequent development would be subject to existing County Code provisions (e.g., Section 16.28.100).</p>	<p>Less than Significant</p> <p>This alternative would retain the existing land use designations under the current General Plan Land Use Map as well as the policy guidance set forth under the existing General Plan. Between the year 2005 and 2030, it is projected that there would be an additional 2,235 dwelling units and 16,014,000 square feet of non-residential uses, new agricultural uses (up to 12,500 acres of new vineyards) that could result in non-point sources of water quality impacts. However, subsequent development would be subject to existing County Code provisions (e.g., Section 16.28.100).</p>	<p>Less than Significant</p> <p>This alternative would provide for additional growth within currently General Plan designated areas for rural and urban development (beyond Alternative A) as well as re-use of the Pacific Coast/Boca site and Napa Pipe site. Between the year 2005 and 2030, it is projected that there would be an additional 3,885 dwelling units and 14,636,000 square feet of non-residential uses in the unincorporated portion of the County, as well as additional agricultural development (up to 12,500 acres of new vineyard development). This could result in non-point sources of water quality impacts. However, subsequent development would be subject to existing County Code provisions (e.g., Section 16.28.100).</p>	<p>Less than Significant</p> <p>This alternative would be similar to Alternative B, but would provide for additional residential development. For this alternative, between the year 2005 and 2030, it is projected that there would be an additional 7,635 dwelling units and 12,990,000 square feet of non-residential uses, allow for expansion of the Angwin bubble for additional rural and urban and rural development, and establish a new RUL for the City of American Canyon. This could result in non-point sources of water quality impacts. However, subsequent development would be subject to existing County Code provisions (e.g., Section 16.28.100).</p>	<p>Less than Significant</p> <p>This alternative would result in the least impact, given the reduced development potential associated with its land use map (1,951 new dwelling units, 16,300,000 square feet of non-residential uses and 7,500 acres of new vineyard development between 2005 and 2030). Subsequent development would be subject to existing County Code provisions (e.g., Section 16.28.100).</p>	<p>Less than Significant</p> <p>This alternative would be similar to Alternative C, but would also include further development allowed in the AWOS designation, and changes to County Code allowing for vineyard development on slopes up to 35% resulting in 15,000 acres of new vineyard development. Subsequent development would be subject to existing County Code provisions (e.g., Section 16.28.100).</p>

1.0 EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

Impact	Mitigation Measure	Preferred Plan Impact Summary	Alternative A Impact Summary	Alternative B Impact Summary	Alternative C Impact Summary	Alternative D Impact Summary	Alternative E Impact Summary
4.11.2 – Construction-Related Soil Erosion and Sedimentation	MM 4.11.2a - Continued implementation of Napa County Conservation Regulations and water quality protection. MM 4.11.2b - Establishment of water quality monitoring programs (see page 4.11-48 of DEIR for full text of mitigation measures)	Significant and Mitigable The Preferred Plan, between the year 2005 and 2030, is projected that there would be an additional 2,935 dwelling units and 11,200,000 square feet of non-residential uses, new agricultural uses (up to 12,500 acres of new vineyards), potential expansion of the rural and urban uses in Angwin, new RUL for the City of American Canyon, and recycled water, recreation and roadway infrastructure improvements that could contribute to soil erosion from construction activities.	Significant and Mitigable This alternative would retain the existing land use designations under the current General Plan Land Use Map as well as the policy guidance set forth under the existing General Plan. Between the year 2005 and 2030, it is projected that there would be an additional 2,235 dwelling units and 16,014,000 square feet of non-residential uses, new agricultural uses (up to 12,500 acres of new vineyards) that could contribute to soil erosion from construction activities.	Significant and Mitigable This alternative would provide for additional growth within currently General Plan designated areas for rural and urban development (beyond Alternative A) as well as re-use of the Pacific Coast/Boca site and Napa Pipe site. Between the year 2005 and 2030, it is projected that there would be an additional 3,885 dwelling units and 14,636,000 square feet of non-residential uses in the unincorporated portion of the County, as well as additional agricultural development (up to 12,500 acres of new vineyard development) and recycled water, recreation and roadway infrastructure improvements. This development could contribute to soil erosion from construction activities.	Significant and Mitigable This alternative would be similar to Alternative B, but would provide for additional residential development. For this alternative, between the year 2005 and 2030, it is projected that there would be an additional 7,635 dwelling units and 12,990,000 square feet of non-residential uses, allow for expansion of the Angwin bubble for additional rural and urban and rural development, and establish a new RUL for the City of American Canyon. This development could contribute to soil erosion from construction activities.	Significant and Mitigable This alternative would result in the least impact given the reduced non-agricultural development potential associated with its land use map (1,951 new dwelling units, 16,300,000 square feet of non-residential uses) and that the AWOS designation would be split into two districts: AOS and WOS, with the latter including areas where policies would be developed to achieve greater forest protection, riparian habitat preservation, and water quality improvements than envisioned under the current General Plan. In addition, vineyard development would be restricted in sensitive biotic communities and reduced to 7,500 acres.	Significant and Mitigable This alternative would be similar to Alternative C, but would also include further development allowed in the AWOS designation, and changes to County Code allowing for vineyard development on slopes up to 35% resulting in 15,000 acres of new vineyard development. Subsequent development would be subject to existing County Code provisions (e.g., Section 16.28.100). This alternative would result in the most severe soil erosion impact of the alternatives considered.
4.11.3 - Agricultural and Resource Uses	MM 4.11.3a – Post-development conditions mitigation regarding drainage flows. MM 4.11.3b - Continued implementation of Napa County Conservation Regulations and BMPs. (see page 4.11-54 of DEIR for full text of mitigation measures)	Significant and Mitigable New vineyard development by year 2030 for the Preferred Plan is anticipated to range from 10,000 and 12,500 acres, which does not include growth of other agricultural activities. In addition to agricultural operations, other resource extraction activities (e.g., timber harvesting and mineral extraction) could also occur in the County by 2030. These activities would result in water quality impacts associated with soil erosion and other pollutants.	Significant and Mitigable New vineyard development by year 2030 under this alternative is anticipated to range from 10,000 and 12,500 acres, which does not include growth of other agricultural activities. In addition to agricultural operations, other resource extraction activities (e.g., timber harvesting and mineral extraction) could also occur in the County by 2030. These activities would result in water quality impacts associated with soil erosion and other pollutants (e.g., nutrients, pesticides and herbicides).	Significant and Mitigable This alternative would include the same opportunity for agricultural and other resource extraction activities as Alternative A and would result in similar water quality impacts. These activities would result in water quality impacts associated with soil erosion and other pollutants (e.g., nutrients, pesticides and herbicides).	Significant and Mitigable This alternative would include the same opportunity for agricultural and other resource extraction activities as Alternative A and would result in similar water quality impacts. These activities would result in water quality impacts associated with soil erosion and other pollutants (e.g., nutrients, pesticides and herbicides).	Significant and Mitigable This alternative would result in the least impact given that the AWOS designation would be split into two districts: AOS and WOS, with the latter including areas where policies would be developed to achieve greater forest protection, riparian habitat preservation, and water quality improvements than envisioned under the current General Plan. In addition, vineyard development would be restricted in sensitive biotic communities and reduced to 7,500 acres.	Significant and Mitigable This alternative would result in the greatest impact, given the allowance of vineyard development on slopes up to 35% without requiring a use permit (i.e., vineyard development scenario 4).
4.11.4 - Water Quality Impacts Associated With Proposed Ministerial Process for Vineyard Development Projects	MM 4.11.4 - Requirements for stream vineyard development permitting process (Applies to the Preferred Plan,	Significant and Mitigable The Preferred Plan would include policies resulting in modifications to the County's Conservation	Less than Significant This alternative would not include the proposed ministerial process for vineyard development	Significant and Mitigable This alternative would include policies resulting in modifications to the County's Conservation Regulations (County Code	Significant and Mitigable This alternative would include policies resulting in modifications to the County's Conservation Regulations (County Code Chapter	Less than Significant This alternative would not include the proposed ministerial process for vineyard development	Significant and Mitigable This alternative would include policies resulting in modifications to the County's Conservation Regulations

Impact	Mitigation Measure	Preferred Plan Impact Summary	Alternative A Impact Summary	Alternative B Impact Summary	Alternative C Impact Summary	Alternative D Impact Summary	Alternative E Impact Summary
	Alternative B, C, and E) (see page 4.11-55 through -60 of DEIR for full text of mitigation measure)	Regulations (County Code Chapter 18.108) to provide a ministerial process for environmentally superior vineyard development projects that would not require environmental review under CEQA. These projects would be required to go beyond current regulatory requirements and meet performance criteria demonstrating no significant adverse effects to the environment in order to qualify for the streamlined process.	projects.	Chapter 18.108) to provide a ministerial process for environmentally superior vineyard development projects that would not require environmental review under CEQA. These projects would be required to go beyond current regulatory requirements and meet performance criteria demonstrating no significant adverse effects to the environment in order to qualify for the streamlined process.	18.108) to provide a ministerial process for environmentally superior vineyard development projects that would not require environmental review under CEQA. These projects would be required to go beyond current regulatory requirements and meet performance criteria demonstrating no significant adverse effects to the environment in order to qualify for the streamlined process.	projects.	(County Code Chapter 18.108) to provide a ministerial process for environmentally superior vineyard development projects that would not require environmental review under CEQA. These projects would be required to go beyond current regulatory requirements and meet performance criteria demonstrating no significant adverse effects to the environment in order to qualify for the streamlined process.
4.11.5 - Groundwater Level Decline and Overdraft	MM 4.11.5a - Demonstration of adequate groundwater supply for new projects MM 4.11.5b - Maintain a site's pre-development groundwater recharge potential MM 4.11.5c - Requirements for water conservation measures MM 4.11.5d - Maximize the use of recycled water MM 4.11.5e - Requirements for pump tests or hydrogeologic studies for new high-capacity wells (see page 4.11-64 and -65 of DEIR for full text of mitigation measures)	Significant and Unavoidable and The Preferred Plan, between the year 2005 and 2030, is projected that there would be an additional 2,935 dwelling units and 11,200,000 square feet of non-residential uses, new agricultural uses (up to 12,500 acres of new vineyards), potential expansion of the rural and urban uses in Angwin, new RUL for the City of American Canyon that would contribute to further demand for groundwater supply.	Significant and Unavoidable This alternative would retain the existing land use designations under the current General Plan Land Use Map as well as the policy guidance set forth under the existing General Plan. Between the year 2005 and 2030, it is projected that there would be an additional 2,235 dwelling units and 16,014,000 square feet of non-residential uses, new agricultural uses (up to 12,500 acres of new vineyards) that would contribute to further demand for groundwater supply.	Significant and Unavoidable This alternative would provide for additional growth within currently General Plan designated areas for rural and urban development (beyond Alternative A) as well as re-use of the Pacific Coast/Boca site and Napa Pipe site. Between the year 2005 and 2030, it is projected that there would be an additional 3,885 dwelling units and 14,636,000 square feet of non-residential uses in the unincorporated portion of the County, as well as additional agricultural development (up to 12,500 acres of new vineyard development). This would contribute to further demand for groundwater supply.	Significant and Unavoidable This alternative would be similar to Alternative B, but would provide for additional residential development. For this alternative, between the year 2005 and 2030, it is projected that there would be an additional 7,635 dwelling units and 12,990,000 square feet of non-residential uses, allow for expansion of the Angwin bubble for additional rural and urban and rural development, and establish a new RUL for the City of American Canyon. This would contribute to further demand for groundwater supply.	Significant and Mitigable This alternative would result in the least impact given the reduced non-agricultural development potential associated with its land use map (1,951 new dwelling units, 16,300,000 square feet of non-residential uses) and that the AWOS designation would be split into two districts: AOS and WOS, with the latter including areas where policies would be developed to achieve greater forest protection, riparian habitat preservation, and water quality improvements than envisioned under the current General Plan. In addition, vineyard development would be restricted in sensitive biotic communities and reduced to 7,500 acres.	Significant and Unavoidable This alternative would be similar to Alternative C, but would also include further development allowed in the AWOS designation, and changes to County Code allowing for vineyard development on slopes up to 35% resulting in 15,000 acres of new vineyard development. This development (6,535 new dwelling units and 19,600,000 square feet of non-residential uses between 2005 and 2030) would result in the most severe groundwater supply impact of the alternatives considered.
4.11.6 - Well Competition and Adverse Well Interference	Implementation of mitigation measures MM 4.11.5e and MM 4.11.4 (see above for mitigation measure references to DEIR)	Significant and Mitigable The Preferred Plan, between the year 2005 and 2030, is projected that there would be an additional 2,935	Significant and Mitigable This alternative would retain the existing land use designations under the current General Plan Land Use Map as	Significant and Mitigable This alternative would provide for additional growth within currently General Plan designated areas for rural and urban development	Significant and Mitigable This alternative would be similar to Alternative B, but would provide for additional residential development. For this alternative, between the year	Significant and Mitigable This alternative would result in the least impact given the reduced non-agricultural development potential	Significant and Mitigable This alternative would be similar to Alternative C, but would also include further development allowed in the

1.0 EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

Impact	Mitigation Measure	Preferred Plan Impact Summary	Alternative A Impact Summary	Alternative B Impact Summary	Alternative C Impact Summary	Alternative D Impact Summary	Alternative E Impact Summary
		dwelling units and 11,200,000 square feet of non-residential uses, new agricultural uses (up to 12,500 acres of new vineyards), potential expansion of the rural and urban uses in Angwin, new RUL for the City of American Canyon. This development would result in the development of new well facilities that could conflict with preexisting wells in operation.	well as the policy guidance set forth under the existing General Plan. Between the year 2005 and 2030, it is projected that there would be an additional 2,235 dwelling units and 16,014,000 square feet of non-residential uses, new agricultural uses (up to 12,500 acres of new vineyards). This development would result in the development of new well facilities that could conflict with preexisting wells in operation.	(beyond Alternative A) as well as re-use of the Pacific Coast/Boca site and Napa Pipe site. Between the year 2005 and 2030, it is projected that there would be an additional 3,885 dwelling units and 14,636,000 square feet of non-residential uses in the unincorporated portion of the County, as well as additional agricultural development (up to 12,500 acres of new vineyard development). This development would result in the development of new well facilities that could conflict with preexisting wells in operation.	2005 and 2030, it is projected that there would be an additional 7,635 dwelling units and 12,990,000 square feet of non-residential uses, allow for expansion of the Angwin bubble for additional rural and urban and rural development, and establish a new RUL for the City of American Canyon. This development would result in the development of new well facilities that could conflict with preexisting wells in operation.	associated with its land use map (1,951 new dwelling units, 16,300,000 square feet of non-residential uses) and that the AWOS designation would be split into two districts: AOS and WOS, with the latter including areas where policies would be developed to achieve greater forest protection, riparian habitat preservation, and water quality improvements than envisioned under the current General Plan. In addition, vineyard development would be restricted in sensitive biotic communities and reduced to 7,500 acres. However, this development would result in the development of new well facilities that could conflict with preexisting wells in operation.	AWOS designation, and changes to County Code allowing for vineyard development on slopes up to 35% resulting in 15,000 acres of new vineyard development. This development (6,535 new dwelling units and 19,600,000 square feet of non-residential uses between 2005 and 2030) would result in the development of new well facilities that could conflict with preexisting wells in operation.
4.11.7 - Changes to Drainage Patterns Leading to Increased Runoff and Streambank Erosion	Implementation of mitigation measures MM 4.11.3a and MM 4.11.3b (see above for mitigation measure references to DEIR)	Significant and Mitigable The Preferred Plan, between the year 2005 and 2030, is projected that there would be an additional 2,935 dwelling units and 11,200,000 square feet of non-residential uses, new agricultural uses (up to 12,500 acres of new vineyards), potential expansion of the rural and urban uses in Angwin, new RUL for the City of American Canyon, and recycled water, recreation and roadway infrastructure improvements. These activities would result in drainage impacts from the alteration of drainage patterns and features.	Significant and Mitigable This alternative would retain the existing land use designations under the current General Plan Land Use Map as well as the policy guidance set forth under the existing General Plan. Between the year 2005 and 2030, it is projected that there would be an additional 2,235 dwelling units and 16,014,000 square feet of non-residential uses, new agricultural uses (up to 12,500 acres of new vineyards). These activities would result in drainage impacts from the alteration of drainage patterns and features.	Significant and Mitigable This alternative would provide for additional growth within currently General Plan designated areas for rural and urban development (beyond Alternative A) as well as re-use of the Pacific Coast/Boca site and Napa Pipe site. Between the year 2005 and 2030, it is projected that there would be an additional 3,885 dwelling units and 14,636,000 square feet of non-residential uses in the unincorporated portion of the County, as well as additional agricultural development (up to 12,500 acres of new vineyard development) and recycled water, recreation and roadway infrastructure improvements. These activities would result in drainage impacts from the alteration of drainage patterns and features.	Significant and Mitigable This alternative would be similar to Alternative B, but would provide for additional residential development. For this alternative, between the year 2005 and 2030, it is projected that there would be an additional 7,635 dwelling units and 12,990,000 square feet of non-residential uses, allow for expansion of the Angwin bubble for additional rural and urban and rural development, and establish a new RUL for the City of American Canyon. These activities would result in drainage impacts from the alteration of drainage patterns and features.	Significant and Mitigable This alternative would result in the least impact given the reduced non-agricultural development associated with its land use map ((1,951 new dwelling units, 16,300,000 square feet of non-residential uses) and that the AWOS designation would be split into two districts: AOS and WOS, with the latter including areas where policies would be developed to achieve greater forest protection, riparian habitat preservation, and water quality improvements than envisioned under the current General Plan. In addition, vineyard development would be restricted in sensitive biotic communities and reduced to 7,500 acres.	Significant and Mitigable This alternative would be similar to Alternative C, but would also include further development allowed in the AWOS designation, and changes to County Code allowing for vineyard development on slopes up to 35% resulting in 15,000 acres of new vineyard development. This development (6,535 new dwelling units and 19,600,000 square feet of non-residential uses between 2005 and 2030) would result in the most severe impact of the alternatives considered.

Impact	Mitigation Measure	Preferred Plan Impact Summary	Alternative A Impact Summary	Alternative B Impact Summary	Alternative C Impact Summary	Alternative D Impact Summary	Alternative E Impact Summary
4.11.8 - Changes to Drainage Patterns Leading to Increased Runoff and Hillside Erosion	Implementation of mitigation measures MM 4.11.3a, MM 4.11.3b and MM 4.11.2a (see above for mitigation measure references to DEIR)	Significant and Mitigable The Preferred Plan, between the year 2005 and 2030, is projected that there would be an additional 2,935 dwelling units and 11,200,000 square feet of non-residential uses, new agricultural uses (up to 12,500 acres of new vineyards), potential expansion of the rural and urban uses in Angwin, new RUL for the City of American Canyon, and recycled water, recreation and roadway infrastructure improvements. These activities would result in drainage patterns and features from changes in overland flow conditions.	Significant and Mitigable This alternative would retain the existing land use designations under the current General Plan Land Use Map as well as the policy guidance set forth under the existing General Plan. Between the year 2005 and 2030, it is projected that there would be an additional 2,235 dwelling units and 16,014,000 square feet of non-residential uses, new agricultural uses (up to 12,500 acres of new vineyards). These activities would result in the alteration of drainage patterns from changes in overland flow conditions.	Significant and Mitigable This alternative would provide for additional growth within currently General Plan designated areas for rural and urban development (beyond Alternative A) as well as re-use of the Pacific Coast/Boca site and Napa Pipe site. Between the year 2005 and 2030, it is projected that there would be an additional 3,885 dwelling units and 14,636,000 square feet of non-residential uses in the unincorporated portion of the County, as well as additional agricultural development (up to 12,500 acres of new vineyard development) and recycled water, recreation and roadway infrastructure improvements. These activities would result in the alteration of drainage patterns from changes in overland flow conditions.	Significant and Mitigable This alternative would be similar to Alternative B, but would provide for additional residential development. For this alternative, between the year 2005 and 2030, it is projected that there would be an additional 7,635 dwelling units and 12,990,000 square feet of non-residential uses, allow for expansion of the Angwin bubble for additional rural and urban and rural development, and establish a new RUL for the City of American Canyon. These activities would result in drainage patterns and features from changes in overland flow conditions.	Significant and Mitigable This alternative would result in the least impact given the reduced non-agricultural development potential associated with its land use map ((1,951 new dwelling units, 16,300,000 square feet of non-residential uses) and that the AWOS designation would be split into two districts: AOS and WOS, with the latter including areas where policies would be developed to achieve greater forest protection, riparian habitat preservation, and water quality improvements than envisioned under the current General Plan. In addition, vineyard development would be restricted in sensitive biotic communities and reduced to 7,500 acres.	Significant and Mitigable This alternative would be similar to Alternative C, but would also include further development allowed in the AWOS designation, and changes to County Code allowing for vineyard development on slopes up to 35% resulting in 15,000 acres of new vineyard development. This development (6,535 new dwelling units and 19,600,000 square feet of non-residential uses between 2005 and 2030) would result in the most severe impact of the alternatives considered.
4.11.9 - Flood Risk from Drainage System Alteration	MM 4.11.9 – Drainage improvements that ensure no new or increased flooding impacts (see page 4.11-73 of DEIR for full text of mitigation measure)	Significant and Mitigable The Preferred Plan, between the year 2005 and 2030, is projected that there would be an additional 2,935 dwelling units and 11,200,000 square feet of non-residential uses, new agricultural uses (up to 12,500 acres of new vineyards), potential expansion of the rural and urban uses in Angwin, new RUL for the City of American Canyon, and recycled water, recreation and roadway infrastructure improvements. These activities would result in the alteration of drainage conditions and features that could result in flooding impacts.	Significant and Mitigable This alternative would retain the existing land use designations under the current General Plan Land Use Map as well as the policy guidance set forth under the existing General Plan. Between the year 2005 and 2030, it is projected that there would be an additional 2,235 dwelling units and 16,014,000 square feet of non-residential uses, new agricultural uses (up to 12,500 acres of new vineyards). These activities would result in the alteration of drainage conditions and features that could result in flooding impacts.	Significant and Mitigable This alternative would provide for additional growth within currently General Plan designated areas for rural and urban development (beyond Alternative A) as well as re-use of the Pacific Coast/Boca site and Napa Pipe site. Between the year 2005 and 2030, it is projected that there would be an additional 3,885 dwelling units and 14,636,000 square feet of non-residential uses in the unincorporated portion of the County, as well as additional agricultural development (up to 12,500 acres of new vineyard development) and recycled water, recreation and roadway infrastructure improvements. These activities would result in the alteration of drainage conditions and features that could result in flooding impacts.	Significant and Mitigable This alternative would be similar to Alternative B, but would provide for additional residential development. For this alternative, between the year 2005 and 2030, it is projected that there would be an additional 7,635 dwelling units and 12,990,000 square feet of non-residential uses, allow for expansion of the Angwin bubble for additional rural and urban and rural development, and establish a new RUL for the City of American Canyon. These activities would result in the alteration of drainage conditions and features that could result in flooding impacts.	Significant and Mitigable This alternative would result in the least impact given the reduced non-agricultural development potential associated with its land use map (1,951 new dwelling units, 16,300,000 square feet of non-residential uses) and that the AWOS designation would be split into two districts: AOS and WOS, with the latter including areas where policies would be developed to achieve greater forest protection, riparian habitat preservation, and water quality improvements than envisioned under the current General Plan. In addition, vineyard development would be restricted in sensitive biotic communities and reduced to 7,500 acres.	Significant and Mitigable This alternative would be similar to Alternative C, but would also include further development allowed in the AWOS designation, and changes to County Code allowing for vineyard development on slopes up to 35% resulting in 15,000 acres of new vineyard development. This development (6,535 new dwelling units and 19,600,000 square feet of non-residential uses between 2005 and 2030) would result in the most severe impact of the alternatives considered.

1.0 EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

Impact	Mitigation Measure	Preferred Plan Impact Summary	Alternative A Impact Summary	Alternative B Impact Summary	Alternative C Impact Summary	Alternative D Impact Summary	Alternative E Impact Summary
4.11.10 - 100-Year Flood Hazard Areas	None required	<p>Less than Significant</p> <p>The Preferred Plan, between the year 2005 and 2030, is projected that there would be an additional 2,935 dwelling units and 11,200,000 square feet of non-residential uses, new agricultural uses (up to 12,500 acres of new vineyards), potential expansion of the rural and urban uses in Angwin, new RUL for the City of American Canyon, and recycled water, recreation and roadway infrastructure improvements that could potentially be placed in the 100-year floodplain. New development would be subject to the County Floodplain Management Ordinances and the Code of Federal Regulations for the National Flood Insurance Program that ensures structures placed within the designated 100-year floodplain are designed to avoid flooding impacts.</p>	<p>Less than Significant</p> <p>This alternative would retain the existing land use designations under the current General Plan Land Use Map as well as the policy guidance set forth under the existing General Plan. Between the year 2005 and 2030, it is projected that there would be an additional 2,235 dwelling units and 16,014,000 square feet of non-residential uses, new agricultural uses (up to 12,500 acres of new vineyards) that could be placed in the 100-year floodplain. New development would be subject to the County Floodplain Management Ordinances and the Code of Federal Regulations for the National Flood Insurance Program that ensures structures placed within the designated 100-year floodplain are designed to avoid flooding impacts.</p>	<p>Less than Significant</p> <p>This alternative would provide for additional growth within currently General Plan designated areas for rural and urban development (beyond Alternative A) as well as re-use of the Pacific Coast/Boca site and Napa Pipe site. Between the year 2005 and 2030, it is projected that there would be an additional 3,885 dwelling units and 14,636,000 square feet of non-residential uses in the unincorporated portion of the County, as well as additional agricultural development (up to 12,500 acres of new vineyard development) and recycled water, recreation and roadway infrastructure improvements that could be placed in the 100-year floodplain. However, new development would be subject to the County Floodplain Management Ordinances and the Code of Federal Regulations for the National Flood Insurance Program that ensures structures placed within the designated 100-year floodplain are designed to avoid flooding impacts.</p>	<p>Less than Significant</p> <p>This alternative would be similar to Alternative B, but would provide for additional residential development. For this alternative, between the year 2005 and 2030, it is projected that there would be an additional 7,635 dwelling units and 12,990,000 square feet of non-residential uses, allow for expansion of the Angwin bubble for additional rural and urban and rural development, and establish a new RUL for the City of American Canyon. That development potential could place development in the 100-year floodplain. However, new development would be subject to the County Floodplain Management Ordinances and the Code of Federal Regulations for the National Flood Insurance Program that ensures structures placed within the designated 100-year floodplain are designed to avoid flooding impacts.</p>	<p>Less than Significant</p> <p>This alternative would result in the least impact given the reduced non-agricultural development potential associated with its land use map (1,951 new dwelling units, 16,300,000 square feet of non-residential uses) and that the AWOS designation would be split into two districts: AOS and WOS, with the latter including areas where policies would be developed to achieve greater forest protection, riparian habitat preservation, and water quality improvements than envisioned under the current General Plan. In addition, vineyard development would be restricted in sensitive biotic communities and reduced to 7,500 acres. New development would be subject to the County Floodplain Management Ordinances and the Code of Federal Regulations for the National Flood Insurance Program that ensures structures placed within the designated 100-year floodplain are designed to avoid flooding impacts.</p>	<p>Less than Significant</p> <p>This alternative would be similar to Alternative C, but would also include further development allowed in the AWOS designation, and changes to County Code allowing for vineyard development on slopes up to 35% resulting in 15,000 acres of new vineyard development. This development (6,535 new dwelling units and 19,600,000 square feet of non-residential uses between 2005 and 2030) would be subject to the County Floodplain Management Ordinances and the Code of Federal Regulations for the National Flood Insurance Program that ensures structures placed within the designated 100-year floodplain are designed to avoid flooding impacts.</p>
4.11.11 - New Vineyard Development and 100-Year Flooding	<p>Implementation of mitigation measures MM 4.11.9, MM 4.11.3a, and MM 4.11.4</p> <p>(see above for mitigation measure references to DEIR)</p>	<p>Significant and Mitigable</p> <p>New vineyard development by year 2030 for the Preferred Plan is anticipated to range from 10,000 and 12,500 acres, which does not include growth of other agricultural activities. This impact would be same as for Alternatives A, B and C, given that anticipated vineyard development would be the same.</p>	<p>Significant and Mitigable</p> <p>New vineyard development by year 2030 for this alternative is anticipated to range from 10,000 and 12,500 acres, which does not include growth of other agricultural activities. This impact would be same as for Alternatives B and C, given that anticipated vineyard development would be the same under these alternatives.</p>	<p>Significant and Mitigable</p> <p>New vineyard development by year 2030 for this alternative is anticipated to range from 10,000 and 12,500 acres, which does not include growth of other agricultural activities. This impact would be same as for Alternatives A and C, given that anticipated vineyard development would be the same under these alternatives.</p>	<p>Significant and Mitigable</p> <p>New vineyard development by year 2030 for this alternative is anticipated to range from 10,000 and 12,500 acres, which does not include growth of other agricultural activities. This impact would be same as for Alternatives A and B, given that anticipated vineyard development would be the same under these alternatives.</p>	<p>Significant and Mitigable</p> <p>This alternative would result in the least impact given that new vineyard development would consist of 7,500 acres (lowest of the alternatives evaluated). the reduced non-</p>	<p>Significant and Mitigable</p> <p>This alternative would result in the most vineyard development between 2005 and 2030 with 15,000 acres. However, this increase in vineyard development would not result in a substantial increase in flood conditions as compared to Alternatives A, B and C (as documented in Section 3.0 of this document – Responses to Comment Letter X).</p>

Impact	Mitigation Measure	Preferred Plan Impact Summary	Alternative A Impact Summary	Alternative B Impact Summary	Alternative C Impact Summary	Alternative D Impact Summary	Alternative E Impact Summary
Cultural and Paleontological Resources							
4.12. 1 - Archaeological (Prehistoric & Historic) Resources, Human Remains, and Paleontological Resources	MM 4.12.1 – Cultural resources protection requirements for discretionary projects (see page 4.12-18 and -19 of DEIR for full text of mitigation measure)	Significant and Mitigable The Preferred Plan, between the year 2005 and 2030, is projected that there would be an additional 2,935 dwelling units and 11,200,000 square feet of non-residential uses, new agricultural uses (up to 12,500 acres of new vineyards), potential expansion of the rural and urban uses in Angwin, new RUL for the City of American Canyon, and recycled water, recreation and roadway infrastructure improvements. This development could impact cultural and paleontological resources.	Significant and Mitigable This alternative would retain the existing land use designations under the current General Plan Land Use Map as well as the policy guidance set forth under the existing General Plan. Between the year 2005 and 2030, it is projected that there would be an additional 2,235 dwelling units and 16,014,000 square feet of non-residential uses, new agricultural uses (up to 12,500 acres of new vineyards). This development could impact cultural and paleontological resources.	Significant and Mitigable This alternative would provide for additional growth within currently General Plan designated areas for rural and urban development (beyond Alternative A) as well as re-use of the Pacific Coast/Boca site and Napa Pipe site. Between the year 2005 and 2030, it is projected that there would be an additional 3,885 dwelling units and 14,636,000 square feet of non-residential uses in the unincorporated portion of the County, as well as additional agricultural development (up to 12,500 acres of new vineyard development) and recycled water, recreation and roadway infrastructure improvements. This development could impact cultural and paleontological resources.	Significant and Mitigable This alternative would be similar to Alternative B, but would provide for additional residential development. For this alternative, between the year 2005 and 2030, it is projected that there would be an additional 7,635 dwelling units and 12,990,000 square feet of non-residential uses, allow for expansion of the Angwin bubble for additional rural and urban and rural development, and establish a new RUL for the City of American Canyon. This development could impact cultural and paleontological resources.	Significant and Mitigable This alternative would result in the least impact given the reduced non-agricultural development potential associated with its land use map (1,951 new dwelling units, 16,300,000 square feet of non-residential uses) and that the AWOS designation would be split into two districts: AOS and WOS, with the latter including areas where policies would be developed to achieve greater forest protection, riparian habitat preservation, and water quality improvements than envisioned under the current General Plan. In addition, vineyard development would be restricted in sensitive biotic communities and reduced to 7,500 acres.	Significant and Mitigable This alternative would be similar to Alternative C, but would also include further development allowed in the AWOS designation, and changes to County Code allowing for vineyard development on slopes up to 35% resulting in 15,000 acres of new vineyard development. This development (6,535 new dwelling units and 19,600,000 square feet of non-residential uses between 2005 and 2030) would have the most severe impact of the alternatives evaluated, given that it would allow development over a larger area.
4.12.2 - Historic Architectural Resources	MM 4.12.2 – Historic architectural resources requirements for discretionary projects (see page 4.12-21 of DEIR for full text of mitigation measure)	Significant and Unavoidable The Preferred Plan, between the year 2005 and 2030, is projected that there would be an additional 2,935 dwelling units and 11,200,000 square feet of non-residential uses, new agricultural uses (up to 12,500 acres of new vineyards), potential expansion of the rural and urban uses in Angwin, new RUL for the City of American Canyon, and recycled water, recreation and roadway infrastructure improvements. While most of this development is unlikely to affect historic resources, nothing in the General Plan would	Significant and Unavoidable This alternative would retain the existing land use designations under the current General Plan Land Use Map as well as the policy guidance set forth under the existing General Plan. Between the year 2005 and 2030, it is projected that there would be an additional 2,235 dwelling units and 16,014,000 square feet of non-residential uses, new agricultural uses (up to 12,500 acres of new vineyards). While most of this development is expected to occur in previously-disturbed areas, and is not likely to affect historic resources, nothing in the General Plan would preclude damage or removal of historic resources and	Significant and Unavoidable This alternative would provide for additional growth within currently General Plan designated areas for rural and urban development (beyond Alternative A) as well as re-use of the Pacific Coast/Boca site and Napa Pipe site. Between the year 2005 and 2030, it is projected that there would be an additional 3,885 dwelling units and 14,636,000 square feet of non-residential uses in the unincorporated portion of the County, as well as additional agricultural development (up to 12,500 acres of new vineyard development) and recycled water, recreation and roadway infrastructure improvements. While most of this development is unlikely to affect historic resources, nothing in the General	Significant and Unavoidable This alternative would be similar to Alternative B, but would provide for additional residential development. For this alternative, between the year 2005 and 2030, it is projected that there would be an additional 7,635 dwelling units and 12,990,000 square feet of non-residential uses, allow for expansion of the Angwin bubble for additional rural and urban and rural development, and establish a new RUL for the City of American Canyon. While most development under this alternative would be unlikely to affect historic resources, nothing in the General Plan would preclude damage or removal of historic resources and structures.	Significant and Unavoidable This alternative would result in the least impact given the reduced non-agricultural development potential associated with its land use map (1,951 new dwelling units, 16,300,000 square feet of non-residential uses) and that the AWOS designation would be split into two districts: AOS and WOS, with the latter including areas where policies would be developed to achieve greater forest protection, riparian habitat preservation, and water quality improvements than envisioned under the current General Plan. In addition, vineyard development would be restricted in sensitive biotic	Significant and Unavoidable This alternative would be similar to Alternative C, but would also include further development allowed in the AWOS designation, and changes to County Code allowing for vineyard development on slopes up to 35% resulting in 15,000 acres of new vineyard development. This development (6,535 new dwelling units and 19,600,000 square feet of non-residential uses between 2005 and 2030) would have the most severe impact of the alternatives evaluated, given that it would allow development over a larger area.

1.0 EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

Impact	Mitigation Measure	Preferred Plan Impact Summary	Alternative A Impact Summary	Alternative B Impact Summary	Alternative C Impact Summary	Alternative D Impact Summary	Alternative E Impact Summary
		preclude damage or removal of historic resources and structures.	structures.	Plan would preclude damage or removal of historic resources and structures.		communities and reduced to 7,500 acres. While most development under this alternative would be unlikely to affect historic resources, nothing would preclude damage or removal of historic resources and structures.	
Public Services and Utility Systems							
4.13.1.1 - Fire Protection and Emergency Medical Services	MM 4.13.1.1a – Requirements for cave facilities. MM 4.13.1.1b – Required consultation with fire agency and compliance with standards. MM 4.13.1.1c – Required provision for alternate power source for water wells. (see page 4.13-8 and -9 of DEIR for full text of mitigation measures)	Significant and Mitigable The Preferred Plan, between the year 2005 and 2030, is projected that there would be an additional 2,935 dwelling units and 11,200,000 square feet of non-residential uses, new agricultural uses (up to 12,500 acres of new vineyards), potential expansion of the rural and urban uses in Angwin, new RUL for the City of American Canyon. This development would increase demands for fire protection services County-wide and would potentially require the construction of new facilities.	Significant and Mitigable This alternative would retain the existing land use designations under the current General Plan Land Use Map as well as the policy guidance set forth under the existing General Plan. Between the year 2005 and 2030, it is projected that there would be an additional 2,235 dwelling units and 16,014,000 square feet of non-residential uses, new agricultural uses (up to 12,500 acres of new vineyards). This development would increase demands for fire protection services County-wide and would potentially require the construction of new facilities.	Significant and Mitigable This alternative would provide for additional growth within currently General Plan designated areas for rural and urban development (beyond Alternative A) as well as re-use of the Pacific Coast/Boca site and Napa Pipe site. Between the year 2005 and 2030, it is projected that there would be an additional 3,885 dwelling units and 14,636,000 square feet of non-residential uses in the unincorporated portion of the County, as well as additional agricultural development (up to 12,500 acres of new vineyard development). This development would increase demands for fire protection services County-wide as well as within the City of Napa and would potentially require the construction of new facilities.	Significant and Mitigable This alternative would be similar to Alternative B, but would provide for additional residential development. For this alternative, between the year 2005 and 2030, it is projected that there would be an additional 7,635 dwelling units and 12,990,000 square feet of non-residential uses, allow for expansion of the Angwin bubble for additional rural and urban and rural development, and establish a new RUL for the City of American Canyon. Similar to Alternative B, this development would increase demands for fire protection services County-wide as well as within the City of Napa and American Canyon and would potentially require the construction of new facilities.	Significant and Mitigable This alternative would result in the least impact given the reduced non-agricultural development potential associated with its land use map (1,951 new dwelling units, 16,300,000 square feet of non-residential uses) and that the AWOS designation would be split into two districts: AOS and WOS, with the latter including areas where policies would be developed to achieve greater forest protection, riparian habitat preservation, and water quality improvements than envisioned under the current General Plan. In addition, vineyard development would be restricted in sensitive biotic communities and reduced to 7,500 acres.	Significant and Mitigable This alternative would be similar to Alternative C, but would also include further development allowed in the AWOS designation, and changes to County Code allowing for vineyard development on slopes up to 35% resulting in 15,000 acres of new vineyard development. This development (6,535 new dwelling units and 19,600,000 square feet of non-residential uses between 2005 and 2030) would increase demands for fire protection services County-wide as well as within the City of Napa and American Canyon and would potentially require the construction of new facilities (similar to Alternative C).
4.13.2.1 - Law Enforcement Service and Standards	MM 4.13.2.1a – Required consulting with law enforcement agencies and agency needs to serve MM 4.13.2.1b – Site location for new public safety facilities (Applies to the Preferred Plan, Alternative B, C, and E) (see page 4.13-14 of DEIR for full text of mitigation measures)	Significant and Mitigable The Preferred Plan, between the year 2005 and 2030, is projected that there would be an additional 2,935 dwelling units and 11,200,000 square feet of non-residential uses, new agricultural uses (up to 12,500 acres of new vineyards), potential expansion of the rural and urban uses in Angwin, new RUL for the City of American Canyon. Based on the standard of 0.7 officers	Less than Significant This alternative would retain the existing land use designations under the current General Plan Land Use Map as well as the policy guidance set forth under the existing General Plan. Between the year 2005 and 2030, it is projected that there would be an additional 2,235 dwelling units and 16,014,000 square feet of non-residential uses, new agricultural uses (up to 12,500 acres of new vineyards). Based on the	Significant and Mitigable This alternative would provide for additional growth within currently General Plan designated areas for rural and urban development (beyond Alternative A) as well as re-use of the Pacific Coast/Boca site and Napa Pipe site. Between the year 2005 and 2030, it is projected that there would be an additional 3,885 dwelling units and 14,636,000 square feet of non-residential uses in the unincorporated portion of the County, as well as additional agricultural development (up to	Significant and Mitigable This alternative would be similar to Alternative B, but would provide for additional residential development. For this alternative, between the year 2005 and 2030, it is projected that there would be an additional 7,635 dwelling units and 12,990,000 square feet of non-residential uses, allow for expansion of the Angwin bubble for additional rural and urban and rural development, and establish a new RUL for the City of American Canyon. Based on the standard of 0.7 officers per 1,000 residents, the County would need to	Less than Significant This alternative would result in the least impact given the reduced non-agricultural development potential associated with its land use map (1,951 new dwelling units, 16,300,000 square feet of non-residential uses). Based on the standard of 0.7 officers per 1,000 residents, the County would need to add an additional three (3) officers for this alternative.	Significant and Mitigable This alternative would be similar to Alternative C, but would also include further development allowed in the AWOS designation, and changes to County Code allowing for vineyard development on slopes up to 35% resulting in 15,000 acres of new vineyard development. This development (6,535 new dwelling units and 19,600,000 square feet of non-residential uses between

Impact	Mitigation Measure	Preferred Plan Impact Summary	Alternative A Impact Summary	Alternative B Impact Summary	Alternative C Impact Summary	Alternative D Impact Summary	Alternative E Impact Summary
		per 1,000 residents, the County would need to add an additional six (6) officers and related supporting equipment for the Preferred Plan.	standard o 0.7 officers per 1,000 residents, the County would need to add an additional four (4) officers and associated equipment for this alternative.	12,500 acres of new vineyard development). Based on the standard of 0.7 officers per 1,000 residents, the County would need to add an additional six (6) officers and related supporting equipment if this alternative were implemented. However, it should be acknowledged that some of this growth would occur in the City of Napa (250 multi family units projected by year 2030 that could result in approximately 617 residents), generating the need for additional City police services.	add an additional thirteen (13) officers for this alternative. However, it should be acknowledged that some of this growth would occur in the City of Napa (500 multi family units projected by year 2030), generating the need for additional City police services.		2005 and 2030) would increase demands for law enforcement by 11 additional officers (based on the standard of 0.7 officers per 1,000 residents). However, it should be acknowledged that some of this growth would occur in the City of Napa (700 multi family units projected by year 2030), generating the need for additional City police services.
4.13.3.1 - Water Supply Impacts	MM 4.13.3.1a – Periodic review of groundwater ordinance and discretionary projects for groundwater availability. MM 4.13.3.1b - Verification of adequate water supply and distribution facilities for development projects. (see page 4.13-46 of DEIR for full text of mitigation measures)	Significant and Unavoidable Growth under the Preferred Plan, between the year 2005 and 2030, it is projected to generate 1,106 acre-feet annually of residential water demand and 1,943 acre-feet annually for non-residential uses.	Significant and Unavoidable Growth under this alternative, between the year 2005 and 2030, it is projected to generate 842 acre-feet annually of residential water demand and 2,780 acre-feet annually for non-residential uses.	Significant and Unavoidable Growth under this alternative, between the year 2005 and 2030, it is projected to generate 1,539 acre-feet annually of residential water demand and 2,541 acre-feet annually for non-residential uses.	Significant and Unavoidable Growth under this alternative, between the year 2005 and 2030, it is projected to generate 3,077 acre-feet annually of residential water demand and 2,255 acre-feet annually for non-residential uses.	Significant and Unavoidable Growth under this alternative, between the year 2005 and 2030, it is projected to generate 735 acre-feet annually of residential water demand and 2,826 acre-feet annually for non-residential uses. This alternative would also generate the least water demand associated with vineyard development at 8,325 acre-feet annually. This alternative would have the least severe water supply impact of the alternatives evaluated.	Significant and Unavoidable Growth under this alternative, between the year 2005 and 2030, it is projected to generate 2,462 acre-feet annually of residential water demand and 3,398 acre-feet annually for non-residential uses. This alternative would also generate the most water demand associated with vineyard development at 16,650 acre-feet annually. This alternative would have the most severe water supply impact of the alternatives evaluated.

1.0 EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

Impact	Mitigation Measure	Preferred Plan Impact Summary	Alternative A Impact Summary	Alternative B Impact Summary	Alternative C Impact Summary	Alternative D Impact Summary	Alternative E Impact Summary
4.13.4.1 - Sewer Treatment and Conveyance	MM 4.13.4.1 - Verification of adequate wastewater service for development projects. (see page 4.13-56 of DEIR for full text of mitigation measures)	Significant and Mitigable Growth under the Preferred Plan, between the year 2005 and 2030, it is projected to generate 1.13 million gallons per day (mgd) in total wastewater demand from new residential and non-residential development.	Significant and Mitigable Growth under this alternative, between the year 2005 and 2030, it is projected to generate 0.99 million gallons per day (mgd) in total wastewater demand from new residential and non-residential development.	Significant and Mitigable Growth under this alternative, between the year 2005 and 2030, it is projected to generate 1.50 million gallons per day (mgd) in total wastewater demand from new residential and non-residential development.	Significant and Mitigable Growth under this alternative, between the year 2005 and 2030, it is projected to generate 2.55 million gallons per day (mgd) in total wastewater demand from new residential and non-residential development. This alternative would have the largest wastewater demand of the alternatives evaluated.	Significant and Mitigable This alternative would result in the lowest wastewater service demand impacts given the reduced non-agricultural development potential associated with its land use map. Wastewater service demands under this Alternative would be 0.88 million gallons per day by year 2030.	Significant and Mitigable Growth under this alternative, between the year 2005 and 2030, it is projected to generate 2.39 million gallons per day (mgd) in total wastewater demand from new residential and non-residential development.
4.13.5.1 - Solid Waste Service	None required	Less than Significant Growth under the Preferred Plan, between the year 2005 and 2030, it is projected to generate approximately 39,654 tons of solid waste annually from new residential and non-residential development.	Less than Significant Growth under this alternative, between the year 2005 and 2030, it is projected to generate approximately 15,609 tons of solid waste annually from new residential and non-residential development.	Less than Significant Growth under this alternative, between the year 2005 and 2030, it is projected to generate approximately 23,637 tons of solid waste annually from new residential and non-residential development.	Less than Significant Growth under this alternative, between the year 2005 and 2030, it is projected to generate approximately 40,137 tons of solid waste annually from new residential and non-residential development. This alternative would generate the most solid waste of the alternatives evaluated.	Less than Significant Growth under this alternative, between the year 2005 and 2030, it is projected to generate approximately 13,789 tons of solid waste annually from new residential and non-residential development. This alternative would generate the least amount of solid waste of the alternatives evaluated.	Less than Significant Growth under this alternative, between the year 2005 and 2030, it is projected to generate approximately 37,307 tons of solid waste annually from new residential and non-residential development.
4.13.6.1 - Public School Facilities	None required	Less than Significant The Preferred Plan, between the year 2005 and 2030, is projected that there would be an additional 2,935 dwelling units and 11,200,000 square feet of non-residential uses, new agricultural uses (up to 12,500 acres of new vineyards), potential expansion of the rural and urban uses in Angwin, new RUL for the City of American Canyon. This development would be required to pay school mitigation fees that would address its impact. Government Code Section 65995(h) states that the payment or satisfaction of a	Less than Significant This alternative would retain the existing land use designations under the current General Plan Land Use Map as well as the policy guidance set forth under the existing General Plan. Between the year 2005 and 2030, it is projected that there would be an additional 2,235 dwelling units and 16,014,000 square feet of non-residential uses, new agricultural uses (up to 12,500 acres of new vineyards). This development would be required to pay school mitigation fees that would address its impact. Government Code Section 65995(h) states that the payment or satisfaction of a	Less than Significant This alternative would provide for additional growth within currently General Plan designated areas for rural and urban development (beyond Alternative A) as well as re-use of the Pacific Coast/Boca site and Napa Pipe site. Between the year 2005 and 2030, it is projected that there would be an additional 3,885 dwelling units and 14,636,000 square feet of non-residential uses in the unincorporated portion of the County, as well as additional agricultural development (up to 12,500 acres of new vineyard development). This development would be required to pay school mitigation fees that would address its impact. Government Code Section 65995(h) states that the	Less than Significant This alternative would be similar to Alternative B, but would provide for additional residential development. For this alternative, between the year 2005 and 2030, it is projected that there would be an additional 7,635 dwelling units and 12,990,000 square feet of non-residential uses, allow for expansion of the Angwin bubble for additional rural and urban and rural development, and establish a new RUL for the City of American Canyon. This development would be required to pay school mitigation fees that would address its impact. Government Code Section 65995(h) states that the payment or satisfaction of a fee, charge, or other requirement levied or imposed pursuant to Section 17620 of the	Less than Significant This alternative would result in the least impact given the reduced non-agricultural development potential associated with its land use map (1,951 new dwelling units, 16,300,000 square feet of non-residential uses). This development would be required to pay school mitigation fees that would address its impact. Government Code Section 65995(h) states that the payment or satisfaction of a fee, charge, or other requirement levied or imposed pursuant to Section 17620 of the Education Code is deemed to be full and complete mitigation of the	Less than Significant This alternative would be similar to Alternative C, but would also include further development allowed in the AWOS designation, and changes to County Code allowing for vineyard development on slopes up to 35% resulting in 15,000 acres of new vineyard development. This development (6,535 new dwelling units and 19,600,000 square feet of non-residential uses between 2005 and 2030) would be required to pay school mitigation fees that would address its impact. Government Code Section 65995(h) states that the

Impact	Mitigation Measure	Preferred Plan Impact Summary	Alternative A Impact Summary	Alternative B Impact Summary	Alternative C Impact Summary	Alternative D Impact Summary	Alternative E Impact Summary
		fee, charge, or other requirement levied or imposed pursuant to Section 17620 of the Education Code is deemed to be full and complete mitigation of the impacts for the planning, use, development, or the provision of adequate school facilities.	fee, charge, or other requirement levied or imposed pursuant to Section 17620 of the Education Code is deemed to be full and complete mitigation of the impacts for the planning, use, development, or the provision of adequate school facilities.	payment or satisfaction of a fee, charge, or other requirement levied or imposed pursuant to Section 17620 of the Education Code is deemed to be full and complete mitigation of the impacts for the planning, use, development, or the provision of adequate school facilities.	Education Code is deemed to be full and complete mitigation of the impacts for the planning, use, development, or the provision of adequate school facilities.	impacts for the planning, use, development, or the provision of adequate school facilities.	payment or satisfaction of a fee, charge, or other requirement levied or imposed pursuant to Section 17620 of the Education Code is deemed to be full and complete mitigation of the impacts for the planning, use, development, or the provision of adequate school facilities.
4.13.7.1 – Provision of Electric and Natural Gas Resources	None required	Less than Significant Growth under the Preferred Plan, between the year 2005 and 2030, it is projected to generate approximately 39.22 BOEs (barrels of oil equivalent) of natural gas and gas source demand and 30.17 BOEs of electrical service demand from new residential and non-residential development.	Less than Significant Growth under this alternative, between the year 2005 and 2030, it is projected to generate approximately 26.16 BOEs (barrels of oil equivalent) of natural gas and gas source demand and 20.15 BOEs of electrical service demand from new residential and non-residential development.	Less than Significant Growth under this alternative, between the year 2005 and 2030, it is projected to generate approximately 47.13 BOEs (barrels of oil equivalent) of natural gas and gas source demand and 36.29 BOEs of electrical service demand from new residential and non-residential development.	Less than Significant Growth under this alternative, between the year 2005 and 2030, it is projected to generate approximately 94.28 BOEs (barrels of oil equivalent) of natural gas and gas source demand and 72.61 BOEs of electrical service demand from new residential and non-residential development.	Less than Significant This alternative would result in the least impact given the reduced non-agricultural development potential associated with its land use map (1,951 new dwelling units, 16,300,000 square feet of non-residential uses).	Less than Significant This alternative would be similar to Alternative C, but would also include further development allowed in the AWOS designation, and changes to County Code allowing for vineyard development on slopes up to 35% resulting in 15,000 acres of new vineyard development. This development (6,535 new dwelling units and 19,600,000 square feet of non-residential uses between 2005 and 2030) would result in slightly less power demand than Alternative C.
4.13.8.1 – Social Services	None required	Less than Significant The Preferred Plan, between the year 2005 and 2030, is projected that there would be an additional 2,935 dwelling units, potential expansion of the rural and urban uses in Angwin, new RUL for the City of American Canyon. A limited amount of improvements are required to accommodate future growth that are not expected to result in adverse physical impacts to the environment.	Less than Significant This alternative would retain the existing land use designations under the current General Plan Land Use Map as well as the policy guidance set forth under the existing General Plan. Between the year 2005 and 2030, it is projected that there would be an additional 2,235 dwelling units. A limited amount of improvements required to accommodate future growth are not expected to result in adverse physical impacts to the environment.	Less than Significant This alternative would provide for additional growth within currently General Plan designated areas for rural and urban development (beyond Alternative A) as well as re-use of the Pacific Coast/Boca site and Napa Pipe site. Between the year 2005 and 2030, it is projected that there would be an additional 3,885 dwelling units. A limited amount of improvements required to accommodate future growth are not expected to result in adverse physical impacts to the environment.	Less than Significant This alternative would be similar to Alternative B, but would provide for additional residential development. For this alternative, between the year 2005 and 2030, it is projected that there would be an additional 7,635 dwelling units. A limited amount of improvements required to accommodate future growth are not expected to result in adverse physical impacts to the environment.	Less than Significant This alternative would result in the least impact given the reduced non-agricultural development potential associated with its land use map that would allow 1,951 new dwelling units. A limited amount of improvements required to accommodate future growth are not expected to result in adverse physical impacts to the environment.	Less than Significant This alternative would be similar to Alternative C, but would also include further development allowed in the AWOS designation. This development (6,535 new dwelling units between 2005 and 2030) would require limited amount of improvements to accommodate future growth are not expected to result in adverse physical impacts to the environment.

1.0 EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

Impact	Mitigation Measure	Preferred Plan Impact Summary	Alternative A Impact Summary	Alternative B Impact Summary	Alternative C Impact Summary	Alternative D Impact Summary	Alternative E Impact Summary
4.13.9.1 - Increased Demand for Park and Recreational Facilities	<p>MM 4.13.9.1a - Increase the dedicated open space</p> <p>MM 4.13.9.1b – Increase non-motorized, off-street trails</p> <p>MM 4.13.9.1c - Proximity to parks mitigation</p> <p>MM 4.13.9.1e – Requirements for parkland dedication fees or development of recreation facilities for new developments (Applies to Preferred Plan and Alternative B, C, and E)</p> <p>(see page 4.13-80 of DEIR for full text of mitigation measures)</p>	<p>Significant and Mitigable</p> <p>The Preferred Plan, between the year 2005 and 2030, is projected that there would be an additional 2,935 dwelling units, potential expansion of the rural and urban uses in Angwin, new RUL for the City of American Canyon. This increase in population would add to the demand for recreation opportunities in the County.</p>	<p>Significant and Mitigable</p> <p>This alternative would retain the existing land use designations under the current General Plan Land Use Map as well as the policy guidance set forth under the existing General Plan. Between the year 2005 and 2030, it is projected that there would be an additional 2,235 dwelling units. This increase in population would add to the demand for recreation opportunities in the County.</p>	<p>Significant and Mitigable</p> <p>This alternative would provide for additional growth within currently General Plan designated areas for rural and urban development (beyond Alternative A) as well as re-use of the Pacific Coast/Boca site and Napa Pipe site. Between the year 2005 and 2030, it is projected that there would be an additional 3,885 dwelling units. This increase in population would add to the demand for recreation opportunities in the County and the City of Napa.</p>	<p>Significant and Mitigable</p> <p>This alternative would be similar to Alternative B, but would provide for additional residential development. For this alternative, between the year 2005 and 2030, it is projected that there would be an additional 7,635 dwelling units. This alternative includes the re-use of County-owned sites within the City of Napa that would generate up to 1,234 persons that would increase the demand of City recreation facilities. This increase in population would add to the demand for recreation opportunities in the County. This alternative would have the most severe impact of the alternatives evaluated.</p>	<p>Significant and Mitigable</p> <p>This alternative would result in the least impact given the reduced non-agricultural development potential associated with its land use map that would allow 1,951 new dwelling units. This alternative would result in reduced recreation demand impacts (as compared to all Alternatives).</p>	<p>Significant and Mitigable</p> <p>This alternative would be similar to Alternative C, but would also include further development allowed in the AWOS designation. This development (6,535 new dwelling units between 2005 and 2030) would result in similar recreation demand impacts as Alternative C.</p>
Visual Resources/Light and Glare							
4.14.1 - Degradation of the Quality of Visual Character Associated With Designated Scenic Resources Within the County	<p>MM 4.14.1a - Continued implementation of Napa County Viewshed Protection Program</p> <p>MM 4.14.1b - Retention of trees along public roadways</p> <p>MM 4.14.1c – Requirements for telecommunication facilities and transmission lines</p> <p>MM 4.14.1d – Retention of current landscape characteristics for new roadway construction</p> <p>MM 4.14.1e - Requirements for visually compatibility</p>	<p>Significant and Mitigable</p> <p>The Preferred Plan, between the year 2005 and 2030, is projected that there would be an additional 2,935 dwelling units and 11,200,000 square feet of non-residential uses, new agricultural uses (up to 12,500 acres of new vineyards), potential expansion of the rural and urban uses in Angwin, new RUL for the City of American Canyon, and recycled water, recreation and roadway infrastructure improvements. This development could impact scenic resources in the County.</p>	<p>Significant and Mitigable</p> <p>This alternative would retain the existing land use designations under the current General Plan Land Use Map as well as the policy guidance set forth under the existing General Plan. Between the year 2005 and 2030, it is projected that there would be an additional 2,235 dwelling units and 16,014,000 square feet of non-residential uses, new agricultural uses (up to 12,500 acres of new vineyards). However, this alternative would not include recycled water, recreation and roadway infrastructure improvements. This development could impact scenic resources in the County.</p>	<p>Significant and Mitigable</p> <p>This alternative would provide for additional growth within currently General Plan designated areas for rural and urban development (beyond Alternative A) as well as re-use of the Pacific Coast/Boca site and Napa Pipe site. Between the year 2005 and 2030, it is projected that there would be an additional 3,885 dwelling units and 14,636,000 square feet of non-residential uses in the unincorporated portion of the County, as well as additional agricultural development (up to 12,500 acres of new vineyard development) and recycled water, recreation and roadway infrastructure improvements. This development could impact scenic resources in the County.</p>	<p>Significant and Mitigable</p> <p>This alternative would be similar to Alternative B, but would provide for additional residential development. For this alternative, between the year 2005 and 2030, it is projected that there would be an additional 7,635 dwelling units and 12,990,000 square feet of non-residential uses, allow for expansion of the Angwin bubble for additional rural and urban and rural development, and establish a new RUL for the City of American Canyon. This development could impact scenic resources in the County.</p>	<p>Significant and Mitigable</p> <p>This alternative would result in the least impact given the reduced non-agricultural development potential associated with its land use map (1,951 new dwelling units, 16,300,000 square feet of non-residential uses) and that the AWOS designation would be split into two districts: AOS and WOS, with the latter including areas where policies would be developed to achieve greater forest protection, riparian habitat preservation, and water quality improvements than envisioned under the current General Plan. In addition, vineyard development would be restricted in sensitive biotic communities and reduced to</p>	<p>Significant and Mitigable</p> <p>This alternative would be similar to Alternative C, but would also include further development allowed in the AWOS designation, and changes to County Code allowing for vineyard development on slopes up to 35% resulting in 15,000 acres of new vineyard development. This development (6,535 new dwelling units and 19,600,000 square feet of non-residential uses between 2005 and 2030) would have the most severe impact of the alternatives evaluated, given that it would allow development over a larger area.</p>

Impact	Mitigation Measure	Preferred Plan Impact Summary	Alternative A Impact Summary	Alternative B Impact Summary	Alternative C Impact Summary	Alternative D Impact Summary	Alternative E Impact Summary
	<p>(Applies to the Preferred Plan, Alternative B, C, and E)</p> <p>MM 4.14.1f - Dedication of land to on slopes greater than 15% for annexed City of American Canyon lands.</p> <p>(Applies to Alternative C)</p> <p>(see pages 4.14-13 and -14of DEIR for full text of mitigation measures)</p>					<p>7,500 acres. This development could impact scenic resources in the County.</p>	
<p>4.14.2 - Daytime Glare and Nighttime Lighting</p>	<p>MM 4.14.2a – Requirements for landscaping with roadway improvements</p> <p>MM 4.14.2b – Limiting street lighting mitigation</p> <p>MM 4.14.2c – Avoidance of use of reflective building materials</p> <p>MM 4.14.2d – Avoidance of the use of spillover light</p> <p>(see pages4.14-16 of DEIR for full text of mitigation measures)</p>	<p>Significant and Mitigable</p> <p>The Preferred Plan, between the year 2005 and 2030, is projected that there would be an additional 2,935 dwelling units and 11,200,000 square feet of non-residential uses, new agricultural uses (up to 12,500 acres of new vineyards), potential expansion of the rural and urban uses in Angwin, new RUL for the City of American Canyon, and recycled water, recreation and roadway infrastructure improvements. This development could impact scenic resources in the County. This development could result in significant glare and lighting impacts.</p>	<p>Significant and Mitigable</p> <p>This alternative would retain the existing land use designations under the current General Plan Land Use Map as well as the policy guidance set forth under the existing General Plan. Between the year 2005 and 2030, it is projected that there would be an additional 2,235 dwelling units and 16,014,000 square feet of non-residential uses, new agricultural uses (up to 12,500 acres of new vineyards). However, this alternative would not include recycled water, recreation and roadway infrastructure improvements. This development could result in significant glare and lighting impacts.</p>	<p>Significant and Mitigable</p> <p>This alternative would provide for additional growth within currently General Plan designated areas for rural and urban development (beyond Alternative A) as well as re-use of the Pacific Coast/Boca site and Napa Pipe site. Between the year 2005 and 2030, it is projected that there would be an additional 3,885 dwelling units and 14,636,000 square feet of non-residential uses in the unincorporated portion of the County, as well as additional agricultural development (up to 12,500 acres of new vineyard development) and recycled water, recreation and roadway infrastructure improvements. This development could result in significant glare and lighting impacts.</p>	<p>Significant and Mitigable</p> <p>This alternative would be similar to Alternative B, but would provide for additional residential development. For this alternative, between the year 2005 and 2030, it is projected that there would be an additional 7,635 dwelling units and 12,990,000 square feet of non-residential uses, allow for expansion of the Angwin bubble for additional rural and urban and rural development, and establish a new RUL for the City of American Canyon. This development could result in significant glare and lighting impacts.</p>	<p>Significant and Mitigable</p> <p>This alternative would result in the least impact given the reduced non-agricultural development potential associated with its land use map (1,951 new dwelling units, 16,300,000 square feet of non-residential uses) and that the AWOS designation would be split into two districts: AOS and WOS, with the latter including areas where policies would be developed to achieve greater forest protection, riparian habitat preservation, and water quality improvements than envisioned under the current General Plan. In addition, vineyard development would be restricted in sensitive biotic communities and reduced to 7,500 acres.</p>	<p>Significant and Mitigable</p> <p>This alternative would be similar to Alternative C, but would also include further development allowed in the AWOS designation, and changes to County Code allowing for vineyard development on slopes up to 35% resulting in 15,000 acres of new vineyard development. This development (6,535 new dwelling units and 19,600,000 square feet of non-residential uses between 2005 and 2030) would have the most severe impact of the alternatives evaluated, given that it would allow development over a larger area.</p>