3.0 COMMENTS AND RESPONSES TO COMMENTS

Letter 152

Date: June 15, 2007

To:
Patrick Lowe, Deputy Planning Director
Napa County Office of Conservation, Development & Planning
1195 Third St., Suite #210
Napa, CA 94559

From:
Paula J. Peterson
P.O. Box 296
Angwin, CA 94508

Subject: Draft EIR Comments
RE: Comments & Questions

Thank you for the opportunity to comment on the Napa County Draft General Plan and Draft EIR. As a resident of Napa County, I see these documents as vitally important to maintain Napa County’s vision of preserving existing agricultural land uses (Ag/LU Goal 1) as well as continuing policies which “collectively...perpetuate...agricultural preservation as the immovable foundation for sound decision making within Napa County”. (DGP pg 31)

Included with this submission are two Matrixes which I have used to provide comments and questions relative to the Napa County DGP and DEIR. The first matrix is the DEIR 2.0 Executive Summary. Second is a Policy Location Matrix. Both of these documents are being used to contain some of my comments and questions as well as indicate areas and/or language I support.

“State CEQA Guidelines Section 15123(b)(1) provides that the Summary shall identify each significant effect with proposed mitigation measures that would reduce or avoid that effect.” There are 74 “impacts” identified in Table 2.0-1. Of those nearly 1/4* are identified as “Significant and Unavoidable” (SU) impacts for all alternatives presented even after implementing the proposed mitigation measures.

* Alternative A = 15 SU = 21%
Alternative B = 16 SU = 22%
Alternative C = 17 SU = 23%
For an Environmental Review document this percentage seems unacceptably high to me. It defies logic to approve a “Project” (GP) that would result in the identified consequences of implementing any of the three primary Project Alternatives.

To prepare for providing comments, I read or reviewed the following documents: Napa County General Plan Amended through 3-5-02, Draft General Plan 2007, Draft EIR Volume I dated 2007, Draft EIR Volume II dated 2007 (Appendices A-E; Appendices F-J were reviewed on-line), County of Napa DGP/DEIR Fact Sheets, Napa County GP Update Policy Location Matrix, portions of Napa County Ordinances (on-line), and portions of the Base Line Data Report. I attended Napa County Up-Valley General Plan Workshops, 2 Steering Committee meetings, 1 Planning Commission meeting. I participated with a group of Angwin residents in reviewing the DGP/DEIR, meeting weekly for the past two months. Regardless, I found it very difficult to correlate, in any meaningful way, the DEIR Alternatives and Mitigation Measures with the DGP Goals and Policies. It is a daunting process and there seems to be a “disconnect” between the Project Vision and Goals and the outcome under the various Alternatives. That said, I have the following overriding observations, comments and/or questions:

- I am in SUPPORT of the comments and proposal, including map, submitted by Save Rural Angwin. Please give it full consideration as the Land Use Map in AP/LU Element of the General Plan. (REF DGP Page 50) Existing and Alternate maps shown in the DGP and DEIR all provide for building intensity NOT CONSISTENT with Circulation and other infrastructure elements including Community Character, Safety, and Open Space. I support elimination of all of the “Urban Bubbles” as they are artificial unnecessary configurations and confounding to thoughtful land use planning and appropriate zoning.

- Transportation/Circulation Impacts. Mitigation showing changing all 2-lane roads to 4-lane roads (and 4 to 6) as the roadway improvements necessary to accommodate traffic should the proposed building intensities of Alternatives B, C, and E be allowed is NOT FEASIBLE. (REF DEIR Table 4.4-15) Realistically, such a Mitigating Measure would never be funded. For example, private ownership plus set-back distances recommended/required (Table 4.8-5, DEIR Page 4.8-16) along Deer Park and Howell Mt. Rd and the unlikeliness that the County would ever have the capital funds to acquire (through purchase or condemnation) the required footage or parcels to widen the 2-lanes to 4-lanes,
coupled with the significant environmental consequences of doing so, is INFEASIBLE. Additionally, mitigating to LOS D or better is INSUFFICIENT. The County should require mitigation for Arterials and Collectors to be LOS C or better. Further, LOS seems to focus on the ratio between volume and capacity including comfort and convenience without regard for the roadway classification or condition. This is an INADEQUATE assessment. In the case of Collector roads such as Deer Park and Howell Mtn, implementing the proposed Mitigating Measure would result in greater growth inducement impacts affecting the quality of life in Napa County negatively. (Note: I recognize a specific development proposal is necessary to conduct a comprehensive and reliable analysis - Appendix B, Dowling Associates, Inc.). Finally, Deer Park and Howell Mtn now have a considerable amount of diesel traffic, ever increasing with more drive through commuter and construction related traffic. Diesel exhaust is a toxic Air Contaminant (TAC). Diesel engine particulate has been identified as a human carcinogen. (DEIR page 4.8-7: Problematic for Napa County is the 2006 status identifying 4 of 7 air pollutant concentrations listed in Table 4.8-4 in violation of State & Federal standards).

- It appears to me that key assumptions made in water studies and fisheries studies do not include evaluation of the rural Angwin area. In addition, the 2050 Study indicates that the unincorporated area and agriculture water uses are the primary users of groundwater in the County with potential shortfall in both “normal” and multi-dry years. Groundwater level data needs to be collected in the rural Angwin area to assess the impacts of increasing pumping. Depletion of groundwater levels can result in decreasing or eliminating stream flows which contributes to poor fisheries rearing habitat and water quality problems such as stagnant water. Protections need to be put in place to preclude overdraft of Napa County’s finite ground water resources.

- The DEIR FAILS TO ADEQUATELY address the impacts in rural unincorporated areas to water supply drainages (i.e., Friesen Lakes – Conn Creek – Lake Hennessy). Discharge from large scale development and associated activity may cause or contribute to storm water pollution. Development at the growth levels proposed by the A-C Alternatives will increase impervious areas that could result in a substantial increase in surface runoff and peak discharge. Creeks and drainages are especially productive for plants/biotic communities providing shelter and food sources for resident and migratory wildlife. Wildlife movement has not been well studied in Napa County or analogous landscapes. Development must not be allowed to permanently and negatively impact access of wildlife to food and water. Development (and subsequent activity by people and their household pets) could cause further constriction that reduces the quality of creek corridors. Angwin is identified as a location of special-status animal species occurrences; ACCURACY of the occurrence data is low for the Angwin area.

- The County’s potential purchase of Angwin Airport is NOT ADEQUATELY addressed in the DEIR. For example, if the Angwin Airport were to become anything other than a landing strip, there could be significant impacts. Increased hanger space and other airport services could be jobs inducing. Further, potential
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proposed development adjacent to and/or nearby the airport could compromise operations of the airport if not addressed.

- The cumulative impact of timber conversion and well drilling has NOT BEEN ADEQUATELY analyzed. Such impacts could allow for significant irreversible environmental changes and UNACCEPTABLE cumulative impacts.

- I would like to see a Goal or Policy added to the DGP Recreation and Open Space or Conservation Elements that encourages the various educational institutions in Napa County to promote green technology programs and courses of study that address Global Warming.

- The View Shed Ordinance refers to the General Plan for identification of Scenic Roadways yet the DGP seems to have eliminated that list. Please ensure the Scenic roadways list is incorporated.

- The terminology “already developed area” (Ref DGP page 14, 15, 33, 39, etc; also Ag/LU 3 and 20) needs to be further defined. Any property with as little as a shed or outhouse could be viewed as “already developed” and could therefore apply to almost all of the County lands. “Existing incorporated and city centered areas” should be more consistently used.

- Among the elements of CEQA Guidelines Section 15130(b) for an EIR to be adequate it shall examine reasonable, feasible options for mitigating or avoiding the project’s contribution to any significant cumulative effects. In DEIR 5.0/5.3 the Cumulative Impacts Analysis identifies 15 environmental issue areas, 10 of which are shown to be “Significant and Unavoidable (SU)” and the Project’s contribution would be considered “Considerable”. The cumulative impacts are NOT ADEQUATELY addressed in DEIR for population/housing/employment, transportation and circulation, biological resources, noise, air quality, global warming effects, geology and soils, hydrology/water quality, cultural and paleontological resources, and public services/utilities (specifically water supply).

- This Project analysis addresses only approved and pending development projects identified at the time the DEIR was prepared. Large scale in-County projects known to be under discussion have as yet to be included in the overall analysis and will have significant impact on their own as well as cumulative impacts. Other projected development in the Region (i.e. adjacent Lake County) will additionally accelerate UNACCEPTABLE cumulative impacts. The Mitigating Measures related to critical infrastructure fall short even prior to the addition of these potential developments. As is, the DEIR 7.3 “Significant and Unavoidable Environmental Effects” have appalling long-term implications if the General Plan project is accepted under any of the considered primary Alternatives. The policies related to the preservation of rural Napa County and the conservation of significant natural resources are INCOMPLETE.

- In DEIR 7.0 Long-Term Implications, 7.3 SU Environmental Effects, again of the 19 Impacts identified, 15 are SU all Alternatives, 2 others have 2 SU Alternatives, and the final 2 have 3 SU Alternatives. Additionally, all 10 Cumulative Impacts will be cumulatively “Considerable”. This surely can not be considered consistent with Napa County’s long standing Vision and Goals regarding quality of life.
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- Correct DEIR 9.0 Acronyms and Abbreviations – CDC is listed twice; CDPR (California Department of Parks and Recreation) is missing in the list.
- It is unfortunate that the Resource Preservation Alternative was evaluated at a lesser level of detail. Given the outcome of the analysis of the A-C and No Project Alternatives, and given the very confusing and unwieldy detail of the growth inducing Alternatives as considerably inmitigable, I SUPPORT consideration of distilling the DEIR to one Preferred Alternative that represents the 1 % Measure A Growth Control and is proximate to the Environmentally Superior Alternative. While retaining the work of the aforementioned alternatives in an Appendix.

Thank you for your consideration of my input. The extensive work of County Staff, Consultants, Steering Committee members, Planning Commissioners, Board of Supervisor Representatives and public respondents is greatly appreciated and applauded.

Attachments/Enclosures:
- DEIR 2.0 Executive Summary
- CP Policy Location Matrix
- EIR Alternatives Development Assumptions
### 3.0 Comments and Responses to Comments

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Current General Plan</th>
<th>Draft General Plan</th>
<th>Proposed Changes</th>
<th>Rationale for Change</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Pg 19 Re Vision - 2</td>
<td>The Napa Plan</td>
<td>Field and its tributaries</td>
<td>Napa County has a need for more urban development and needs to balance growth and environmental concerns.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pg 33 Re Vision - 3</td>
<td>Agy/44 Sec 3</td>
<td>Appropriate for agricultural and urban areas adjacent to the urban growth boundary.</td>
<td>The town developed in the past and the county expects it to remain as an urban growth area.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pg 59 Re Vision - 30 and Pcy Method 19-21</td>
<td>Data as modify keep of these policies.</td>
<td>The implications of these revisions depend on the goals and standards of the planning process. The new standards identify a new category as a better match for the County's current land development goals.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pg 95 Re Vision - 39</td>
<td>Hwy No Changes Improv Plan</td>
<td>While the changes support a new plan.</td>
<td>Designated to be used in that policy area to preserve agricultural, open space, and environmental values.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pg 99-93</td>
<td>Hwy No Changes Improv Plan</td>
<td>Classification as a &quot;green belt&quot; provides non-urban uses.</td>
<td>Designated for use in that policy area.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pg 151 Re Vision</td>
<td>Hwy No Changes Improv Plan</td>
<td>Support local tribal ownership of lands under the treaty.</td>
<td>Support local tribal ownership of lands under the treaty.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Napa County General Plan Update
Final Environmental Impact Report December 2007
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### 3.0 Comments and Responses to Comments

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Current General Plan</th>
<th>Draft General Plan</th>
<th>Proposed Changes</th>
<th>Rationale for Change</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

### General Plan

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Current General Plan</th>
<th>Draft General Plan</th>
<th>Proposed Changes</th>
<th>Rationale for Change</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Pg. 98 Policy 98 Policy</td>
<td>Policies 98 Policy</td>
<td>Policies 98 Policy</td>
<td>Policies 98 Policy</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

---

**County of Napa**  
**Napa County General Plan Update**  
**December 2007**  
**Final Environmental Impact Report**  
3.0-1379
### 3.0 Comments and Responses to Comments

#### 2.0 Executive Summary

**Table 2.0-1 Project Impacts and Proposed Mitigation Measures**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Impact</th>
<th>Level of Significance Before Mitigation</th>
<th>Mitigation Measure</th>
<th>Significance After Mitigation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>4.1 Agriculture</td>
<td><strong>Impact 4.1.1</strong> Implementation of the proposed General Plan Update could directly or indirectly result in the loss of Prime Farmland, Unique Farmland, Farmland of Statewide Importance to non-agricultural uses, as shown on the maps prepared pursuant to the Farmland Mapping and Monitoring Program of the California Resources Agency.</td>
<td>LS</td>
<td>MM 4.1.1a As part of consideration of subsequent projects, the County shall evaluate individual rezoning, development and public projects to determine the potential for impacts on farmlands of concern under CEQA (defined as Prime Farmland, Unique Farmland, and Farmland of Statewide Importance) as mapped by the State Farmland Mapping and Monitoring Program and avoid converting farmland.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Notes:**
- 3.0-1380

**Comments:**
- 152-31E
- 152-32E

---

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Impact</th>
<th>Level of Significance Before Mitigation</th>
<th>Mitigation Measure</th>
<th>Significance After Mitigation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>4.1 Agriculture</td>
<td><strong>Impact 4.1.2</strong> Implementation of the proposed General Plan Update would result in the loss of agricultural land as designated on the current Napa County General Plan Land Use Map.</td>
<td>LS LS SU</td>
<td>Implement mitigation measures MM 4.1.1a and b.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Notes:**
- 152-33E

**Comments:**
- 152-34E

---

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Impact</th>
<th>Level of Significance Before Mitigation</th>
<th>Mitigation Measure</th>
<th>Significance After Mitigation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>4.1 Agriculture</td>
<td><strong>Impact 4.1.3</strong> Implementation of the proposed General Plan Update could result in a conflict with existing agricultural zoning or Williamson Act contracts.</td>
<td>SU SU SU</td>
<td>Implement mitigation measures MM 4.1.1a and b.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Notes:**
- 152-35E

**Comments:**
- County of Napa
  - Final Environmental Impact Report
  - February 2007

---

**County of Napa**
- Final Environmental Impact Report
- December 2007

---

**Napa County General Plan Update**
- Final Environmental Impact Report
- December 2007

---

**3.0-1380**
### 3.0 Comments and Responses to Comments

#### 2.0 Executive Summary

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Impact</th>
<th>Level of Significance Before Mitigation</th>
<th>Mitigation Measure</th>
<th>Significance After Mitigation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>4.2 Land Use</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Impact 4.2.1 Implementation of the proposed Napa County General Plan Update would not result in the physical division of established communities because the proposed General Plan Update consists of maintaining the overall land use patterns of the County rather than developing in a way that might split established communities (e.g., development of a highway or establishment of land use patterns that divide existing communities). However, land use changes proposed under Alternatives B and C could conflict with existing land uses.</td>
<td>LS</td>
<td>S</td>
<td>S</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Impact 4.2.2 Implementation of the proposed Napa County General Plan</td>
<td>LS</td>
<td>S</td>
<td>S</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**S - Significant**

**LS - Less Than Significant**

**SU - Significant and Unavoidable**

---

**Napa County General Plan Update Draft Environmental Impact Report**

**County of Napa February 2007**

4.3 Population/Housing/Employment

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Impact</th>
<th>Level of Significance Before Mitigation</th>
<th>Mitigation Measure</th>
<th>Significance After Mitigation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Update would not substantially conflict with applicable land use plans, policies, or regulations of other agencies that provide for environmental protection.</td>
<td>SU</td>
<td>SU</td>
<td>SU</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**S - Significant**

**LS - Less Than Significant**

**SU - Significant and Unavoidable**

---

**Napa County General Plan Update Draft Environmental Impact Report**

**County of Napa February 2007**

---

**Napa County General Plan Update Final Environmental Impact Report**

**County of Napa December 2007**
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### 2.0 EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

#### 3.0 COMMENTS AND RESPONSES TO COMMENTS

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Impact</th>
<th>Level of Significance Before Mitigation</th>
<th>Mitigation Measure</th>
<th>Significance After Mitigation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Alt A</td>
<td>Alt B</td>
<td>Alt C</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Impact 4.3.2 Implementation of the proposed Napa County General Plan Update could alter the ratio or balance between housing and employment in the unincorporated area, substantially increasing commute times in or out of the county</td>
<td>SU</td>
<td>LS</td>
<td>LS</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Impact 4.3.3 Implementation of the proposed Napa County General Plan Update would not result in the displacement of a substantial number of people or housing</td>
<td>LS</td>
<td>LS</td>
<td>LS</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

#### 4.0 Transportation

| Impact 4.4.1 Land use and growth under the proposed General Plan Update could raise an increase in traffic, which is substantial | SU | SU | SU | MM 4.4.1a | The County shall provide a policy in the General Plan establishing a standard for adequate level of service on roads and intersections to be applied to all discretionary projects. | SU | SU | SU |

#### 4.1-10 Napa County General Plan Update County of Napa Draft Environmental Impact Report February 2007

#### 2.0 EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Impact</th>
<th>Level of Significance Before Mitigation</th>
<th>Mitigation Measure</th>
<th>Significance After Mitigation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Alt A</td>
<td>Alt B</td>
<td>Alt C</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>In relation to the existing traffic load and capacity of the street system, within the County and adjacent jurisdictions, and could affect emergency access</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

#### 3.0-1382 Napa County General Plan Update County of Napa Final Environmental Impact Report December 2007
2.0 EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

3.0 COMMENTS AND RESPONSES TO COMMENTS

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Impact</th>
<th>Level of Significance Before Mitigation</th>
<th>Mitigation Measure</th>
<th>Significance After Mitigation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>AR A</td>
<td>AR B</td>
<td>AR C</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MM 4.1h</td>
<td>No additional measures needed</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MM 4.1i</td>
<td>The County shall provide a policy in the General Plan that requires all developments along fixed transit routes to provide amenities designed to encourage carpooling, bicycling, and transit use to coordinate with</td>
<td>152-45E</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MM 4.1j</td>
<td>The County shall include a policy in the General Plan that requires all developments along fixed transit routes to provide amenities designed to encourage carpooling, bicycling, and transit use in coordination with</td>
<td>152-46E</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

4.1-12

2.0 EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Impact</th>
<th>Level of Significance Before Mitigation</th>
<th>Mitigation Measure</th>
<th>Significance After Mitigation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>AR A</td>
<td>AR B</td>
<td>AR C</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MM 4.6-1h</td>
<td>No additional measures needed</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MM 4.6-1i</td>
<td>The County shall include a policy in the General Plan that states where sufficient right of way is available, bicycle lanes shall be added to county roads when repaving or upgrading of the roadway occurs</td>
<td>152-47E</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MM 4.6-1j</td>
<td>The County shall provide a policy in the General Plan that requires that abandoned rail right-of-way shall be used for alternative uses such as parking, pedestrian, bicycle, parks, or park and ride facilities which are feasible</td>
<td>152-48E</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MM 4.6-1k</td>
<td>The County shall provide a policy in the General Plan that requires that bicycle and pedestrian access shall be integrated into all parking lots and considered in the evaluation of development proposals and public projects</td>
<td>152-49E</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

5 - Significant
LS - Less Than Significant
SU - Significant and Unavoidable

Napa County General Plan Update
Draft Environmental Impact Report

County of Napa
February 2007

Napa County General Plan Update
Final Environmental Impact Report

December 2007
## 3.0 Comments and Responses to Comments

### 2.0 Executive Summary

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Impact</th>
<th>Level of Significance Before Mitigation</th>
<th>Mitigation Measure</th>
<th>Significance After Mitigation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>AL A</td>
<td>AL B</td>
<td>AL C</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Impact 4.4.3</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Implementation of the proposed General Plan Update could conflict with NCPA's planning efforts associated with transit-oriented development and pedestrian and bicycle facilities.</td>
<td>S</td>
<td>S</td>
<td>S</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Impact 4.4.4</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Land use and development under the proposed General Plan Update could create additional demand for parking facilities and therefore inadequately meet parking capacity of these facilities are not constructed.</td>
<td>S</td>
<td>S</td>
<td>S</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**SU** - Significant and Unavoidable

**LS** - Less than Significant

**S** - Significant

---

**Notes:**

- **152-50E cont'd**
- **152-51E**
- **152-52E**

---

### 4.5 Biological Resources

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Impact</th>
<th>Level of Significance Before Mitigation</th>
<th>Mitigation Measure</th>
<th>Significance After Mitigation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>AL A</td>
<td>AL B</td>
<td>AL C</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Impact 4.5.1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Land use and development under the proposed General Plan Update could result in the loss of special-status plant and animal species.</td>
<td>S</td>
<td>S</td>
<td>S</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Unapparent sensitive biological communities are vulnerable.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**SU** - Significant and Unavoidable

**LS** - Less than Significant

**S** - Significant

---

**Notes:**

- **152-52E**
- **152-54E**

---

**County of Napa**

February 2007

**Napa County General Plan Update**

**Draft Environmental Impact Report**

---

**County of Napa**

December 2007

**Napa County General Plan Update**

**Final Environmental Impact Report**

**3.0-1384**
## 3.0 Comments and Responses to Comments

### 2.0 Executive Summary

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Impact</th>
<th>Level of Significance Before Mitigation</th>
<th>Mitigation Measure</th>
<th>Significance After Mitigation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>AL A</td>
<td>AL B</td>
<td>AL C</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

1. Preservation of habitat and connectivity of adequate size, quality, and configuration to support the special-status species identified in a manner generally consistent with the provisions of County Code Chapter 18.10M. Connectivity shall be determined based on the specifics of the species needs.

2. Provision of supplemental planting and maintenance of prairie, shrubs, and trees of similar quality and quantity to provide adequate vegetation cover to enhance water quality, minimize sedimentation, and provide adequate shelter and food for wildlife.

3. Provide protection for habitat and the known locations of special-status species through adequate buffering or other means.

4. Provide replacement habitat of like quantity and quality on- or off-site for special-status species.

5. Enhance existing special-status species habitat values through

---

**S - Significant**

**LS - Less Than Significant**

**SU - Significant and Unavoidable**

---

**Napa County General Plan Update**

**County of Napa**

**Draft Environmental Impact Report**

**January 2007**

---

**2.0 Executive Summary**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Impact</th>
<th>Level of Significance Before Mitigation</th>
<th>Mitigation Measure</th>
<th>Significance After Mitigation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>AL A</td>
<td>AL B</td>
<td>AL C</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

1. Preservation of temporary or permanent buffers of adequate size (based on the specific needs of the special-status species) to avoid nest abandonment by nesting birds and the loss of reproductive nest sites associated with construction and site development activities.

2. Incorporation of the provisions or demonstration of compliance with applicable recovery plans for federally listed species.

---

**S - Significant**

**LS - Less Than Significant**

**SU - Significant and Unavoidable**

---

**Napa County General Plan Update**

**County of Napa**

**Draft Environmental Impact Report**

**February 2007**
### 3.0 Comments and Responses to Comments

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Impact</th>
<th>Level of Significance Before Mitigation</th>
<th>Mitigation Measure</th>
<th>Significance After Mitigation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>AA</td>
<td>A B</td>
<td>A C</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sensitive biotic communities and oak woodlands within the County</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

---

### 2.0 Executive Summary

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Impact</th>
<th>Level of Significance Before Mitigation</th>
<th>Mitigation Measure</th>
<th>Significance After Mitigation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>AA</td>
<td>A B</td>
<td>A C</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MM 4.5.2b</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MM 4.6.2b</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

---

Napa County General Plan Update
Draft Environmental Impact Report

County of Napa
February 2007

Napa County General Plan Update
Final Environmental Impact Report

County of Napa
December 2007
### 3.0 Comments and Responses to Comments

#### 3.0.1 Executive Summary

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Impact</th>
<th>Level of Significance</th>
<th>Mitigation Measure</th>
<th>Significance After Mitigation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Alt A</td>
<td>Alt B</td>
<td>Alt C</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4.3.5</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4.3.6</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4.3.6</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4.3.6</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4.3.6</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### 3.0.2 Other Considerations

- **Redwood**: Suitable locations for redwood stands are needed to be identified and addressed. See Napa County General Plan Update Draft Environmental Impact Report, Section 152-62E.

### 3.0.3 Mitigation Measures

- Implement mitigation measures MM 4.5.1b and c and MM 4.6.3a through c and MM 4.11.4

### 3.0.4 Review and Consideration

- The County shall provide a policy in the General Plan that require individual projects limit movement contraries to adequate lethal in and in habitat quality to allow for continued wildlife use based on the species anticipated to use the corridor. This may be accomplished through continued implementation of the Napa County Conservation Regulations associated with vegetation protection (Sections 18.150.102) and 18.108.002, setbacks from waterways (Section 18.108.002) and MM 4.5.1b and c and MM 4.6.3a through c and MM 4.11.4.

### 3.0.5 Environmental Impact

- The County shall maintain a policy in the General Plan that require individual projects limit movement contraries to adequate lethal in and in habitat quality to allow for continued wildlife use based on the species anticipated to use the corridor. This may be accomplished through continued implementation of the Napa County Conservation Regulations associated with vegetation protection (Sections 18.150.102) and 18.108.002, setbacks from waterways (Section 18.108.002) and MM 4.5.1b and c and MM 4.6.3a through c and MM 4.11.4.

### 3.0.6 Specific Issues

- **Fisheries**: Suitable locations for redwood stands are needed to be identified and addressed. See Napa County General Plan Update Draft Environmental Impact Report, Section 152-62E.

### 3.0.7 Impacts

- **Fisheries**: Suitable locations for redwood stands are needed to be identified and addressed. See Napa County General Plan Update Draft Environmental Impact Report, Section 152-62E.

### 3.0.8 Additional Considerations

- The County shall provide a policy in the General Plan that require individual projects limit movement contraries to adequate lethal in and in habitat quality to allow for continued wildlife use based on the species anticipated to use the corridor. This may be accomplished through continued implementation of the Napa County Conservation Regulations associated with vegetation protection (Sections 18.150.102) and 18.108.002, setbacks from waterways (Section 18.108.002) and MM 4.5.1b and c and MM 4.6.3a through c and MM 4.11.4.
### 3.0 Comments and Responses to Comments

#### 2.0 Executive Summary

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Impact 4.6.3</th>
<th>Level of Significance Before Mitigation</th>
<th>Mitigation Measure</th>
<th>Significance After Mitigation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>S</td>
<td>S</td>
<td>Implement mitigation measures MM 4.11.3b, MM 4.11.3c, and MM 4.11.9.</td>
<td>LS</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

- **S**: Significant
- **LS**: Less Than Significant
- **SU**: Significant and Unavoidable

---

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Impact 4.6.4</th>
<th>Level of Significance Before Mitigation</th>
<th>Mitigation Measure</th>
<th>Significance After Mitigation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>S</td>
<td>S</td>
<td>Implement mitigation measures MM 4.11.3b and MM 4.11.9.</td>
<td>LS</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

- **S**: Significant
- **LS**: Less Than Significant
- **SU**: Significant and Unavoidable

---

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Impact 4.6.5</th>
<th>Level of Significance Before Mitigation</th>
<th>Mitigation Measure</th>
<th>Significance After Mitigation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>S</td>
<td>S</td>
<td>MM 4.6.5a</td>
<td>LS</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

- **S**: Significant
- **LS**: Less Than Significant
- **SU**: Significant and Unavoidable
### 2.0 EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Impact</th>
<th>Level of Significance Before Mitigation</th>
<th>Mitigation Measure</th>
<th>Significance After Mitigation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>All A</td>
<td>All B</td>
<td>All C</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

- **Comments and Responses to Comments**

This indirectly results in the loss of populations or degradation of habitat for specialized fish species.

Mitigation measure in coordination with Regional Water Quality Control Boards, California Department of Fish and Game, U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service, and National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration. National Marine Fisheries Service and other coordinating resource agencies that identify essential stream and stream reaches necessary for the health of populations of native fisheries and other sensitive aquatic organisms within the County's watersheds. Where avoidance of impacts to riparian habitat is impossible along stream reaches, appropriate measures will be undertaken to ensure that protection, restoration, and enhancement activities will occur within those identified stream reaches that support or could support native fisheries and other sensitive aquatic species within the watersheds.

The County shall provide a policy in the General Plan that requires the County to develop mitigation plans that prioritize removal of gravel to reduce adverse effects to native fisheries during project review. The County shall require mitigation that results in no net adverse effects to stream bed.

- **SU – Significant and Unavoidable**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Impact</th>
<th>Level of Significance Before Mitigation</th>
<th>Mitigation Measure</th>
<th>Significance After Mitigation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>All A</td>
<td>All B</td>
<td>All C</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

- **S – Significant**
- **LS – Less Than Significant**

**Napa County General Plan Update**
**Draft Environmental Impact Report**

**County of Napa**
**February 2007**
### 3.0 Comments and Responses to Comments

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Impact</th>
<th>Level of Significance Before Mitigation</th>
<th>Mitigation Measure</th>
<th>Significance After Mitigation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>4.7 Noise</td>
<td>5 5 5</td>
<td>MAH 4.7.1a</td>
<td>LS LS LS</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>MAH 4.7.1b</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td><strong>Support</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The County shall (a) minimize the noise levels produced by the new noise-sensitive uses by designing noise barriers and landscaping the buffer zones. The noise levels at the boundaries of the new noise-sensitive uses shall be less than the Napa County Noise Ordinance limits.

S - Significant  LS - Less Than Significant  SU - Significant and Unavoidable

---

**Napa County General Plan Update Draft Environmental Impact Report**

**County of Napa**

February 2007

---

### 2.0 Executive Summary

The following mitigation measures shall apply to Alternatives B and C:

**MAH 4.7.1c**

The County shall provide a policy in the General Plan that requires that property owners proposing new noise-sensitive uses in proximity to existing industrial activities and railroad corridors (such as submittal development of the Pacific CoastHwy and the Napa Pipe Steel) to develop a noise levels in proximity to the existing industrial activities and railroad corridors. The noise levels at the boundaries of the new noise-sensitive uses shall be less than the Napa County Noise Ordinance limits. In the case of existing industrial activities and railroad corridors, the County shall ensure that noise levels at the boundaries of the new noise-sensitive uses shall be less than the Napa County Noise Ordinance limits.

S - Significant  LS - Less Than Significant  SU - Significant and Unavoidable

---

**Napa County General Plan Update Draft Environmental Impact Report**

**County of Napa**

February 2007

---

**Napa County General Plan Update Final Environmental Impact Report**

**County of Napa**

December 2007
### 3.0 Comments and Responses to Comments

#### 2.0 Executive Summary

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Impact</th>
<th>Level of Significance Before Mitigation</th>
<th>Mitigation Measure</th>
<th>Significance After Mitigation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>AR A</td>
<td>AR B</td>
<td>AR C</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>impact 4.7.1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Implementation of Alternatives B and C of the General Plan Update could result in the development of residential and/or commercial in proximity to significant known sources of groundborne vibration.</td>
<td>LS</td>
<td>LS</td>
<td>LS</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The following mitigation measures shall apply to Alternatives B and C.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MM 4.7.3a</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The County shall include a policy in the General Plan that requires new vibration sensitive development, such as residences, shall be avoided within 100 feet of all railroad tracks and other identified sources of strong ground vibration to the extent feasible. For residences proposed within 100 feet of any significant source of groundborne vibration, a vibration study shall be conducted prior to construction by a qualified consultant to ensure that residences would not be exposed to excessive vibration levels that are disruptive or potentially even cause structural damage. The results of the study shall include performance standards to fully mitigate vibration impacts, which may take the form of building setbacks, site design, soil compaction/pacing, and other appropriate methods.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**5 - Significant**

**LS = Less Than Significant**

**SU = Significant and Unavoidable**

---

**County of Napa**

Draft Environmental Impact Report

February 2007

---

**3.0-1391**

---

**County of Napa**

Draft Environmental Impact Report

February 2007

---

**152-71E**

---

**3.0-1391**

---
## 2.0 EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Impact</th>
<th>Level of Significance Before Mitigation</th>
<th>Mitigation Measure</th>
<th>Significance After Mitigation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>LS</td>
<td>LS</td>
<td>None required.</td>
<td>LS</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Impact 4.7.5**
With the implementation of the General Plan Update, new significant noise increases at noise-sensitive land uses could occur from the continued development of noise-generating activities associated with existing or new agricultural, industrial and commercial land uses.

### LS - Significant
### LS - Less Than Significant
### SU - Significant and Unavoidable

---

### Notes on Mitigation
- **LS**
- **SU**
- **comments**
- **CS**
- **CL**
- **SU**
- **comments**
- **CS**
- **CL**
- **SU**

---

### 2.0 EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Impact</th>
<th>Level of Significance Before Mitigation</th>
<th>Mitigation Measure</th>
<th>Significance After Mitigation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>LS</td>
<td>LS</td>
<td>None required.</td>
<td>LS</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Impact 4.7.6**
Implementation of the General Plan Update would generate construction noise and would temporarily increase noise levels at adjacent land uses.

**Impact 4.7.7**
Implementation of the General Plan Update could result in the development of residential land uses in proximity to Napa Airport and Angwin-Vichy O'Hearn Field.

**4.8 Air Quality**
Implementation of the General Plan Update would not be consistent with the Clean Air Plan (CAP) since County population and employment projections would exceed regional growth projections prepared by ABAG, and proposed VMT would increase at a

---

### Notes on Mitigation
- **LS**
- **SU**
- **comments**
- **CS**
- **CL**
- **SU**
- **comments**
- **CS**
- **CL**
- **SU**

---

### 2.0 EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Impact</th>
<th>Level of Significance Before Mitigation</th>
<th>Mitigation Measure</th>
<th>Significance After Mitigation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>LS</td>
<td>LS</td>
<td>None required.</td>
<td>LS</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

---

### 2.0 EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Impact</th>
<th>Level of Significance Before Mitigation</th>
<th>Mitigation Measure</th>
<th>Significance After Mitigation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>LS</td>
<td>LS</td>
<td>None required.</td>
<td>LS</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

---

### Notes on Mitigation
- **LS**
- **SU**
- **comments**
- **CS**
- **CL**
- **SU**
- **comments**
- **CS**
- **CL**
- **SU**

---

**County of Napa**
February 2007

---

### Notes on Mitigation
- **LS**
- **SU**
- **comments**
- **CS**
- **CL**
- **SU**
- **comments**
- **CS**
- **CL**
- **SU**

---

**Napa County General Plan Update**
November 2007

---

### Notes on Mitigation
- **LS**
- **SU**
- **comments**
- **CS**
- **CL**
- **SU**
- **comments**
- **CS**
- **CL**
- **SU**

---

**County of Napa**
December 2007

---

### Notes on Mitigation
- **LS**
- **SU**
- **comments**
- **CS**
- **CL**
- **SU**
- **comments**
- **CS**
- **CL**
- **SU**

---

**Napa County General Plan Update**
Final Environmental Impact Report

---

**3.0-1392**
### 3.0 Comments and Responses to Comments

#### 2.0 Executive Summary

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Impact</th>
<th>Level of Significance Before Mitigation</th>
<th>Mitigation Measure</th>
<th>Significance After Mitigation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>AA</td>
<td>BB</td>
<td>CC</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fresher rate than the population; Level and development would result in increased emissions of certain pollutants resulting primarily from vehicles. The increased emissions were above the BAAQMD threshold. In addition, the General Plan Update would not fully support the Clean Air Program.</td>
<td></td>
<td>MM.4.B.1b</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>MM.4.B.1c</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Central Measures that Cities and Counties are identified as having a role in implementing.</td>
<td></td>
<td>MM.4.B.1d</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**S - Significant**

**LS - Less Than Significant**

**SU - Significant and Unavoidable**

---

**Implementation of the General Plan Update would lead to construction and new residential uses that could have wood burning devices. These activities would increase PM10 emissions for an area.**

**The County shall include a policy in the General Plan that the County shall support environmental efforts directed at reducing undesirable emissions standards and inspection and maintenance programs for all feasible vehicle classes and revisions to the Air Quality Attainment Plan to accelerate and strengthen market-based strategies consistent with the General Plan.**

**The County shall include a policy in the General Plan that requires the evaluation of potential project- specific air quality impacts based on the Bay Area Air Quality Management District’s CRQA. Consideration of new development projects will require appropriate design (e.g., provision of energy efficiency features in building design, construction use of reduced emissions construction equipment, operational features e.g., provision of alternative forms of transportation and use of reduced emission vehicles and equipment), and participation in Bay Area Air Quality Management District’s air quality improvement programs to reduce emissions.**

---

**S - Significant**

**LS - Less Than Significant**

**SU - Significant and Unavoidable**

---

**Implementation of the General Plan Update would lead to construction and new residential uses that could have wood burning devices. These activities would increase PM10 emissions for an area.**

**The County shall include the following as a policy in the General Plan:**

- **The County shall seek to reduce particulate emissions and exceedances of state PM standards:**
  - a) Improving air quality, regarding low emitting fireplaces and property owners who are constructing or remodelling homes;
  - b) Fireplaces or wood stoves in new developments with densities greater than one residential home per acre, shall comply with current EPA emission standards for wood-burning stoves or be fueled by natural gas;
  - c) Diminishing information in accordance with the BAAQMD’s “Repair the Air Tonight” program when particulate matter exceedances.
### 2.0 EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

#### Impact

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Level of Significance Before Mitigation</th>
<th>Mitigation Measure</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Alt A</td>
<td>Alt B</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>S</td>
<td>S</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

#### Significance After Mitigation

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Alt A</th>
<th>Alt B</th>
<th>Alt C</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>LS</td>
<td>LS</td>
<td>LS</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Impact</th>
<th>Alt A</th>
<th>Alt B</th>
<th>Alt C</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>S</td>
<td>S</td>
<td>S</td>
<td>S</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

#### Implementation of the General Plan Update

The County shall include a General Plan Policy that requires the following dust control measures to be applied to construction sites as applicable, these measures are consistent with those recommended by the California Air Resources Board:

- For all construction and similar earth disturbing activities:
  - Apply water on all active construction areas daily or more often when conditions warrant.
  - Cover all stocks hauling soil, sand and other loose materials or require all trucks to maintain at least two feet of fine load.
  - Spray or water three times daily, or apply iron oxide soil stabilizers on all unpaved access roads, parking areas and staging areas at construction sites daily as needed to control dust.
  - Sweep all paved access roads, parking areas, and staging areas at construction sites and sweep streets daily if viable soil materials are carried onto adjacent public streets.
  - Implement the Napa County Conservation Regulations (Chapter 16.106 of County Code) where these regulations are applicable.
  - For sites greater than 4 acres in size:
    - Hydromulch and apply iron oxide soil stabilizers to inactive construction areas.
    - Enclose, cover, water twice daily, or apply iron oxide soil stabilizers to unpaved roadsides (dirt, sand, etc.)

### Notes

- Napa County General Plan Update
- County of Napa Final Environmental Impact Report
- County of Napa General Plan Update
- County of Napa Final Environmental Impact Report
- Napa County General Plan Update
- County of Napa Final Environmental Impact Report

3.0-1394
## 2.0 EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Impact</th>
<th>Level of Significance Before Mitigation</th>
<th>Mitigation Measure</th>
<th>Significance After Mitigation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>A/B/C</td>
<td>A/B/C</td>
<td></td>
<td>A/B/C</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>• Limit traffic speeds on unpaved roads to 15 miles per hour.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>• Install appropriate erosion control measures to prevent silt runoff.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>• Replant soil stabilizing vegetation in disturbed areas as quickly as possible.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>• Install wheel washers for all existing trucks and wash off all trucks and equipment leaving the site.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>• Suspend grading activities when winds exceed 25 miles per hour, and visible dust clouds cannot be prevented from extending beyond active construction areas.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>• Limit the area subject to excavation, grading and other construction activities at any one time.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**MM 4.4.3b** The County shall include a General Plan policy that requires that applicants seeking demolition permits...

---

## 5 - Significant LS – Less Than Significant SU – Significant and Unavoidable

**County of Napa**

**Draft Environmental Impact Report**

February 2007
## 3.0 Comments and Responses to Comments

### 4.0 Executive Summary

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Impact</th>
<th>Level of Significance Before Mitigation</th>
<th>Mitigation Measure</th>
<th>Significance After Mitigation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Alt A</td>
<td>Alt B</td>
<td>Alt C</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Impact 4.8.4</td>
<td>Implementation of the General Plan Update may locate new sensitive receptors near existing or future sources of odors. In addition, existing sensitive receptors could be affected by new sources of odors developed under the General Plan Update.</td>
<td>S</td>
<td>S</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5 - Significant</td>
<td>LS - Less Than Significant</td>
<td>SU - Significant and Unavoidable</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Napa County General Plan Update Draft Environmental Impact Report

4.1-38

### 2.0 Executive Summary

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Impact</th>
<th>Level of Significance Before Mitigation</th>
<th>Mitigation Measure</th>
<th>Significance After Mitigation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Alt A</td>
<td>Alt B</td>
<td>Alt C</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Impact 4.8.5</td>
<td>Implementation of the General Plan Update may locate new sensitive receptors near existing or future sources of toxic air contaminants (TACs). In addition, existing sensitive receptors could be affected by new sources of toxic air contaminants developed under the General Plan Update.</td>
<td>S</td>
<td>SU</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5 - Significant</td>
<td>LS - Less Than Significant</td>
<td>SU - Significant and Unavoidable</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Napa County General Plan Update Draft Environmental Impact Report

2.0-39

Napa County General Plan Update Final Environmental Impact Report

County of Napa
February 2007

Napa County General Plan Update
Final Environmental Impact Report

County of Napa
December 2007

3.0-1396
### 3.0 Comments and Responses to Comments

#### 2.0 Executive Summary

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Impact</th>
<th>Level of Significance Before Mitigation</th>
<th>Mitigation Measure</th>
<th>Significance After Mitigation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>AL A</td>
<td>AL B</td>
<td>AL C</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Impact 4.8.6</td>
<td>Future growth in traffic could cause increases in carbon monoxide levels along County roadways. However, overall concentration would remain below health-based ambient air quality standards.</td>
<td>LS</td>
<td>LS</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Impact 4.8.7</td>
<td>Implementation of the proposed General Plan Update would contribute to an increase in Greenhouse Gas (GHG) emissions from vehicle transportation, building energy use and possibly agricultural operations and may contribute to increases in atmospheric GHG concentrations.</td>
<td>SU</td>
<td>SU</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**S - Significant**  
**LS - Less Than Significant**  
**SU - Significant and Unavoidable**

---

**County of Napa**  
**Napa County General Plan Update**  
**Draft Environmental Impact Report**  
**February 2007**
### 3.0 Comments and Responses to Comments

#### 3.0 Executive Summary

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Impact</th>
<th>Level of Significance Before Mitigation</th>
<th>Mitigation Measure</th>
<th>Significance After Mitigation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Alt A</td>
<td>Alt B</td>
<td>Alt C</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Accident conditions</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Impact 4.9.3** Land use and development consistent with the proposed Napa County General Plan Update would locate land uses within the vicinity of public use airports or private airstrips.  
**Level of Significance:** LS  
**Mitigation:** Implement mitigation measures MA 4.2.2.  
**Significance After Mitigation:** LS

**Impact 4.9.4** Proposed land uses and/or changes in land use patterns that would occur as a result of implementation of the proposed Napa County General Plan Update.  
**Level of Significance:** LS  
**Mitigation:** MA 4.9.4 - The County shall include a General Plan policy that requires developers to develop proposals in the unincorporated community of Angwin, Napa, site and the Pacific Coast which include provisions for adequate emergency access for evacuation as well as the

---

### Geology and Soils

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Impact</th>
<th>Level of Significance Before Mitigation</th>
<th>Mitigation Measure</th>
<th>Significance After Mitigation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Alt A</td>
<td>Alt B</td>
<td>Alt C</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>County General Plan Update could interfere with County emergency response and evacuation plans.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Impact 4.10.1** Land uses and development under the proposed Napa County General Plan Update may expose people, structures, and development to ground shaking as a result of earthquakes resulting in the risk of loss, injury, or death.  
**Level of Significance:** SU  
**Mitigation:** MA 4.10.1 - The County shall provide a policy in the General Plans that requires detailed geologic/earthquake evaluation for public and private projects including modifications to existing projects and structures located in or near known geologic/earthquake hazards. The evaluation shall identify site design such as setbacks from active faults and avoidance of or relocate seismic design conditions that could become unstable or fail during a seismic event and structural measures to prevent injury, death, and...  
**Significance After Mitigation:** SU
## 3.0 Comments and Responses to Comments

### 2.0 Executive Summary

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Impact</th>
<th>Level of Significance Before Mitigation</th>
<th>Mitigation Measure</th>
<th>Significance After Mitigation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>AB A</td>
<td>AB B</td>
<td>AB C</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

#### Impact 4.10.2

- Level of Significance:
  - SU
  - SU
  - SU

- Mitigation Measure:
  - MAH 4.10.2

- Significance After Mitigation:
  - SU
  - SU
  - SU

*The County shall provide a policy in the General Plan that the County shall not accept dedication of roads (al or not intersected) by landowners, for in hilly areas or 30 feet above imperfection, subsidence or settlement, which, in the opinion of the Napa County Public Works Department, would require an excessive degree of maintenance and repair costs.*

#### Impact 4.10.3

- Level of Significance:
  - LS
  - LS
  - LS

- Mitigation Measure:
  - None required.

- Significance After Mitigation:
  - LS
  - LS
  - LS

*Update is not expected to expose substantial numbers of people and structures to hazards associated with seismically induced tsunamis and seismic waves.*

#### Impact 4.10.4

- Level of Significance:
  - SU
  - SU
  - SU

- Mitigation Measure:
  - MAH 4.10.4a
  - MAH 4.10.4b

- Significance After Mitigation:
  - SU
  - SU
  - SU

*The County shall provide a policy in the General Plan that as part of the review and approval of development and public works projects, the planting of vegetation on unstable slopes to protect structures at lower elevations or other appropriate measures shall be incorporated into the project design. Native plants should be recommended for landscaping in the hills, to eliminate the need for supplemental watering which can promote such movement. This shall be done in conjunction with implementation of applicable County Code provisions (e.g., Conservation Regulations).*

---

**County of Napa**  
*February 2007*

---

**Napa County General Plan Update**  
*December 2007*

---

3.0-1399
### 3.0 Comments and Responses to Comments

#### 2.0 Executive Summary

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Impact</th>
<th>Level of Significance Before Mitigation</th>
<th>Mitigation Measure</th>
<th>Significance After Mitigation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Alt A</td>
<td>Alt B</td>
<td>Alt C</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Impact 4.10.6**

- Land uses and development under the proposed Napa County General Plan Update could expose property owners to increased hazards resulting in the risk of loss, injury, or death.
- This type of hazard can be triggered seasonally, resulting from seasonal saturation of soils, or result from by grading activities.
- **S** - Significant
- **LS** - Less than Significant
- **SU** - Significant and Unavoidable
- **None required.**

---

**Impact 4.10.7**

- Land uses and development under the proposed Napa County General Plan Update could impact areas where soils may be unsuitable for development, requiring that use of septic tanks or alternative wastewater disposal systems be addressed.
- **S** - Significant
- **LS** - Less than Significant
- **SU** - Significant and Unavoidable
- **None required.**

---

**Impact 4.10.8**

- Land uses and development under the proposed Napa County General Plan Update would not result in the substantial loss of availability of open space resources, which are locally important due to their use by the construction community.
- **S** - Significant
- **LS** - Less than Significant
- **SU** - Significant and Unavoidable
- **None required.**
## 3.0 Comments and Responses to Comments

### County of Napa

#### Napa County General Plan Update

##### Final Environmental Impact Report

3.0-1401

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Impact</th>
<th>Level of Significance Before Mitigation</th>
<th>Mitigation Measure</th>
<th>Significance After Mitigation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>All A</td>
<td>All B</td>
<td>All C</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6.1.11 Hydrologic Alteration Quality</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Impact 4.11.1</td>
<td>Residential, commercial, industrial, and public uses consistent with the proposed General Plan Update could introduce new and additional non-point source pollutants to downstream surface waters.</td>
<td>LS</td>
<td>LS</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Impact 4.11.2</td>
<td>Land use and development consistent with the proposed General Plan Update could result in increased soil erosion and sedimentation during construction activities, thereby degrading water quality in downstream watersheds.</td>
<td>S</td>
<td>S</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

| S - Significant | LS - Less Than Significant | SU - Significant and Unavoidable |

Napa County General Plan Update
Draft Environmental Impact Report

February 2007

### County of Napa

#### Napa County General Plan Update

##### Draft Environmental Impact Report

4.1-49

2.0 Executive Summary

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Impact</th>
<th>Level of Significance Before Mitigation</th>
<th>Mitigation Measure</th>
<th>Significance After Mitigation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>All A</td>
<td>All B</td>
<td>All C</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>plan that demonstrate mitigation of soil erosion impacts to either (a minimum) pre-development conditions or in compliance with the Soil Plan requirements and are protective to municipal water supply watersheds prior to construction commencing. These technical reports shall meet the requirements of County Code and will provide detailed information regarding site-specific geologic, soil, and hydrologic conditions and how proposed fibrines will function under site-specific conditions.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Impact 4.11.2</td>
<td>Continued agricultural and municipal resource development (i.e., timber harvesting and mineral resource extraction) land uses</td>
<td>S</td>
<td>S</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

S - Significant | LS - Less Than Significant | SU - Significant and Unavoidable

Napa County General Plan Update
Draft Environmental Impact Report

February 2007
### 3.0 Comments and Responses to Comments

#### 2.0 Executive Summary

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Impact</th>
<th>Level of Significance Before Mitigation</th>
<th>Mitigation Measure</th>
<th>Significance After Mitigation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Alt A</td>
<td>Alt B</td>
<td>Alt C</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.0.1402</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

- **Alt A**: Essential of technical reports (e.g., associated with compliance with the County Conservation Regulations, Chapter 18.198 of the County Code) that demonstrate compliance with this requirement.

- **Alt B**: The County shall refer to the General Plan for the mitigation of impacts from land use activities consistent with and in compliance with applicable basin plans and basin plan amendments associated with implementation of the Napa River TMDL for sediment, phosphorus, and turbidity. Subsequent projects and development activity in the County shall comply with the submission of technical reports (e.g., stormwater control plans) that demonstrate mitigation of potential water quality impacts to either its own or pre-development conditions or in compliance with the basin plan requirements and are protective to municipal water supply watersheds prior to construction commencing. These technical reports shall meet the requirements of County Code and will provide detailed information regarding site-specific.

**$ - Significant**  
**LS - Less Than Significant**  
**SU - Significant and Unavoidable**

---

#### 2.0 Executive Summary

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Impact</th>
<th>Level of Significance Before Mitigation</th>
<th>Mitigation Measure</th>
<th>Significance After Mitigation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Alt A</td>
<td>Alt B</td>
<td>Alt C</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4.1.50</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

- **Alt A**: Paleotopic, salt, and hydrologic conditions and how proposed vineyard site design and management (e.g., preserved buffer of vineyard, setbacks from waterways, drainage systems, and use of drip irrigation to apply fertilizer and water) will function under site-specific conditions and their protection effectiveness in addressing sediment, nutrient, pesticide, and other sources of water quality pollutants.

- **Alt B**: The following mitigation measure would apply to Alternative B and C.

- **Alt C**: The County shall include the following into the General Plan and/ or County Code, Chapter 18.108, which will allow new vineyard development projects meeting criteria below to participate in a streamlined permitting process. This permit process will require that an erosion control plan be developed and implemented for all disturbed lands where new cultivation is proposed. This permit process will require the County demonstration of "completeness" and no discretionary review. Conditions for participation in this ministerial permit process are described below.

**$ - Significant**  
**LS - Less Than Significant**  
**SU - Significant and Unavoidable**

---

**Napa County General Plan Update**  
**Draft Environmental Impact Report**  
**County of Napa**  
**February 2007**
### 3.0 Comments and Responses to Comments

#### 2.0 Executive Summary

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Impact</th>
<th>Level of Significance Before Mitigation</th>
<th>Mitigation Measure</th>
<th>Significance After Mitigation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Alt A</td>
<td>Alt B</td>
<td>Alt C</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Application Requirements**

The following application requirements will be mandatory:

- Emission control plan
- Geotechnical report
- Hydrologic report
- Water quality report
- Groundwater report
- Biological resources report
- Cultural resources report

These reports must demonstrate compliance with applicable Napa County Conservation Regulations and consistency with the conditions as described below. The specific detailed requirements for these submittals and the completeness determination process shall be defined by Napa County in a subsequent formal amendment to the Conservation Regulations.

Where the submitted application material does not demonstrate compliance with the conditions below, the application shall be denied. Where the submitted application material is incomplete, the County shall identify the information necessary to complete the application. Where the information submitted leaves uncertainty as to the ability of...

---

**S - Significant**  
**LS - Less Than Significant**  
**SU - Significant and Unavoidable**

---

**County of Napa**

**Napa County General Plan Update**

**December 2007**

**Final Environmental Impact Report**

---

**County of Napa**

**Napa County General Plan Update**

**February 2007**

**Draft Environmental Impact Report**

---

**County of Napa**

**Napa County General Plan Update**

**February 2007**

**Draft Environmental Impact Report**
### 3.0 Comments and Responses to Comments

#### Table 3.0-1404

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Impact</th>
<th>Level of Significance Before Mitigation</th>
<th>Mitigation Measure</th>
<th>Significance After Mitigation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>All A</td>
<td>All B</td>
<td>All C</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**C. Surface Hydrology**
- The project and associated improvements (i.e., access roads, view point areas, water supply developments and accessory uses) shall not result in a peak flow discharge downstream of the project site or at the floodplain outlet. Peak discharges for 2, 10, 50, and 100-year recurrence intervals shall be compared to baseline (pre-project) conditions.

**D. Groundwater Use**
- The project shall not lower groundwater levels offsite and shall not be located in the MGT.
- The project shall not result in any reduction in summer baseflow contributions to either the groundwater aquifer or receiving waters (rivers, ponds, downstream of site, etc.).

### 2.0 Executive Summary

#### Table 2.0-55

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Impact</th>
<th>Level of Significance Before Mitigation</th>
<th>Mitigation Measure</th>
<th>Significance After Mitigation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>All A</td>
<td>All B</td>
<td>All C</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**E. Water Diversion/Water Transfer**
- The project shall not require a new appropriative surface water diversion.
- The project shall not require water transfers between existing subbasins (pre-project water allocations in subbasins must be unchanged from pre-project subbasins conditions).

**F. Soil Loss/Productivity**
- The project shall not lead to an increase in soil loss.

**G. Water Quality**
- The project shall not result in an increase in downstream sedimentation.
- The project application shall specifically identify BMP measures intended to treat water quality pollutants associated with terrestrial, pesticides, herbicides, petroleum-based pollutants, and other pollutants anticipated to occur. It shall **Support**

---

*Napa County General Plan Update*
*Final Environmental Impact Report*

*County of Napa*
*February 2007*

*County of Napa*
*December 2007*
### 2.0 EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Impact</th>
<th>Level of Significance Before Mitigation</th>
<th>Mitigation Measure</th>
<th>Significance After Mitigation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>AB A</td>
<td>AB B</td>
<td>AB C</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

- Be demonstrated that these BMPs will mitigate potential water quality impacts to achieve at a minimum pre-development conditions or in compliance with the Basin Plan requirements and are protective to municipal water supply watersheds prior to construction commencing.

- **M. Stream Setback**
  - All projects shall provide for stream setbacks in excess of those required by Napa County’s Conservation Regulations.
  - If the stream setback areas are currently disturbed/degraded, the entire width of the required setback area shall be naturalized/revegetated with native vegetation adjacent to the waterway so as to provide a continuous riparian corridor within the setback area.

- **I. Biological Resources**
  - A biological report prepared

---

**5 - Significant**

**LS – Less Than Significant**

**SU – Significant and Unavoidable**

---

**County of Napa**

**Draft Environmental Impact Report**

**February 2007**

---

**County of Napa**

**Final Environmental Impact Report**

**December 2007**

---

**3.0 COMMENTS AND RESPONSES TO COMMENTS**

---
### 3.0 Comments and Responses to Comments

#### 3.0 Executive Summary

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Impact</th>
<th>Level of Significance Before Mitigation</th>
<th>Mitigation Measure</th>
<th>Significance After Mitigation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Alt A</td>
<td>Alt B</td>
<td>Alt C</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

- **DOIR and BDIR**
  - The project shall not be located in areas identified in adopted recovery plans for verbal species, songbirds, soil plants, and other rare areas that may be identified by USFWS.
  - The project shall not occur in streams, wetlands, or other waterbodies within the wetlands under Section 404 of the Clean Water Act, the California Department of Fish and Game under Section 1602 of the California Fish and Wildlife, the Regional Water Quality Control Board under the Porter-Cologne Water Quality Control Act (NOTE: The state permits noted herein are discretionary and thus require CEQA compliance and thus projects that involve such permits are in no longer consider "minimized")
  - The project shall

- **S - Significant**
- **LS - Less Than Significant**
- **SU - Significant and Unavoidable**

---

#### 2.0 Executive Summary

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Impact</th>
<th>Level of Significance Before Mitigation</th>
<th>Mitigation Measure</th>
<th>Significance After Mitigation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Alt A</td>
<td>Alt B</td>
<td>Alt C</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

- **DOIR and BDIR**
  - The project shall maintain or preserve at least 60% of the tree canopy cover and 40% of the shrub and herbaceous cover present as of 1992 as part of land use, if sensitive natural communities are defined by the BDIR, other than communities of limited distribution, are found on the site, the on-site preservation to meet the 60% requirements shall be biased towards preservation of the sensitive natural communities over other communities that may be present. Habitat to be maintained/preserved shall be contiguous.
  - The project proponent shall implement the following measures to avoid disturbance to the nests of special-status birds during the breeding season:
    - For ground disturbing activities occurring during the breeding season March 1 through August 31, a qualified bat biologist shall conduct preconstruction

- **S - Significant**
- **LS - Less Than Significant**
- **SU - Significant and Unavoidable**

--
### 2.0 EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Impact</th>
<th>Level of Significance Before Mitigation</th>
<th>Mitigation Measure</th>
<th>Significance After Mitigation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>All A</td>
<td>All B</td>
<td>All C</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

- Unoccupied by special-status taxa or that are located more than 300 feet from active nests may be removed. This buffer may be modified in coordination with CDFG.

#### Project Proponent
- The project proponent shall implement the following elements to avoid disturbing special-status bird nests:

  - Ground disturbing activities occurring during the breeding season (March 1 through July 31) shall be conducted preconstruction surveys of all potential nesting habitat for birds within 100 feet of wetland areas. Preconstruction surveys shall be conducted no greater than 3 weeks prior to the commencement of any grading and vegetation removal.

#### Mitigation
- If active bird nests are detected, they shall be removed.

### 3.0 COMMENTS AND RESPONSES TO COMMENTS
### 3.0 Comments and Responses to Comments

#### 2.0 Executive Summary

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Impact</th>
<th>Level of Significance Before Mitigation</th>
<th>Mitigation Measure</th>
<th>Significance After Mitigation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Alt A</td>
<td>Alt B</td>
<td>Alt C</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**S - Significant**

**LS - Less Than Significant**

**SU - Significant and Unavoidable**

---

4.3-62

---

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Impact</th>
<th>Level of Significance Before Mitigation</th>
<th>Mitigation Measure</th>
<th>Significance After Mitigation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Alt A</td>
<td>Alt B</td>
<td>Alt C</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**S - Significant**

**LS - Less Than Significant**

**SU - Significant and Unavoidable**

---

2.0-63
### 3.0 Comments and Responses to Comments

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Impact</th>
<th>Level of Significance Before Mitigation</th>
<th>Mitigation Measure</th>
<th>Level of Significance After Mitigation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Alt A</td>
<td>Alt B</td>
<td>Alt C</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Not limited to resources considered eligible for the California Register of Cultural Resources and the National Register of Historic Places.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• If a cultural resource is discovered during project construction or operation, the applicant shall cease all activity within the vicinity of the resource, shall contact Napa County immediately, and shall apply for and obtain authorization for any activity through the non-inventoried permit process applicable to the activity, including any and all CTCQA processing.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>K. Construction timing</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• All project staging and grading shall be conducted between April 1 and September 1.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• All site management and construction shall be installed by September 30.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>L. Monitoring</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Notes:**
- S - Significant
- LS - Less Than Significant
- SU - Significant and Unavoidable

---

### 2.0 Executive Summary

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Impact</th>
<th>Level of Significance Before Mitigation</th>
<th>Mitigation Measure</th>
<th>Significance After Mitigation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Alt A</td>
<td>Alt B</td>
<td>Alt C</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Project applicants shall agree to allow field monitoring by Napa County and their agents of their vineyards and adjacent areas under their control in order to verify compliance with project conditions and to support ecosystem management goals in Napa County. Monitoring for assessment of baseline project conditions may occur prior to acceptance of project into ministerial review. Monitoring for project compliance with terms and conditions of the ministerial review process may occur during construction or following construction.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Project applicants shall agree to monitor their ground water levels annually at the beginning and end of each water year (October 1st of one year and September 30th of the next) and provide the County with annual well log documenting these onsite water levels for the duration of vineyard operations authorized by the ministerial authorization.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Notes:**
- S - Significant
- LS - Less Than Significant
- SU - Significant and Unavoidable
## 3.0 Comments and Responses to Comments

### 2.0 Executive Summary

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Impact</th>
<th>Level of Significance Before Mitigation</th>
<th>Mitigation Measures</th>
<th>Significance After Mitigation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>ABA</td>
<td>AB</td>
<td>AC</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>M. Limitations</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- A ministerial permit may only be issued for one purpose per parcel.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Applications for ministerial permits where subdivision of land in 2007 or after has been approved for the sole purpose of qualifying multiple projects for ministerial permits shall be denied.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>N. Unique Circumstances</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Ministerial permits may not be used for projects that include any of the following unique circumstances:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- The project is located in a designated mineral resource area</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### 4.1 Comments on Chapter 4.1.6 Well Characterization

**Impact 4.1.5.** Continued land uses and development under the proposed General Plan Update would increase demand on groundwater supplies, and the associated increased well pumping could therefore result in the decline of groundwater level and accelerated overdraft.

**MM 4.1.5.a** The County shall include a policy in the General Plan that requires the continued demonstration of adequate groundwater supply for new projects prior to approval of well and groundwater permits as well as protective provisions for the MSF, Pope Valley, Chiles Valley, Capay Valley and Carneros groundwater basins set forth under County Code Chapter 13.12 (Well and 13.15 (Groundwater Conservation). This technical information shall be provided in combination with other County required application submittals e.g., erosion control plan applications as required under County Code Chapter 18.105.

**MM 4.1.5.b** The County shall include a policy in the General Plan that requires that all projects located within identified areas of groundwater recharge be designed to ensure (at a minimum) maintain a site’s pre-development groundwater recharge potential. Implementation could include...

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>S - Significant</th>
<th>LS - Less Than Significant</th>
<th>SU - Significant and Unavoidable</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Napa County General Plan Update</td>
<td>Draft Environmental Impact Report</td>
<td>County of Napa</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>February 2007</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

---

**SU**

Well pumping that will accelerate overdraft must not be approved. To allow it is unacceptable.
### 3.0 Comments and Responses to Comments

#### 2.0 Executive Summary

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Impact</th>
<th>Level of Significance Before Mitigation</th>
<th>Mitigation Measure</th>
<th>Significance After Mitigation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

- **Limitations on impervious surfaces, project design characteristics, water impoundments (reservoir/retention structures), use of permeable paving materials, bioswales, water gardens, and detention, and other measures to increase runoff retention, protect water quality, and enhance groundwater recharge.**

**NAPA 4.11.45**

The County shall include a policy in the General Plan that requires the use of water conservation measures on urban development projects to improve water use efficiency and reduce overall water demand. Reduce possible water demand through conservation measures, including but not limited to the following:

- a) Work cooperatively with all water providers and developers to incorporate conservation measures into project designs (such as those recommended by the California Urban Water Conservation Council).

- b) Coordinate with water providers to continue to develop and implement water drought

**S - Significant**

**LS - Less Than Significant**

**SU - Significant and Unavoidable**

---

**Notes:**

- Contingency plans to assist residents and businesses in reducing water use during periods of water shortages and emergencies.

- b) Revise the County Code to include a Water Efficient Landscape Ordinance to encourage, or as appropriate, require the use of water efficient landscaping consistent with A.R. 335.

**NAPA 4.11.5d**

The County shall include a policy in the General Plan that maximizes the use of recycled water as an irrigation incorporated water source for vineyards, agricultural activities, and other irrigation opportunities in the County.

**NAPA 4.11.5e**

The County shall include a policy in the General Plan that requires pump tests or hydrogeologic studies be conducted for all high-capacity wells, including high-capacity agricultural production wells, where there may be potential for adversely affect existing adjacent domestic or water system wells. If the County shall not allow the location of any new wells, or the expansion of an existing well, based on the results of pump tests or hydrogeologic studies.

---

**County of Napa**

February 2007

**Napa County General Plan Update**

Draft Environmental Impact Report

**December 2007**

**Napa County General Plan Update**

Final Environmental Impact Report
### 3.0 Comments and Responses to Comments

#### 3.0.1 Land Use

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Impact</th>
<th>Level of Significance Before Mitigation</th>
<th>Mitigation Measure</th>
<th>Significance After Mitigation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Alt A</td>
<td>Alt B</td>
<td>Alt C</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>S</td>
<td>S</td>
<td>S</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Impact 4.11.6** Land use and development associated with the proposed General Plan Update could result in an increase in the number of private wells in unincorporated areas of the County. Approval of wells in these areas would result in well interference impacts.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Impact</th>
<th>Level of Significance Before Mitigation</th>
<th>Mitigation Measure</th>
<th>Significance After Mitigation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Alt A</td>
<td>Alt B</td>
<td>Alt C</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>S</td>
<td>S</td>
<td>S</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Impact 4.11.7** Land use and development under the proposed General Plan Update would result in alterations to existing drainage patterns. Such changes would increase erosion, both in overland flow paths and in drainage swales and channels.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Impact</th>
<th>Level of Significance Before Mitigation</th>
<th>Mitigation Measure</th>
<th>Significance After Mitigation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Alt A</td>
<td>Alt B</td>
<td>Alt C</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>S</td>
<td>S</td>
<td>S</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Impact 4.11.9** Land use and development under the proposed General Plan Update would result in increased stormwater runoff and peak discharge. Entering storm drain systems, including urban, creeks and

---

**Napa County General Plan Update**

**County of Napa**

**Final Environmental Impact Report**

**County of Napa**

**December 2007**
### 3.0 Comments and Responses to Comments

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Impact</th>
<th>Level of Significance Before Mitigation</th>
<th>Mitigation Measure</th>
<th>Significance After Mitigation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Alt A</td>
<td>Alt B</td>
<td>Alt C</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Land use and development under the proposed General Plan Update would</td>
<td>LS</td>
<td>LS</td>
<td>LS</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>allow continued development in 100-year flood plains and flood areas</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>New vinedard development could result in increased 100-year peak</td>
<td>S</td>
<td>S</td>
<td>S</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>discharge rates and water surface elevations</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

#### 4.12 Cultural and Paleontological Resources

| Impact 4.12.1: Implementation of the land uses and development under   | Level of Significance | Mitigation Measure | Significance After Mitigation |
| the proposed Napa County General Plan Update could result in the     | Alt A | Alt B | Alt C | Alt A | Alt B | Alt C |
| potential destruction of archaeological resources, e.g.,              | S     | S     | S     | S     | S     | S     |
| AMM 4.12.1 The County shall provide a policy in the General Plan     |       |       |       |       |       |       |
| that requires all discretionary projects involving ground            |       |       |       |       |       |       |
| disturbing activity to comply with the following standards:          |       |       |       |       |       |       |
| • Reduce the services of a qualified archaeologist to conduct       |       |       |       |       |       |       |
| archaeological research and/or pre-construction archaeological        |       |       |       |       |       |       |
| resource investigations                                             |       |       |       |       |       |       |

#### 2.0 Executive Summary

- Prehistoric and paleontological remains and human remains
- Mitigation measure: on sites identified as having cultural resource sensitivity in Baseline Data Report Map 142, which may be updated from time to time, initiate archaeological resources are discovered that are determined to be eligible for the California Register of Historic Resources, implement measures for the protection of the identified archaeological resources consistent with the provisions of Public Resources Code Section 39983.2. These measures may include, but are not limited to, excavation of the archaeological resource by qualified archaeologists leading to curation of recovered materials and publication of results of research and analysis, and avoidance or capitalization of the cultural resources. The results of archival research and/or pre-construction investigations shall be provided to the County for review, along with recommendations regarding construction measures for excavation and recovery or assessment, prior to the commencement of construction.
- The Napa County Planning Department shall be notified.
## 3.0 Comments and Responses to Comments

### 2.0 Executive Summary

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Impact</th>
<th>Level of Significance Before Mitigation</th>
<th>Mitigation Measure</th>
<th>Significance After Mitigation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>AA A</td>
<td>AA B</td>
<td>AA C</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Immediate if any prehistoric or historic artifacts or paleontological resources (e.g., fossils) are uncovered during construction. All construction shall stop in vicinity of the discovery and a qualified archaeologist shall be retained to evaluate the finds and recommend appropriate actions prior to re-commencement of construction. Appropriate action may include data collection, and/or recovery of significant artifacts, project redesign to avoid the resources, and shall always include preparation of a written report documenting the find and describing steps taken to evaluate and protect significant resources.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• The Napa County Planning Department shall be notified immediately if any human remains are uncovered during construction. All construction shall stop in vicinity of any uncovered human remains, and the County Coroner shall be notified according to Section 7050.5 of California’s Health and Safety Code. If the remains are determined to be Native American, the procedures outlined in State CEQA.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**S – Significant**  **LS – Less Than Significant**  **SU – Significant and Unavoidable**

---

**Napa County General Plan Update**  
**Draft Environmental Impact Report**  
**County of Napa**  
**February 2007**

---

**Impact 4.12.2**  
Projected development under the proposed Napa County General Plan Update could result in the substantial alteration or demolition of significant historic architectural resources (e.g., buildings, structures, and/or stone wall).  

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Level of Significance Before Mitigation</th>
<th>Mitigation Measure</th>
<th>Significance After Mitigation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>AA A</td>
<td>AA B</td>
<td>AA C</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Project development under the proposed Napa County General Plan Update could result in the substantial alteration or demolition of significant historic architectural resources (e.g., buildings, structures, and/or stone wall).</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Guidelines Section 15064.5 (d) and (d) shall be followed.**

• If the project area is determined sensitive for paleontological resources, a qualified paleontologist shall be retained to recommend appropriate actions. Appropriate action may include avoidance, preservation in place, excavation, documentation, and/or data recovery, and shall always include preparation of a written report documenting the find and describing steps taken to evaluate and protect significant resources.

**SU**  
**SU**  
**SU**  
**SU**  
**SU**  

---

**County of Napa**  
**February 2007**  

---

**Napa County General Plan Update**  
**Draft Environmental Impact Report**  
**County of Napa**  
**December 2007**
3.0 COMMENTS AND RESPONSES TO COMMENTS

2.0 EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Impact 4.13.1.3</th>
<th>Level of Significance Before Mitigation</th>
<th>Mitigation Measures</th>
<th>Level of Significance After Mitigation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Land use and development under the proposed Napa County General Plan Update would increase the demand for additional fire protection and emergency medical services and facilities, which may result in physical environmental impacts</td>
<td>S S S</td>
<td>NM 4.13.1.1.b The County shall include a General Plan policy that requires that all new development shall comply with established fire safety standards. Design plans shall be referred to the appropriate fire agency for review in order to verify compliance with applicable requirements as to:</td>
<td>S S S</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Adequacy of water supply for firefighting.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Site design for fire department access in and along streets.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Ability for a safe and efficient fire department response.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Specific fire protection features.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LS</td>
<td>S</td>
<td>LS</td>
<td>S</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Napa County General Plan Update
Draft Environmental Impact Report

County of Napa
February 2007
### 3.0 Comments and Responses to Comments

#### 2.0 Executive Summary

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Impact</th>
<th>Level of Significance</th>
<th>Response</th>
<th>Mitigation Measure</th>
<th>Significance After Mitigation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Increase the demand for law enforcement services.</td>
<td>SU</td>
<td>SU</td>
<td>consult with County law enforcement to determine the need for special services and/or additional facilities, and to determine how these services and/or facilities can be provided prior to project approval. If the proposed project is adjacent to or within an incorporated city/crown, consultation with their law enforcement agency shall also be required.</td>
<td>152-127E</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Impact 4.13.3.1 Land uses and development under the proposed General Plan Update would increase the demand for additional sources of potable and irrigation water as well as additional or expanded treatment and distribution facilities to meet increased demands in year 2030 and at year 2050.</td>
<td>SU</td>
<td>SU</td>
<td>The County shall include a policy in the General Plan that requires the County to periodically review its groundwater ordinance based on available studies and monitoring data, and shall review all discretionary projects proposing the use of groundwater to ensure they will not significantly impact groundwater availability or use over the long term. In some cases, this analysis may utilize quantitative standards based on technical studies and established by ordinance; in other areas, this analysis may involve comparing the projected rate of groundwater use to the calculated rate of recharge. The area covered is significant and unavoidable.</td>
<td>SU</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

#### Table 3.0.14-16

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Impact</th>
<th>Level of Significance</th>
<th>Response</th>
<th>Mitigation Measure</th>
<th>Significance After Mitigation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Impact 4.13.3.1 Land uses and development under the proposed General Plan Update would increase the demand for additional sources of potable and irrigation water as well as additional or expanded treatment and distribution facilities to accommodate the increase in demand.</td>
<td>S</td>
<td>S</td>
<td>detailed review and the most stringent standards will be applied in officially designated groundwater deficient areas, such as the HST.</td>
<td>152-128E</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Impact 4.13.4.1 Land uses and development under the proposed Napa County General Plan Update would require additional sewer treatment capacity and conveyance facilities to accommodate the increase in demand.</td>
<td>S</td>
<td>S</td>
<td>The County shall include a policy in the General Plan that requires as part of continued implementation of County Code Title 13 Division 1 provisions associated with sewer systems) verification of adequate wastewater service for development projects prior to their approvals. This will include coordination with wastewater service providers to verify adequate capacity and infrastructure either exists or will be available upon completion of the development project.</td>
<td>LS</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

#### Table 3.0.14-17

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Impact</th>
<th>Level of Significance</th>
<th>Response</th>
<th>Mitigation Measure</th>
<th>Significance After Mitigation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Increase the demand for law enforcement services.</td>
<td>SU</td>
<td>SU</td>
<td>consult with County law enforcement to determine the need for special services and/or additional facilities, and to determine how these services and/or facilities can be provided prior to project approval. If the proposed project is adjacent to or within an incorporated city/crown, consultation with their law enforcement agency shall also be required.</td>
<td>152-127E</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Impact 4.13.3.1 Land uses and development under the proposed General Plan Update would increase the demand for additional sources of potable and irrigation water as well as additional or expanded treatment and distribution facilities to meet increased demands in year 2030 and at year 2050.</td>
<td>SU</td>
<td>SU</td>
<td>The County shall include a policy in the General Plan that requires the County to periodically review its groundwater ordinance based on available studies and monitoring data, and shall review all discretionary projects proposing the use of groundwater to ensure they will not significantly impact groundwater availability or use over the long term. In some cases, this analysis may utilize quantitative standards based on technical studies and established by ordinance; in other areas, this analysis may involve comparing the projected rate of groundwater use to the calculated rate of recharge. The area covered is significant and unavoidable.</td>
<td>SU</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

#### Table 3.0.14-18

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Impact</th>
<th>Level of Significance</th>
<th>Response</th>
<th>Mitigation Measure</th>
<th>Significance After Mitigation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Impact 4.13.3.1 Land uses and development under the proposed General Plan Update would increase the demand for additional sources of potable and irrigation water as well as additional or expanded treatment and distribution facilities to accommodate the increase in demand.</td>
<td>S</td>
<td>S</td>
<td>detailed review and the most stringent standards will be applied in officially designated groundwater deficient areas, such as the HST.</td>
<td>152-128E</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Impact 4.13.4.1 Land uses and development under the proposed Napa County General Plan Update would require additional sewer treatment capacity and conveyance facilities to accommodate the increase in demand.</td>
<td>S</td>
<td>S</td>
<td>The County shall include a policy in the General Plan that requires as part of continued implementation of County Code Title 13 Division 1 provisions associated with sewer systems) verification of adequate wastewater service for development projects prior to their approvals. This will include coordination with wastewater service providers to verify adequate capacity and infrastructure either exists or will be available upon completion of the development project.</td>
<td>LS</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

#### Table 3.0.14-19

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Impact</th>
<th>Level of Significance</th>
<th>Response</th>
<th>Mitigation Measure</th>
<th>Significance After Mitigation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Increase the demand for law enforcement services.</td>
<td>SU</td>
<td>SU</td>
<td>consult with County law enforcement to determine the need for special services and/or additional facilities, and to determine how these services and/or facilities can be provided prior to project approval. If the proposed project is adjacent to or within an incorporated city/crown, consultation with their law enforcement agency shall also be required.</td>
<td>152-127E</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Impact 4.13.3.1 Land uses and development under the proposed General Plan Update would increase the demand for additional sources of potable and irrigation water as well as additional or expanded treatment and distribution facilities to meet increased demands in year 2030 and at year 2050.</td>
<td>SU</td>
<td>SU</td>
<td>The County shall include a policy in the General Plan that requires the County to periodically review its groundwater ordinance based on available studies and monitoring data, and shall review all discretionary projects proposing the use of groundwater to ensure they will not significantly impact groundwater availability or use over the long term. In some cases, this analysis may utilize quantitative standards based on technical studies and established by ordinance; in other areas, this analysis may involve comparing the projected rate of groundwater use to the calculated rate of recharge. The area covered is significant and unavoidable.</td>
<td>SU</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

#### Table 3.0.14-20

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Impact</th>
<th>Level of Significance</th>
<th>Response</th>
<th>Mitigation Measure</th>
<th>Significance After Mitigation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Impact 4.13.3.1 Land uses and development under the proposed General Plan Update would increase the demand for additional sources of potable and irrigation water as well as additional or expanded treatment and distribution facilities to accommodate the increase in demand.</td>
<td>S</td>
<td>S</td>
<td>detailed review and the most stringent standards will be applied in officially designated groundwater deficient areas, such as the HST.</td>
<td>152-128E</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Impact 4.13.4.1 Land uses and development under the proposed Napa County General Plan Update would require additional sewer treatment capacity and conveyance facilities to accommodate the increase in demand.</td>
<td>S</td>
<td>S</td>
<td>The County shall include a policy in the General Plan that requires as part of continued implementation of County Code Title 13 Division 1 provisions associated with sewer systems) verification of adequate wastewater service for development projects prior to their approvals. This will include coordination with wastewater service providers to verify adequate capacity and infrastructure either exists or will be available upon completion of the development project.</td>
<td>LS</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

#### Table 3.0.14-21

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Impact</th>
<th>Level of Significance</th>
<th>Response</th>
<th>Mitigation Measure</th>
<th>Significance After Mitigation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Increase the demand for law enforcement services.</td>
<td>SU</td>
<td>SU</td>
<td>consult with County law enforcement to determine the need for special services and/or additional facilities, and to determine how these services and/or facilities can be provided prior to project approval. If the proposed project is adjacent to or within an incorporated city/crown, consultation with their law enforcement agency shall also be required.</td>
<td>152-127E</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Impact 4.13.3.1 Land uses and development under the proposed General Plan Update would increase the demand for additional sources of potable and irrigation water as well as additional or expanded treatment and distribution facilities to meet increased demands in year 2030 and at year 2050.</td>
<td>SU</td>
<td>SU</td>
<td>The County shall include a policy in the General Plan that requires the County to periodically review its groundwater ordinance based on available studies and monitoring data, and shall review all discretionary projects proposing the use of groundwater to ensure they will not significantly impact groundwater availability or use over the long term. In some cases, this analysis may utilize quantitative standards based on technical studies and established by ordinance; in other areas, this analysis may involve comparing the projected rate of groundwater use to the calculated rate of recharge. The area covered is significant and unavoidable.</td>
<td>SU</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

#### Table 3.0.14-22

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Impact</th>
<th>Level of Significance</th>
<th>Response</th>
<th>Mitigation Measure</th>
<th>Significance After Mitigation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Impact 4.13.3.1 Land uses and development under the proposed General Plan Update would increase the demand for additional sources of potable and irrigation water as well as additional or expanded treatment and distribution facilities to accommodate the increase in demand.</td>
<td>S</td>
<td>S</td>
<td>detailed review and the most stringent standards will be applied in officially designated groundwater deficient areas, such as the HST.</td>
<td>152-128E</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Impact 4.13.4.1 Land uses and development under the proposed Napa County General Plan Update would require additional sewer treatment capacity and conveyance facilities to accommodate the increase in demand.</td>
<td>S</td>
<td>S</td>
<td>The County shall include a policy in the General Plan that requires as part of continued implementation of County Code Title 13 Division 1 provisions associated with sewer systems) verification of adequate wastewater service for development projects prior to their approvals. This will include coordination with wastewater service providers to verify adequate capacity and infrastructure either exists or will be available upon completion of the development project.</td>
<td>LS</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
2.0 EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

Impact 4.13.6.1 Land use and development under the proposed Napa County General Plan Update would increase population and subsequent student enrollment of the County Districts schools and may require the construction of new school facilities to serve the increased demand.

Impact 4.13.7.1 Land use and development under the proposed Napa County General Plan Update would increase energy use and the demand for electrical and natural gas facilities and related infrastructure.

S - Significant
LS - Less Than Significant
SU - Significant and Unavoidable

County of Napa
February 2007
Napa County General Plan Update
Draft Environmental Impact Report

County of Napa
December 2007
Napa County General Plan Update
Final Environmental Impact Report

3.0 COMMENTS AND RESPONSES TO COMMENTS
## 3.0 Comments and Responses to Comments

### 2.0 Executive Summary

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Impact</th>
<th>Level of Significance Before Mitigation</th>
<th>Mitigation Measure</th>
<th>Significance After Mitigation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Alt A</td>
<td>Alt B</td>
<td>Alt C</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Napa County residents live within close proximity of parks offering a variety of nature-based recreation opportunities by at least doubling the area of publicly accessible open space within a 15-minute driving time of each of the county’s four cities and unincorporated town.

The following mitigation measures would apply to Alternatives B and C:

**MM 4.13.9.1c**

- The County shall include a policy in the General Plan that requires the development of recreation facilities and participation in the funding of planned recreation facilities (e.g., parkland acquisition) to enhance development in the unincorporated community of Amoak and at the Napa River, Pacific Crest Bike and Trailway sites and County-owned sites within the City of Napa.

### 4.14 Visual Resources/Light and glare

**Impact 4.14.1**

Light use and development under the proposed General Plan Update could result in potential alterations to designated scenic resources within the County and could

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Level of Significance Before Mitigation</th>
<th>Mitigation Measure</th>
<th>Significance After Mitigation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Alt A</td>
<td>Alt B</td>
<td>Alt C</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The County shall provide a policy in the General Plan that requires continued implementation of Napa County Visualized Protection Program (Chapter 18-106) of the County Code and will apply the protective provisions of this Program on all public projects, including any further improvements that would affect

### 4.14.2","n

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Level of Significance Before Mitigation</th>
<th>Mitigation Measure</th>
<th>Significance After Mitigation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Alt A</td>
<td>Alt B</td>
<td>Alt C</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The County shall provide a policy in the General Plan that requires:

- **MM 4.14.1b**
  - The retention of trees along public roadways.
- **MM 4.14.1c**
  - The retention of trees along public roadways.
- **MM 4.14.1d**
  - The retention of trees along public roadways.

Other mitigation measures would apply to Alternatives B and C:

- **MM 4.14.1d**
  - The retention of trees along public roadways.

Napa County residents live within close proximity of parks offering a variety of nature-based recreation opportunities by at least doubling the area of publicly accessible open space within a 15-minute driving time of each of the county’s four cities and unincorporated town.

The following mitigation measures would apply to Alternatives B and C:

**MM 4.13.9.1c**

- The County shall include a policy in the General Plan that requires the development of recreation facilities and participation in the funding of planned recreation facilities (e.g., parkland acquisition) to enhance development in the unincorporated community of Amoak and at the Napa River, Pacific Crest Bike and Trailway sites and County-owned sites within the City of Napa.

### 4.14 Visual Resources/Light and glare

**Impact 4.14.1**

Light use and development under the proposed General Plan Update could result in potential alterations to designated scenic resources within the County and could

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Level of Significance Before Mitigation</th>
<th>Mitigation Measure</th>
<th>Significance After Mitigation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Alt A</td>
<td>Alt B</td>
<td>Alt C</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The County shall provide a policy in the General Plan that requires continued implementation of Napa County Visualized Protection Program (Chapter 18-106) of the County Code and will apply the protective provisions of this Program on all public projects, including any further improvements that would affect

### 4.14.2","n

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Level of Significance Before Mitigation</th>
<th>Mitigation Measure</th>
<th>Significance After Mitigation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Alt A</td>
<td>Alt B</td>
<td>Alt C</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The County shall provide a policy in the General Plan that requires:

- **MM 4.14.1b**
  - The retention of trees along public roadways.
- **MM 4.14.1c**
  - The retention of trees along public roadways.
- **MM 4.14.1d**
  - The retention of trees along public roadways.

Other mitigation measures would apply to Alternatives B and C:

- **MM 4.14.1d**
  - The retention of trees along public roadways.

Napa County residents live within close proximity of parks offering a variety of nature-based recreation opportunities by at least doubling the area of publicly accessible open space within a 15-minute driving time of each of the county’s four cities and unincorporated town.

The following mitigation measures would apply to Alternatives B and C:

**MM 4.13.9.1c**

- The County shall include a policy in the General Plan that requires the development of recreation facilities and participation in the funding of planned recreation facilities (e.g., parkland acquisition) to enhance development in the unincorporated community of Amoak and at the Napa River, Pacific Crest Bike and Trailway sites and County-owned sites within the City of Napa.
3.0 COMMENTS AND RESPONSES TO COMMENTS

### 2.0 EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Impact</th>
<th>Level of Significance Before Mitigation</th>
<th>Mitigation Measure</th>
<th>Significance After Mitigation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Alt A</td>
<td>Alt B</td>
<td>Alt C</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MM 4.14.1a</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The County shall provide a policy in the General Plan that requires development projects on County owned sites within the City of Napa to be designed to be visually compatible with their surroundings in terms of size, scale, and materials.</td>
<td>Support</td>
<td>Support</td>
<td>Support</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The following mitigation measure would apply to Alternative C:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MM 4.14.1f</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Prior to any reversion of any land to the City of American Canyon with depths of greater than 15%, the County and the City shall agree that such lands remain as dedicated public open space.</td>
<td>Support</td>
<td>Support</td>
<td>Support</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**S** - Significant  **LS** - Less Than Significant  **SU** - Significant and Unavoidable

---

**Impact 4.14.2** New development under the proposed General Plan Update would create new sources of daytime glare and could change nighttime lighting and illumination levels in the County.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>S</th>
<th>S</th>
<th>S</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>MM 4.14.2a</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>As part of planned roadway improvements identified under the Circulation Element, the County shall include a General Plan policy that requires the installation of landscaping with major roadway improvements (e.g., widening of Highway 12 in Jamieson Canyon) in areas identified where vehicle headlights would generate glare on existing residences.</td>
<td>LS</td>
<td>LS</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

---

**Impact 4.14.3** The County shall provide a policy in the General Plan that street lighting on County roadways shall be limited to the minimum amount needed for public safety and shall be designed to focus the light where it is needed (e.g., intersections). Street lights shall consist of fixtures that are designed to block illumination of adjoining properties and prohibit light rays emitted from the fixture at angles above the horizontal plane.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Alt A</th>
<th>Alt B</th>
<th>Alt C</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>MM 4.14.3b</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The County shall provide a policy in the General Plan that street lighting on County roadways shall be limited to the minimum amount needed for public safety and shall be designed to focus the light where it is needed (e.g., intersections). Street lights shall consist of fixtures that are designed to block illumination of adjoining properties and prohibit light rays emitted from the fixture at angles above the horizontal plane.</td>
<td>Support</td>
<td>Support</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Impact 4.14.4** The County shall provide a policy in the General Plan that the design of buildings visible from County designated scenic byways shall avoid the use of reflective building materials that could cause glare.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Alt A</th>
<th>Alt B</th>
<th>Alt C</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>MM 4.14.3c</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The County shall provide a policy in the General Plan that the design of buildings visible from County designated scenic byways shall avoid the use of reflective building materials that could cause glare.</td>
<td>Support</td>
<td>Support</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**MM 4.14.4d** The County shall provide a policy in the General Plan that nighttime lighting associated with new development shall be designed to limit upward and sideways spillover of light. Standards shall be as specified in the most recent update of the "Nonresidential Compliance Manual for California’s 2005 Energy Efficiency Standards" or the "Residential Compliance Manual for California’s 2005 Energy Efficiency Standards" published by the state.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Alt A</th>
<th>Alt B</th>
<th>Alt C</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>MM 4.14.4d</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The County shall provide a policy in the General Plan that nighttime lighting associated with new development shall be designed to limit upward and sideways spillover of light. Standards shall be as specified in the most recent update of the &quot;Nonresidential Compliance Manual for California’s 2005 Energy Efficiency Standards&quot; or the &quot;Residential Compliance Manual for California’s 2005 Energy Efficiency Standards&quot; published by the state.</td>
<td>Support</td>
<td>Support</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
3.0 COMMENTS AND RESPONSES TO COMMENTS

Designated Public (Scenic) Roads Map

Viewshed
Designated
Scenic Roads

Legend
- SilveradoS
- SilveradoN
- DryCreek
- OakvilleGradeCross
- PetalumaForest
- DeerParkHowellMtn
- ButtsPopeChiles
- PopeCanyon
- WoodenValley
- Oaknoll
- YounMileCross
- SeryessaKnoxville
- Zinfandel
- Lodl
- Balo
- Hwy128
- Hwy29N
- Hwy295
- Hwy121

http://www.co.napa.ca.us/gov/apps/viewshed107/roads.htm
### 3.0 Comments and Responses to Comments

This Policy Location Matrix is a general guide to the disposition of goals and policies in the current Napa County General Plan. This Matrix is a draft, and may be updated and revised.

It is highly recommended that the Public Review Draft General Plan be read along with this Matrix, to gain an understanding of proposed County goals, policies, objectives, and actions.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>LOCATION IN 1983 GENERAL PLAN</th>
<th>LOCATION IN UPDATED GENERAL PLAN</th>
<th>COMMENTS</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>GOALS</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Goal 1** – To plan for agriculture and related activities as the primary land uses in Napa County and concentrate urban uses in the County’s existing cities and urban areas.

Policy AgRU-U1: Agriculture and related activities are the primary land uses in Napa County and must be concentrated in the County’s existing cities and urban areas.

See Draft General Plan page 152-143P

**Goal 2** – To develop and implement a set of planning policies which combine to define a population size, rate of population growth and the geographic distribution of that population in such a manner that the desired quality of life is achieved.

See Draft General Plan page 152-144P

**Goal 3** – To determine what the land is best suited for to match man’s activities to the land’s natural suitability to take advantage of natural capabilities and minimize conflict with the natural environment.

Goal CON-1: The County of Napa will conserve resources by determining the most appropriate use of land, matching land uses and activities to the land’s natural suitability, and minimizing conflicts with the natural environment.

Addressed generally in the “Growth Management” section of the Agricultural Preservation and Land Use Element (see page 94)

See Draft General Plan page 94

**Goal 4** – To work with cities, other governmental units, citizens and the private sector to plan for services, facilities and accommodations, including housing, transportation, economic development, parks and recreation, open space and other local County needs.

See Draft General Plan page 187

**Policy & Objectives**

**1. Open Space and Watershed**

- **1.1 Airport Approach Zones** - The County will consider low density nonresidential development of land such as Industrial under Airport Approach Zones to reduce safety hazards through the use of zoning or acquisition of development rights.

Policy AgRU-U4: Land use in Airport Approach Zones shall comply with applicable Airport Land Use Compatibility Policies. This Policy shall apply to Napa County Airport and Angwin Airport (Parrett Field).

Action Item AgRU-U4.1: Use zoning and, if necessary, acquisition of development rights to implement this Policy.

Action Item AgRU-U4.2: Refer General Plan land use changes, proposed rezonings, and proposed developments in Airport Approach Zones to the Napa County Airport Land Use Commission for review and comment.

See Draft General Plan page 152-145P

- **1.2 Ecologically Sensitive Areas** - The County will enact and enforce regulations which will limit development in ecologically sensitive areas such as those adjacent to river or streamside areas, and physically hazardous areas such as floodplains, steep slopes, high fire areas and environmentally hazardous areas, except for C&D facilities which is planned for urban development.

Policy CON-4: The County will define and identify ecologically sensitive areas and will act to retain their values.

See Draft General Plan page 189

**Guide to Abbreviations**

- AgRU—Agricultural Preservation and Land Use Element
- CC—Community Character Element
- Economic Development Element
- SAF—Safety Element
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### NAPA COUNTY GENERAL PLAN POLICY LOCATION MATRIX

#### 3.0 COMMENTS AND RESPONSES TO COMMENTS

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Location/Plan in 1983 General Plan</th>
<th>Location in Updated General Plan</th>
<th>Comments</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>1.3 Environmental Quality - The County will enact and enforce regulations, which will maintain or improve the current level of environmental quality found in Napa County.</strong></td>
<td>Policy CON-6: The County will enact and enforce regulations which will maintain or improve the current overall level of environmental quality found in Napa County.</td>
<td>See Draft General Plan page 169</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>1.4 Fire Management - The County will develop a controlled burn program for managing fire hazardous areas, to reduce wildfire hazards, improve wildland capabilities, promote wildlife habitat diversification, and improve grazing.</strong></td>
<td>Policy SAF-15: The County will prepare a fire management plan and will continue, enhance, and implement programs enabling to reduce loss of life, property, and associated economic loss.</td>
<td>See Draft General Plan page 272</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>1.5 Limited Development Areas - The County will not allow any development in a limited development area to develop with a combination of urbanized areas, county parks, historical sites, the natural resource area, or the rural resource area.</strong></td>
<td>Policy SAF-3: The County shall evaluate potential safety hazards related when considering General Plan Amendments, rezonings, or other project approvals.</td>
<td>See Draft General Plan page 270</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>1.6 Open Space Areas - The County will preserve suitable land for greenbelts, forest, recreation, flood control, adequate water supply, or quality improvement, in the development of the area.</strong></td>
<td>Policy CON-1: The County will preserve land for greenbelts, forest, recreation, flood control, adequate water supply, or quality improvement, in the development of the area.</td>
<td>See Draft General Plan page 187</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>1.7 Open Space Character - The County will retain the character and natural beauty of Napa County by the preservation of open space especially in areas close to cities and not scheduled for urban development.</strong></td>
<td>Policy CC-1: The County will retain the character and natural beauty of Napa County by the preservation of open space, especially in areas close to cities and not scheduled for urban development.</td>
<td>See Draft General Plan page 182</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>1.8 Transmission Line Corridors - The County will designate the general location of any major utility transmission corridors crossing the County to minimize economic and environmental impacts.</strong></td>
<td>Policy CC-12: To the extent allowed by law, telecommunications and broadcast facilities and transmission lines shall be located in accordance with the County's General Plan unless they are sited and designed so as to be visible to the public.</td>
<td>See Draft General Plan page 154</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>1.9 Water Supply Protection - The County will protect public and private water supply sources from contamination of overdrafts, and encourage groundwater recharge.</strong></td>
<td>Policy CON-11: The County will protect public and private water supply sources from contamination of overdrafts, and encourage groundwater recharge.</td>
<td>See Draft General Plan pages 191 and 200</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

#### Guide to Abbreviations

- AGU—Agricultural Preservation and Land Use Element
- CC—Community Character Element
- E—Economic Development Element
- SA—Safety Element
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**NAPA COUNTY GENERAL PLAN POLICY LOCATION MATRIX**

**Preservation of open space especially in areas close to cities and not scheduled for urban development.**

**Guidance for Location and Designation of Transmission Line Corridors**

**Water Supply Protection - The County will protect public and private water supply sources from contamination of overdrafts, and encourage groundwater recharge.**
### 3.0 Comments and Responses to Comments

#### Napa County General Plan Policy Location Matrix

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Location/Plan in 1983 General Plan</th>
<th>Location in Updated General Plan</th>
<th>Comments</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Watersheds, especially stream side areas, in good condition and to provide shelter and food for wildlife.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Provide protection for wildlife habitat through buffer strips or other means.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Provide replacement habitat of fish and wildlife utilizing native species.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Enhance existing habitat values through restoration and replanting as part of discretionary permit review and approval.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Provide an adequate release flow of water to preserve fish populations.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Policy CON-38: The County will work to protect Napa County's watersheds and public and private water resources to accomplish the following purposes:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Protect ground water recharge areas from excessive development of impervious surfaces and maintain and enhance infiltration and recharge groundwater supplies and aquifers.</td>
<td></td>
<td>See Draft General Plan page 203</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Evaluate and develop land use policies resulting in the appropriate density and mix of impervious surface and suitable vegetation cover to improve water quality and reduce surface water pollution and infiltration within sensitive domestic water supply watersheds.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Plan for water supply and wastewater treatment facilities and delivery systems to centralize and serve high-density development areas of the county.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Use the most advanced wastewater treatment and reuse facilities feasible to reuse treated wastewater.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### 1.10 Watershed Protection - The County will protect the public interest in drainage systems and water impoundments from sedimentation, erosion, and contamination and ensure that urban, agricultural and resource development projects utilize sound short-term and long-term erosion control measures.

Policy CON-38: The County will work to protect Napa County's watersheds and public and private water resources to accomplish the following purposes:

a. Protect ground water recharge areas from excessive development of impervious surfaces and maintain and enhance infiltration and recharge groundwater supplies and aquifers.
b. Evaluate and develop land use policies resulting in the appropriate density and mix of impervious surface and suitable vegetation cover to improve water quality and reduce surface water pollution and infiltration within sensitive domestic water supply watersheds.
c. Plan for water supply and wastewater treatment facilities and delivery systems to centralize and serve high-density development areas of the county.
d. Use the most advanced wastewater treatment and reuse facilities feasible to reuse treated wastewater.

See Draft General Plan page 203

### 1.11 Resource Extraction - The County's resource extraction standards, (e.g., mining and geothermal development

Policy CON-74: Encourage the ongoing reclamation of land and gravel mining areas through the implementation of reclamation plans. All mining operation shall have up-to-date reclamation plans and financial assurances to the satisfaction of the County.

See Draft General Plan page 216

---

**Guide to Abbreviations**

- CRB - Critical Resource Element
- CON - Conservation Element
- RCS - Reclamation and Open Space Element
- References to "current" are to the 1983 General Plan

**Draft—Subject to Revision**
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### 3.0 Comments and Responses to Comments

#### Napa County General Plan Policy Location Matrix

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Location Policy in 1983 General Plan</th>
<th>Location in Updated General Plan</th>
<th>Comments</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>the type of recreation would not be adversely affected by</td>
<td>the surrounding area, require a minimum of public support</td>
<td>See Policy RO-3 listed previously in this matrix.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>commerce, intensification, or continuation of local</td>
<td>services (such as paved roads, emergency services, or low</td>
<td>See Draft General Plan page 325</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>agricultural activity.</td>
<td>enforcement), contain a minimum of paved surfacces,</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>structures, natural landform alteration or other introduced</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>or constructed features inconsistent with the environment,</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>shall not significantly contribute to the likelihood that</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>additional non-agricultural uses of agricultural land will be</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>proposed to support or be accessory to the continued existence</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>of the recreational use.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

2.4 Open Space Character of Rural Recreational Uses - Recreational uses permitted on lands designated for agriculture, watershed and/or open space shall be limited in density, intensity, need for public services, impacts on the natural environment, and growth implications. Such uses shall maintain the character of the surrounding area, require a minimum of public support services (such as paved roads, emergency services, or low enforcement), contain a minimum of paved surfaces, structures, natural landform alteration or other introduced or constructed features inconsistent with the environment, and shall not significantly contribute to the likelihood that additional non-agricultural uses of agricultural land will be proposed to support or be accessory to the continued existence of the recreational use.

See Draft General Plan page 154

2.5 Scenic Transportation Routes - The County will plan for a high-quality of design and visual appearance along all major and scenic designated transportation routes through such means as eliminating all billboards and, where practical, undergrounding utilities. The County will encourage the development of a system of scenic roads that connect existing cities and other local population centers to outdoor recreation areas, scenic open space reserves, and historic sites. Particular emphasis is being placed on the development of Scenic Highways Element of the Napa County General Plan.

Policy CC-13: The County opposes the construction of any new billboards, and supports the removal of existing billboards.

Policy CC-14: Adjacent to scenic roadways, utilities should be placed underground wherever possible.

Guide to Abbreviations
- CB: Circulation Element
- CON: Conservation Element
- RO: Recreation and Open Space Element

References to “current” use to the 1983 General Plan.
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Aptui: Agricultural Preservation and Land Use Element
CC: Community Character Element
E: Economic Development Element
SV: Safety Element

DRAFT—Subject to Revision

Page 8 of 130

April 2, 2007

Napa County General Plan Update

County of Napa

Final Environmental Impact Report

December 2007

3.0-1424
3. Comments and Responses to Comments

### Napa County General Plan Policy Location Matrix

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Location/Item in 1983 General Plan</th>
<th>Location in 1983 General Plan</th>
<th>Comments</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>3.4 Agricultural Taxation</td>
<td>- The County will initiate a study of tax assessment policies which recognize the long term impact of agricultural zoning and the fact that agricultural land uses require a minimum of public expenditure for protection and servicing.</td>
<td>Policy Ag/UL-6: The County will continue to study tax assessment policies which recognize the long term impact of agricultural zoning and the fact that agricultural land uses require a minimum of public expenditure for protection and servicing. See Draft General Plan page 34.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.5 Agricultural/Urban Relationships</td>
<td>- The County will develop planning concepts and zoning standards designed to minimize conflicts arising from encroachment of urban uses into agricultural areas. Land in proximity to existing urban areas currently in mixed agricultural and rural residential uses will be treated as Residential Community Areas and further encroachment of these areas will be discouraged. Day care centers will be allowed in agricultural areas where there is a finding that there will be no conflict with agricultural use of the vicinity.</td>
<td>Policy Ag/UL-14: The County's planning concepts and zoning standards shall be designed to minimize conflicts arising from encroachment of urban uses into agricultural areas. Land in proximity to existing urban areas currently in mixed agricultural and rural residential uses will be treated as Residential Community Areas and further encroachment of these areas will be discouraged. Day care centers will be allowed in agricultural areas where there is a finding that there will be no conflict with agricultural use in the vicinity. See Draft General Plan page 35.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.6 Agricultural Zoning</td>
<td>- The County will establish a minimum agricultural parcel size which will reflect the availability of natural resources, in order to assure that agricultural areas can be maintained as economic units.</td>
<td>Policy Ag/UL-14: The County's minimum agricultural parcel sizes shall ensure that agricultural areas can be maintained as economic units. See Draft General Plan page 35.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.7 Farm Labor Housing</td>
<td>- The County will develop standards in the General Plan and Zoning Ordinance to allow agricultural labor to construct farm labor housing appropriate for the support of long-term agriculture in Napa County. Permanent or seasonal farm labor housing may only be provided where there is a need for full-time farm employment by at least one employee who would be a resident of the unit on the site. This need must be demonstrated to exist on the site of the farm labor housing, and/or on neighboring lands owned or controlled by the applicant, and/or on lands in the vicinity of the residential unit under the ownership or control of the applicant for which agricultural employees require housing.</td>
<td>Policy Ag/UL-16: Seasonal farm labor housing may be provided in agricultural areas without regard to the location of farm employment when the housing is under public agency ownership or control. See Draft General Plan page 35.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Guides to Abbreviations**

- CC - Community Character Element
- CIR - Circulation Element
- ECD - Economic Development Element
- PDP - Park and Open Space Element
- SAF - Safety Element
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**Napa County General Plan Policy Location Matrix**

- a) Seasonal Farm Labor Housing - Seasonal farm labor housing may be provided in agricultural areas without regard to the location of farm employment when the housing is under public agency ownership or control.

- 3.8 Grazinglands | - The County will protect agricultural lands used for grazing, even though they may not be considered prime agricultural lands. | Policy Ag/UL-6: The County will reserve agricultural lands for agricultural use including lands used for grazing, except as permitted in the Land Use Map as planned for urban development. This draft policy incorporates elements of current Land Use Policies 1.6-A and 1.16. See Draft General Plan page 34. |

- 3.9 Hilside Agriculture | - The County, working in conjunction with the Soil Conservation Service, will monitor hillside agricultural operations, and in conjunction with the Soil Conservation Service, establish standards for terracing, contour planting, and maintenance of permanent cover crops on slopes exceeding 15%. | This language is not specifically included in the Updated General Plan. The goal or policy may be addressed in different terms. The action noted may have been completed since the last General Plan Update, or the goal or policy may no longer be needed. |

- 3.10 Prime Agricultural Lands | - The County will reserve prime agricultural lands for agricultural use. | See Policy Ag/UL-4 listed previously in the matrix. See Draft General Plan page 34. |

- 3.11 Processing of Agricultural Products | - Agriculture includes the production and processing of food and fiber, the growing of crops, produce and feed as well as the raising of livestock and animals. In the case of winegrape processing includes growing and harvest, fermenting, pressing, and bottling of wine produced by or for the wine industry. Processing of winegrapes and wine from Napa County grapes, activities for the education and development of consumers and members of the wine trade with respect to wines produced by or at the winery, and limited non-commercial food service, provided any | Policy Ag/UL-9: New wineries and other agricultural processing, facilities as well as expansions of existing wineries and facilities in agricultural areas should be designed to convey the permanence and attractiveness associated with existing Napa Valley wineries and facilities. Policy Ag/UL-11: New non-agricultural use or development of a parcel located in an agricultural area shall be permitted unless it is needed for the agricultural purpose of the parcel, except as provided in Policies UU-1, UU-5, and UU-24. Draft Policy Ag/UL-9 incorporates elements of current Land Use Policies 3.11 and 3.13. Draft Policy Ag/UL-12 reflects the addition of wine-food pairing. See Draft General Plan page. |
3.0 COMMENTS AND RESPONSES TO COMMENTS

Such activities are clearly accessory to the principal use of the facility as an agricultural processing facility. No other use or development of a parcel located in an agricultural area shall be permitted unless it is needed for the agricultural use of the parcel, except as provided in Policies 3.7 and 3.7(b) above. The processing of agricultural products often takes on an industrial character which is subject, in general, to the same limits of regulation as other industrial uses.

3.12 Right-to-Farm - The County will affirm and protect the right of agriculture operators in designated agricultural areas to continue their agricultural practices, even though established urban uses in the general area may foster complaints against those agricultural practices. The existence of a "right-to-farm" policy will be indicated on all parcel maps approved for locations in or adjacent to designated agricultural areas.

Policy Ag/LU-12: In the case of wineries, agricultural processing includes tours and tasting, retail sales of wine produced by or for the winery partly or totally from Napa County grapes, activities for the education and development of consumers and members of the wine trade with respect to wine produced by or at the winery, and testing and commercial food service involving wine-food pairings, provided any such activities are clearly accessory to the principal use of the facility as an agricultural processing facility.

See Draft General Plan page 36

3.13 Winery Location and Design - Wineries and related activities will, where practical, be located on sites off of prime soils areas and should be designed to convey the attractiveness associated with existing Napa Valley wineries.

Policy Ag/LU-14: The County affirms and will protect the right of agriculture operators in designated agricultural areas to continue their agricultural practices (a "right-to-farm"), even though established urban uses in the general area may foster complaints against those agricultural practices. The "right to farm" shall encompass the processing of agricultural products and other activities inherent in the distinct of agriculture provided in Policy Ag/LU-12 above.

See Draft General Plan page 38

3.14 Water Supply - The County will strive to develop a comprehensive understanding of the potential and deficiencies of surface and groundwater supplies in Napa County.

4.1 Affordable Housing - At least 10% of those dwelling units permitted each year in the unincorporated portion of Napa County shall be capable of purchase or rental by persons with average or below-average income. The average income shall be based on the average income of residents of the County of Napa, based on the most recent United States Census. (Added pursuant to Measure A, a citizen initiative passed in November 1980).

Policy Ag/LU-43: Legal structures and uses destroyed by fire or natural disaster may be rebuilt within three years of most recent occupancy or as otherwise approved by the County, whether or not they conformed to the zoning ordinance at the time of the fire/disaster.

See Draft General Plan page 45

4.2 Rented Homes - Legal restrictions destroyed by fire may be rebuilt within a year of recent occupancy, whether or not they conformed to the zoning ordinance at the time of the fire.

See Draft General Plan page 46

4.3 Housing Standards - The County will maintain and improve the quality of the existing housing stock in the County through the establishment of minimum standards and enforcement programs as one means of meeting the County's housing needs.

Policy Ag/LU-43: The County will promote development concepts that create flexibility, economy and variety in housing without resulting in significant environmental impacts.

See Draft General Plan page 41

4.4 Low and Moderate Housing - The County will work with the Cities to see that low and moderate cost housing is provided in proportion to the number of low and moderate income households in Napa County.

Policy Ag/LU-29: The County will work with the Cities to see that low and moderate cost housing is provided in proportion to the number of low and moderate income households in Napa County.

See Draft General Plan page 41
3.0 Comments and Responses to Comments

NAPA COUNTY GENERAL PLAN POLICY LOCATION MATRIX.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>LOCATION/ITEM IN 1983 GENERAL PLAN</th>
<th>LOCATION IN UPDATED GENERAL PLAN</th>
<th>COMMENTS</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Income householders in Napa County.</td>
<td>Napa County. In addition, the County will accept responsibility for meeting its fair share of the housing needs, including a predominant percentage generated by any new employment in unincorporated areas.</td>
<td>See Draft General Plan page 40</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

4.5 Population Distribution - The County will plan for and accommodate the distribution of population among the sub-areas of the County, giving preference to existing incorporated and urban areas.

Policy Ag/LU-26: The County will plan for and accommodate the distribution of population among the sub-areas of the County, giving preference to existing incorporated and urban areas.

Included in Policy Ag/LU-199, which is included at the end of this matrix.

See Draft General Plan page 94

4.6 Population Growth Rate - The County will plan for an average annual combined County/City population increase comparable with national, state and regional growth rates. Pursuant to Measure A (a citizen initiative passed in November, 1980), the annual number of new housing units permitted in the unincorporated portion of Napa County, through the year 2000, shall be limited to accommodate an annual population growth rate that exceeds neither that of the five San Francisco Bay Area Counties (Alameda, Contra Costa, Marin, Napa, Sonoma) nor 1%. The most recent United States Census shall be used for determining population, persons per household, and the vacancy rate of year-round dwelling units.

Policy Ag/LU-32: The following standards shall apply to lands designated as Urban Residential on the Land Use Map of this General Plan.

Intent: Provide, in identified urban areas, for development of a full range of urban housing possibilities, such as single family dwellings, multiple dwellings, townhouses, row houses, condominiums, and cluster housing in a desirable relationship to planned common use spaces, limited commercial, institutional, educational, day care, cultural, recreational and other uses, while at the same time preserving the quality of urban areas.

General Uses: Single family dwellings, multiple dwellings, mobile home park, day care centers, limited commercial.

See Draft General Plan page 42

4.7 Residential Development Concepts - The County will promote development concepts that create flexi...e and variety in housing without destroying the environmental amenities recommended in the General Planning Goals and Policies.

Policy Ag/LU-32: The following standards shall apply to lands designated as Urban Residential on the Land Use Map of this General Plan.

Intent: Provide, in identified urban areas, for development of a full range of urban housing possibilities, such as single family dwellings, multiple dwellings, townhouses, row houses, condominiums, and cluster housing in a desirable relationship to planned common use spaces, limited commercial, institutional, educational, day care, cultural, recreational and other uses, while at the same time preserving the quality of urban areas.

General Uses: Single family dwellings, multiple dwellings, mobile home park, day care centers, limited commercial.

See Draft General Plan page 42
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NAPA COUNTY GENERAL PLAN POLICY LOCATION MATRIX.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>LOCATION/ITEM IN 1983 GENERAL PLAN</th>
<th>LOCATION IN UPDATED GENERAL PLAN</th>
<th>COMMENTS</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>and institutional uses (denotes uses subject to specified conditions). Minimum Parcel Size: Between 0.0625 acre and 1 acre. Maximum Dwelling Density: One dwelling per parcel except as specified in the Housing Element. Other residential, commercial, educational and recreational facilities subject to specified conditions related to the subjugation of utilities and normal municipal services.</td>
<td>See Draft General Plan page 55, 43, and 79</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

4.6 Rural Residential Areas - a) Res...four County Areas - Deer Park and those Rural...will be discouraged.

Policy Ag/LU-57: The County supports the extension of recycled water to the County of Napa on the Angwin Campus and the County's desire to be protective of water quality and future subdivision activity based on...the safety of the State Water Resources Control Board. Also, the County shall encourage the replacement of existing septic systems with municipal wastewater treatment facilities.

See Draft General Plan page 55, 43, and 79

Support

4.7 Urban Areas - a) The County will assume that the density of development...in the Angwin and the County's desire to be protective of water quality and future subdivision activity based on septic tanks. Also, the County shall encourage the replacement of existing septic systems with municipal wastewater treatment facilities.

Policy Ag/LU-57: The County supports the extension of recycled water to the County of Napa on the Angwin Campus and the County's desire to be protective of water quality and future subdivision activity based on septic tanks. Also, the County shall encourage the replacement of existing septic systems with municipal wastewater treatment facilities.

See Draft General Plan page 55, 43, and 79

Support
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### 3.0 Comments and Responses to Comments

#### 4.10 Urban Expansion Limits - The County will work with the Cities, special districts, and Local Agency Formation Commission to delineate and uphold the limits of current and future urban expansion and development.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Location/Use in 1983 General Plan</th>
<th>Location in Updated General Plan</th>
<th>Comments</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Water supplies shall be transferred into the District from outside its boundaries.</td>
<td>Review of future development projects in the Silverado area. All new development, including subdivisions, use permits, and other discretionary actions, shall conform with the General Plan Land Use Map.</td>
<td>See Draft General Plan page 49 and 107</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Policy Ag/UL-111: Figure Ag/UL-1 depicts the land use policy of the County of Napa.

Policy Ag/UL-126: State law changes LACDO with planning the orderly development of local government agencies to advantageously provide for the present and future needs of the community while preventing against the inappropriate conversion of agricultural and open space lands. A principal planning responsibility of LACDO is to determine a sphere of influence for each city and special district under its jurisdiction. State law defines a sphere of influence as a plan for the probably physical boundaries and service area of a local agency, as determined by LACDO. LACDO is required to review and update, as necessary, each agency's sphere of influence every five years, and the County will work collaboratively with LACDO in its reviews of spheres to encourage order, city-centered growth and development in Napa County and the preservation of agricultural lands.

Draft Policy Ag/UL-24: Incorporates elements of current Land Use Policies 4.11 and 4.13

See Draft General Plan page 49

#### 4.11 Urban Services Facilities - The County will oppose the creation of special districts planned to accommodate residential projects outside existing urban areas. The County will discourage proposed developments, which require urban services and which are not properly planned for urbanized areas. Existing utility systems will be used as much as possible to maximize the use of existing services and facilities and to provide a broader user base to ensure the adequate maintenance and operation of such facilities. Where urban areas lack full urban services, the County will encourage means of area-wide provision of such services.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Location/Use in 1983 General Plan</th>
<th>Location in Updated General Plan</th>
<th>Comments</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Policy Ag/UL-23: The County opposes the creation of special districts planned to accommodate new residential developments outside existing urban areas, except as specified in the Housing Element.</td>
<td>Policy Ag/UL-24: The County will discourage proposed developments outside of urban areas which require urban services. However, nothing in this Policy is intended to preclude the construction of a single-family residence, day care center or private school on an existing, vacant, legal parcel of land, in compliance with adopted County ordinances and other applicable regulations.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

See Draft General Plan page 49 and 107

#### 4.12 Urbanization Definitions - The term "urbanization" shall include the subdivision, use, or development of any parcel of land that is not needed for the agricultural use of that parcel.

Policy Ag/UL-25: For the purposes of this General Plan, the term "urbanized" or "urbanizing" shall include the subdivision, use, or development, or any parcel of land for non-agricultural purposes. Engaged in non-agricultural recreation or non-agricultural uses that are permitted in the applicable zoning district without the issuance of a site permit, such as development of one single family house and/or another unit on an existing legal lot, shall not be considered urbanizing.

See Draft General Plan page 39 and 41

#### 4.13 Urbanizing Growth - The County will enact and enforce regulations which will encourage the concentration of residential growth within the County's existing cities and areas designated for urban uses on the General Plan. However, GFG-001-PD/1000-PD/1000 Element is intended to preclude the construction of a single-family residence, day care center or private school on an existing, vacant, legal parcel of land, in compliance with adopted County ordinances and other applicable regulations.

Policy Ag/UL-26: The County will define and enforce regulations which will encourage the concentration of residential growth within the County's existing cities and areas designated for urban uses on the General Plan. | Policy Ag/UL-30: The County will maintain and improve the safety and adequacy of the existing housing stock in the County through application of applicable building and housing codes, and related enforcement programs. |

See Draft General Plan page 49 and 41

8.1 Commercial Areas - a) American Canyon - Land within the American Canyon Commercial area will be a buffer area between the Plan's residential and industrial areas. Neither residential nor industrial uses will be allowed to encroach on any further into this area without the guidance of a Specific Plan for American Canyon, which might include islands and other industrial uses. b) General - The County will encourage the grouping of commercial uses in compact areas designated for commercial uses on the General Plan but not in areas designated for agricultural uses in the General Plan subject to any exceptions prescribed in the text of the General Plan.

Policy Ag/UL-27: Commercial uses will be grouped in a geographically compact area outside of areas designated for agricultural uses in the General Plan (subject to any exceptions contained in this General Plan). | Policy Ag/UL-39: The County will plan to locate industrial centers, in area major improvements of the area, as well as to develop areas for commercial uses, including day care centers, to be planned to meet the needs of the industrial areas. |

See Draft General Plan page 39 and 43

Draft Policy Ag/UL-35: Also incorporates elements of current Land Use Policy 6.7.

See Draft General Plan page 49 and 43

---
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3.0 COMMENTS AND RESPONSES TO COMMENTS

NAPA COUNTY GENERAL PLAN POLICY LOCATION MATRIX

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>LOCATION/USE IN 1983 GENERAL PLAN</th>
<th>LOCATION IN UPDATED GENERAL PLAN</th>
<th>COMMENTS</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>3.0 Plan, the size of the combined commercial uses will reflect the potential market for such facilities and services. The central business district of each urban center will be recognized as the dominant commercial and financial center for the surrounding trade area.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5.3 Tenant Facilities - The County will support the development of local facilities where there is a showing there would be no conflict with agriculture and the necessity for this type of service can be documented to the County’s satisfaction.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5.3 Lake Berryessa Area Commercial Recreational Zoning – The County will support the development of local facilities where there is a showing there would be no conflict with agriculture and the necessity for this type of service can be documented to the County’s satisfaction.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Policy Agri(UI-38): The County will support the development of local facilities where there is a showing there would be no conflict with agriculture and the necessity for this type of service can be documented to the County’s satisfaction.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>See Draft General Plan page 48</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5.4 Policies regulating commercial uses in certain areas designated as Agricultural, Open Space and Open Space Use are subject to the General Plan and permitting requirements for the area. The existing commercial zoned area shall be included as part of an overall residential development proposed for the area.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Policy Agri(UI-41): for parcels located upon the west side of the Napa River south of the City of Napa which are designated &quot;Agriculture, Watershed, and Open Space&quot; or &quot;Agricultural Resource&quot; on the Land Use Map of the General Plan which have commercial zoning, additional commercial development will be allowed as follows:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>All existing commercial establishments that are currently located within a commercial zoning district shall be allowed to continue to operate and use the existing buildings and/or facilities.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Additional commercial uses which are permitted by the existing commercial zoning of the parcel shall be permitted on that portion of the parcel zoned commercial.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>See Draft General Plan page 45 and 46</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Guide to Abbreviations
- Agri—Agricultural Preservation and Land Use Element
- CC—Community Character Element
- E—Economic Development Element
- SAF—Safety Element
- CR—Recreation Element
- CON—Conservation Element
- RO—Residential and Open Space Element
- References to "current" are to the 1983 General Plan.
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NAPA COUNTY GENERAL PLAN POLICY LOCATION MATRIX

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>LOCATION/USE IN 1983 GENERAL PLAN</th>
<th>LOCATION IN UPDATED GENERAL PLAN</th>
<th>COMMENTS</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Agricultural and open-space recreational areas.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The purpose of this policy is to recognize in the Napa County General Plan the commercial nature of the commercially-zoned portions of such parcels, and to allow additional commercial development in these locations under certain circumstances, where existing commercial uses can expand on land which is already served commercially, where previously established marine commercial uses exist on parcels within the commercial zoning but which otherwise would be eligible for marine-commercial zoning; and to the extent that a minimum parcel size is specified in commercial zone districts as of February 1, 1991, the parcel is already developed with an existing permitted commercial use on the portion commercially zoned, and the amount of land so zoned did not meet that minimum, this policy recognizes that due to the small number of such parcels, their limited capacity for commercially-viable agriculture due to pre-existing use and/or site, location and lot configuration, and the minimal impact such commercial operations and expansions we have on adjacent agricultural or open space activities or the agricultural and open space character of the surrounding area, such limited development will not be detrimental to the Agriculture, Watershed or Open Space policies of the General Plan. Therefore, such development is consistent with all of the goals and policies of the General Plan.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Policy Agri(UI-42): All existing commercial establishments that are currently located within a commercial zoning district shall be allowed to continue to operate and use the existing buildings and/or facilities. Additional commercial uses which are permitted by the existing commercial zoning of the parcel shall be permitted on that portion of the parcel zoned commercial.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>See Draft General Plan page 45 and 46</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Guide to Abbreviations
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3.0 COMMENTS AND RESPONSES TO COMMENTS

NAPA COUNTY GENERAL PLAN POLICY LOCATION MATRIX

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>LOCATION/TITLE IN 1983 GENERAL PLAN</th>
<th>LOCATION IN UPDATED GENERAL PLAN</th>
<th>COMMENTS</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>are currently located within a commercial zoning district that shall be allowed to increase the number of seats accommodated within existing buildings and/or facilities on any parcel designated as a historic restaurant combination zoning district. Due to the small number of such restaurants, limited seating expansions within existing commercial buildings and facilities will not be detrimental to the Agriculture, Non-agricultural, Open Space purposes of the General Plan.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5.6 Marine Commercial Land Uses - Lands along the west bank of the Napa River south of the City of Napa and specific urban areas within four miles of the high water mark of Lake Berryessa are appropriate areas for marine commercial zoning and development. Policy AgLU-40: Lands along the west bank of the Napa River south of the City of Napa and specific urban areas within four miles of the high water mark of Lake Berryessa are appropriate areas for marine commercial zoning and development. Action item AgLU-45:1: Consider amendments to the Zoning Code to allow additional commercial, residential, and mixed uses in the Spanish Flat, Moskovitz, Comes, and southern Pope Creek areas which are complementary to recreational activities of Lake Berryessa. See Draft General Plan page 48</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Guide to Abbreviations
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NAPA COUNTY GENERAL PLAN POLICY LOCATION MATRIX

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>LOCATION/TITLE IN 1983 GENERAL PLAN</th>
<th>LOCATION IN UPDATED GENERAL PLAN</th>
<th>COMMENTS</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>6.1 Industrial Acreage - The County will plan for the reservation of sufficient industrial property to satisfy future demands for orderly growth and economic development of the County. Policy AgLU-37: The properties known as the &quot;Hess Vineyard&quot; shall remain in agricultural zoning but shall be reserved for industrial uses to meet the county's long-term need for industrial space. Prior to rezoning these lands for non-agricultural uses, the County shall make a specific finding that no other suitable industrial land is available in the unincorporated area. The 230-acre Hess Vineyard site is located on the east side of Highway 29, north of the city of American Canyon and diagonally across from Greenstand Industrial Park. The site is designated on the Land Use map for industrial uses, but is currently (2006) zoned agricultural and is in use as a vineyard. This language is not specifically included in the Updated General Plan, the goal or policy may be redrafted in different terms, the action noted may have been completed since the last General Plan Update, or the goal or policy may no longer be needed. See Draft General Plan page 35 and 43</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6.2 Industrial Development - The County will study the economic feasibility of enhancing the industrial potential of the Napa County Airport through means that are within Napa County's capability and desires. The precise type and extent of effort will be detailed in a specific plan for the area.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6.3 Industrial Location - The County will direct non-agricultural-oriented industry away from productive agricultural lands toward areas more suitable for industrial purposes as shown in Figure 14. The same location and design considerations applied to wineries will apply to all other food processing businesses or Industrial uses located in the agricultural areas. Policy AgLU-13: The same location, design, and other considerations applied to wineries will apply to all other food processing businesses or Industrial uses located in the agricultural areas. Policy AgLU-37: The properties known as the &quot;Hess Vineyard&quot; shall remain in agricultural zoning but shall be reserved for industrial uses to meet the county's long-term need for industrial space. Prior to rezoning these lands for non-agricultural uses, the County shall make a specific finding that no other suitable industrial land is available in the unincorporated area. The 230-acre Hess Vineyard site is located on the east side of Highway 29, north of the city of American Canyon and diagonally across from Greenstand Industrial Park. The site is designated on the Land Use map for industrial uses, but is currently (2006) zoned agricultural and is in use as a vineyard.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Guide to Abbreviations
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3.0 COMMENTS AND RESPONSES TO COMMENTS

NAPA COUNTY GENERAL PLAN POLICY LOCATION MATRIX

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>LOCATION/ITEM IN 1983 GENERAL PLAN</th>
<th>LOCATION IN UPDATED GENERAL PLAN</th>
<th>COMMENTS</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>6.4 Jobs/Housing Balance - County review of industrial development in unincorporated, particularly rural, areas; will update the balance of job creation and the availability of affordable housing.</td>
<td>Policy Ag/LU-29: County review of non-residential development and, where feasible, update the balance of job creation and the availability of affordable housing.</td>
<td>See Draft General Plan page 142.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6.5 Phased Development - In order to promote efficiencies of development the County will plan for staged development of water and sewer services, in order to remove some of the impediments to leapfrogging industrialization the County will develop plans and policies that would address needs peculiar to the area.</td>
<td>Generally addressed in Policy Ag/LU-119, the Growth Management System for Napa County Draft General Plan page 94. Note: Due to the length of Policy Ag/LU-119, it is included separately at the end of this matrix.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6.6 Pollution Hazard - The County will work with the Environmental Protection Agency, Bay Area Air Pollution Control District, Regional Water Quality Control Board, Division of Mines and Geology, and other environment-oriented public agencies to assure the maintenance of a high level of environmental quality and protection.</td>
<td>Addressed by various policies in the Conservation Element</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6.7 Services - The County will plan to locate industrial areas adjacent to major transportation facilities. Necessary utilities and services including water will be planned to meet the needs of the industrially zoned areas.</td>
<td>Policy Ag/LU-36: The County will plan for the reservation of sufficient industrial property to satisfy future demands for orderly growth and economic development of the County. Non-agriculture oriented industry shall not be located on productive agricultural lands, but should be located in areas more suitable for industrial purposes. Industrial areas should be located adjacent to major transportation facilities.</td>
<td>Draft Policy Ag/LU-36 incorporates elements of current Land Use Policies 4.1, 6.3, and 6.7. See Draft General Plan page 43. See also Policy Ag/LU-37, shown earlier in this table.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Guide to Abbreviations
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NAPA COUNTY GENERAL PLAN POLICY LOCATION MATRIX

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>LOCATION/ITEM IN 1983 GENERAL PLAN</th>
<th>LOCATION IN UPDATED GENERAL PLAN</th>
<th>COMMENTS</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>6.8 Specific Plan - The County will place a priority on the preparation, review and approval of a Specific Plan and Master Plan for the development of the Napa County Airport Industrial Area.</td>
<td>This language is not specifically included in the Updated General Plan. The goal or policy may be added in different terms, the action noted may have been completed since the last General Plan Update, or the goal or policy may no longer be needed.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

7. Rural Urban Limit (RUL) Use

| 7.1 Unincorporated land located within the Rural Urban Limit (RUL) established by the 1983 General Plan will not be further urbanized without annexation to the City except as otherwise provided herein. For purposes of this policy only, engaging in uses that are permitted in the applicable zoning district without the issuance of a use permit shall not be considered urbanizing. In all cases, subdividing property shall be deemed urbanizing for purposes of this policy. | Policy Ag/LU-127: The County recognizes the urban limit line or Rural Urban Limit (RUL) established for the City of Napa (see Figure U-2), and agrees that unincorporated land located within the RUL will not be further urbanized without annexation to the City except as otherwise provided herein. For purposes of this policy only, engaging in uses that are permitted in the applicable zoning district without the issuance of a use permit shall not be considered urbanizing. In all cases, subdividing property shall be deemed urbanizing for purposes of this policy. | See Draft General Plan page 108 |
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### 3.0 Comments and Responses to Comments

#### Napa County General Plan Policy Location Matrix

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Location/Item in 1983 General Plan</th>
<th>Location/Update General Plan</th>
<th>Comments</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

#### 3.0.1 Comments and Responses to Comments

**3.0.2** Subdivisions, if permitted, shall meet applicable County standards. This exception shall not be applicable if the annexation application was filed and denied due to a lack of reasonable effort on the part of the property owner (hereafter "applicant") to complete the annexation, the applicant opposes the annexation, or if the applicant fails to comply with all conditions of approval of the annexation. A lack of reasonable effort for purposes of this policy shall include, but not be limited to, the failure to include in an annexation request all contiguous parcels under the applicant's ownership that would reasonably be expected to be included in an annexation application.

This language is not specifically included in the Updated General Plan. The goal or policy may be addressed in different forms, but the action noted may have been completed since the last General Plan update, or the goal or policy may no longer be needed.

**3.0.3** Properly that would otherwise be subject to policy 7.2, but which is not contiguous to the City of Napa and therefore not annexable, may be developed in the County without first filing an annexation proceeding, provided that the applicant has notified the City before 30 days prior to the application being filed and the City has failed to initiate proceedings to annex sufficient parcels to enable the annexation of the applicant's parcel to be considered. If the City has initiated annexation proceedings within 30 days of the date the annexation proceeding is filed, this section shall continue to be applicable.

This language is not specifically included in the Updated General Plan. The goal or policy may be addressed in different forms, the action noted may have been completed since the last General Plan update, or the goal or policy may no longer be needed.

**3.0.4** Policy 7.3 through 7.4 shall not apply to parcels subject to a residential general plan or zoning designation.

This language is not specifically included in the Updated General Plan.

---

**Guide to Abbreviations**

- AgLU: Agricultural Preservation and Land Use Element
- CCR: Circulation Element
- CC: Community Character Element
- CED: Conservation Element
- EDE: Economic Development Element
- EES: Environmental and Open Space Element
- SAF: Safety Element
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**Napa County General Plan Policy Location Matrix**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Location/Item in 1983 General Plan</th>
<th>Location/Update General Plan</th>
<th>Comments</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

#### 8. Public/Guest Public Lands

**8.1** Governmental uses, public uses, and public utility uses shall be permitted in appropriate locations.

Policy AgLU/27: Governmental uses and public utility uses shall be permitted in appropriate locations. Only those new governmental and public utility uses which specifically implement programs mandated by the state or federal government shall be permitted in non-urban areas. If parcels which are designated "Agricultural Resource" or "Agri-Agricultural Resource," "Agriculture, Watershed and Open Space" on the Napa County Land Use Map, governmental uses and public utility uses existing as of 1983 shall be allowed to continue to operate and to use the existing buildings and/or facilities but shall be allowed to expand in size and volume of business only for the purpose of modernizing the facilities and meeting additional demonstrated public needs.

Draft Policy AgLU/27 incorporates elements of current Land Use Policies 8.1, 8.2, and 8.3.

See Draft General Plan page 40

---

**8.2** Only those new facilities for uses specified in Policy 8.1 which specifically implement programs mandated by the state or federal government shall be permitted in non-urban areas.

See Policy AgLU/27 listed previously in this matrix.

See Draft General Plan page 40

---

**8.3** On parcels which are designated "Agricultural Resource" or "Agri-Agricultural Resource," "Agriculture, Watershed and Open Space" on the Napa County Land Use Map, existing uses of the type specified in Policy 8.1 shall be allowed to continue to operate and to use the existing buildings and/or facilities but shall be allowed to expand in size and volume of business only for the purpose of modernizing the facilities and meeting additional demonstrated public needs.

See Policy AgLU/27 listed previously in this matrix.

See Draft General Plan page 40

---

**Guide to Abbreviations**

- AgLU: Agricultural Preservation and Land Use Element
- CCR: Circulation Element
- CC: Community Character Element
- CED: Conservation Element
- EDE: Economic Development Element
- EES: Environmental and Open Space Element
- SAF: Safety Element
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### 3.0 Comments and Responses to Comments

#### County of Napa General Plan Policy Location Matrix

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>LOCATION/ITEM IN 1983 GENERAL PLAN</th>
<th>LOCATION IN UPDATED GENERAL PLAN</th>
<th>COMMENTS</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>and meeting additional demonstrated public needs.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Housing Element</td>
<td></td>
<td>The Housing Element is not part of this General Plan Update; no changes are proposed to Housing Element goals or policies.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Schools Element</td>
<td></td>
<td>The primary goal of Napa County should be to work with the school districts serving Napa County to coordinate the provision of school facilities with new residential development.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Goals</td>
<td></td>
<td>Policy Ag/Lu-123: Consider school district's proposed school site location criteria such as: a) General Plan designations; b) Geology and seismic considerations; topography; drainage; soil; c) Location and general utility of land; population distribution; d) Access, transportation facilities, utilities; e) Compacting in hazardous conditions (e.g., noise, traffic); f) Protection of agricultural lands. The results of the review are to be forwarded to the appropriate school district board within 30 days from the receipt of the referral.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Focus</td>
<td></td>
<td>Policy Ag/Lu-122: Coordinate an exchange of information with school districts regarding school needs and new residential development in the unincorporated area.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1. Coordinate an exchange of information with school districts regarding school needs and new residential developments.</td>
<td></td>
<td>Draft Policy Ag/Lu-121 is derived from a non-numbered Policy from the current Schools Element.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Consider school district's proposed school sites in relation to a) General Plan designations; b) Geology and seismic considerations; topography; drainage; soil; c) Location and general utility of land; population distribution; d) Access, transportation facilities, utilities.</td>
<td></td>
<td>See Draft General Plan page 156</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

#### Guide to Abbreviations

- Ag/Lu—Agriculture Preservation and Land Use Element
- CC—Community Character Element
- E—Economic Development Element
- SAF—Safety Element
- CR—Circulation Element
- CON—Conservation Element
- ROS—Recreation and Open Space Element
- References to "current" are to the 1983 General Plan

---

**Location/Item in 1983 General Plan**

- e) Conflicting or hazardous conditions (e.g., noise, traffic)
- f) Protection of agricultural lands

**Location in Updated General Plan**

- e) Conflicting or hazardous conditions (e.g., noise, traffic)
- f) Protection of agricultural lands

**Comments**

- The results of the review are to be forwarded to the appropriate school district board within 30 days from the receipt of the referral.

**Objective:**

- To develop a comprehensive circulation system coordinated with planned land uses as shown in the Land Use Element of the General Plan.

**Circulation Goal 1:**

The County's transportation system shall be coordinated with the policies of the Agricultural Preservation & Land Use Element and protective of the County's rural character.
### 3.0 Comments and Responses to Comments

#### Napa County General Plan Policy Location Matrix

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Location/Use in 1983 General Plan</th>
<th>Location in Updated General Plan</th>
<th>Comments</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>3.0-1434 Policy Outline</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

#### 1a. Mixed Land Use Development Provisions (i.e. residential and commercial) should be encouraged in urban areas to minimize trip generation requirements.

Policy CIR-1.1: Consistent with urban-centered growth policies in the Agricultural Preservation and Land Use Element, new residential and commercial development should be concentrated in already-developed areas and areas planned for development where sufficient densities can support transit services and development of pedestrian and bicycle facilities. See Draft General Plan page 125.

#### 1b. The County should require that transit-oriented commercial services (i.e. gas stations, restaurants and lodging facilities) along traffic arterials should be planned to avoid strip commercial development. In conjunction with the land use element, all associated transportation facilities should be planned in conjunction with the land use element.

This language is not specifically included in the Updated General Plan. The goal or policy may be addressed in different terms, the action noted may have been completed since the last General Plan Update, or the goal or policy may no longer be needed.

#### 1c. Create and enforce highway access standards regarding new driveways, including functional layout, location and spacing, so as to minimize interference of major traffic flows by minor driveways. As discussed in Chapter 2, the County could specify that this issue be addressed by developers and property owners, as a part of the normal permit and approval and environmental impact process.

Action Item CIR-2.1.1 The County shall adopt and maintain specific road and street standards. These standards shall include overall right of way widths, pavement widths, lane and shoulder widths and other design details. See Draft General Plan page 186.

#### 1d. The Transportation system should minimize disruption to residential neighborhoods and communities.

Policy CIR-1.4: The County’s roadway improvements should minimize disruption to residential neighborhoods, communities, and agriculture. See Draft General Plan page 125.

#### 1e. The County should follow a land use pattern with concentrated urban areas to facilitate effective public transit services.

Policy CIR-1.1: Consistent with urban-centered growth policies in the Agricultural Preservation and Land Use Element, new residential and commercial development should be concentrated within already-developed areas. See Draft General Plan page 125.

Guide to Abbreviations

- AGU—Agricultural Preservation and Land Use Element
- CIR—Conservation Element
- CC—Community Character Element
- E—Economic Development Element
- SAT—Safety Element

---

### 2. State Highway Routes and County Roads

#### Planning Goal 2

Improve the county roadway system, including State Highway Routes, County roads and local streets (under County jurisdiction), to provide satisfactory levels of service, safety, and convenience in person and goods movement, with respect to the Land Use Element, the Napa County General Plan. Such improvements should optimize the usefulness of the existing transportation system and be implemented in the most effective manner with respect to maintenance of environmental quality in Napa County.

Circulation Goal 1: The County's transportation system shall be correlated with the policies of the Agricultural Preservation, Land Use Element and provisions of the County’s rural character.

Circulation Goal 2: The County’s transportation system shall provide for safe and efficient movement on well-maintained roads throughout the County, meeting the needs of Napa County residents, businesses, employees, visitors, special needs populations, and the elderly.

See Draft General Plan page 125 and 126.

Guide to Abbreviations

- AGU—Agricultural Preservation and Land Use Element
- CIR—Conservation Element
- CC—Community Character Element
- E—Economic Development Element
- SAT—Safety Element

---
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3.0 COMMENTS AND RESPONSES TO COMMENTS

NAPA COUNTY GENERAL PLAN POLICY LOCATION MATRIX

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>LOCATION (NEW 1983 GENERAL PLAN)</th>
<th>LOCATION IN UPDATED GENERAL PLAN</th>
<th>COMMENTS</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>3.0-1435</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Policy Guidelines

2a. Continue or commence planning and engineering activities to improve levels of service on the following critical links in the Highway system. As levels of service increase, exposure to unsafe traffic conditions would decrease. Therefore making the highway system safer for all concerned.

2a(1) S.R. 29, Yountville to St. Helena (with added left turn lanes). This improvement would increase peak hour capacity by about 5 to 10 percent, reduce year 2000 peak hour LOS from "F" to "C", and increase average speed. 2a(2) S.R. 29, from American Canyon Road to S.R. 12 (construct grade separated intersections all S.R. 121/12, S.R. 121, S.R. 12, and American Canyon Road). These improvements would increase the capacity of S.R. 29 slightly (by about 5 to 10 percent), improve access to and egress from S.R. 29, improve average speeds, reduce congestion, and improve year 2000 peak hour LOS, from "D" to "C".

2b(2) American Canyon Road, from hi-way 80 to S.R. 29 (with four lanes). Peak hour capacity would be increased from approximately 100 vph (two-way) to 3,000 vph (peak direction) under the alternative, with a consequent improvement in year 2000 peak hour LOS, from "F" to "C".

2c(3) S.R. 121/12, Sonoma-Napa County Line to S.R. 29 (with four lanes). This would increase peak hour capacity from approximately 1,900 vph (two-way) to 3,200 vph (peak direction), thus improving year 2000 peak hour LOS, from "F" to "C".

2b(3) S.R. 12, Sonoma-Napa County Line to S.R. 29 (with four lanes). Peak hour capacity would be increased to 3,200 vph (peak direction) from 1,900 vph (two-way), thus improving year 2000 peak hour LOS, from "F" to "C".

2b(6) Roseland Road, south of American Canyon Road (extend four lane section to American Canyon Road). Peak hour capacity of this segment would be increased.

Policy CIR-2.3: The County seeks to provide a roadway system that maintains current roadway capacities in most locations, and is both safe and efficient in terms of providing local access. The following list of improvements, illustrated as the County’s ultimate road network in Figure CIR-1., is projected to be achieved by policy makers within the County and all the incorporated cities/towns, and will be implemented over time to the extent that improvements continue to enjoy political support and funding becomes available:

- Widens Yountville Canyon Road (Route 12) by adding one additional vehicular travel lane and room for a class 1 bike lane in each direction that may also allow equestrian use. Construct a safety median barrier in the centerline, straighten curve curves, lower the grade where possible, install turn lanes for safety and to allow for parcel access as appropriate, and install a Multi Trail crossing for pedestrians, equestrians and bicycle use.
- Construct an interchange at the intersection of State Route 12, Airport Boulevard and State Route 29 within the most efficient footprint, including any necessary appurtenant facilities.
- Extend Roseland/Highway Road from American Canyon Road to Green Island Road as a reliever route to traffic on Hwy 29.
- Complete Devlin Road between Sacot Ferry Road and American Canyon Road as a reliever route to Highway 29.
- Widens Hwy 29 between 221 and Green Island Road.
- Synchronize traffic signals on Hwy 29 between 221 and the Solano County line.
- Improve the intersection of State Route 221/ State Route 12/Hwy 29 to increase capacity and safety.
- North of Hwy 29.

See Draft General Plan page 129

Guide to Abbreviations

Agri—Agricultural Preservation and Land Use Element
CC—Community Character Element
ED—Economic Development Element
SAF—Safety Element
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NAPA COUNTY GENERAL PLAN POLICY LOCATION MATRIX

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>LOCATION (NEW 1983 GENERAL PLAN)</th>
<th>LOCATION IN UPDATED GENERAL PLAN</th>
<th>COMMENTS</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>from 1,900 vph (two-way) to 3,200 vph (peak direction) with associated year 2000 peak hour LOS improvement from &quot;F&quot; to &quot;C&quot;.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

- Intersection improvements to improve safety and traffic flow on intersections of State Route 29 and the Usharted Cross Road, Yountville Cross Roads and Corridor lead.
- Construct safety and flow improvements to S.R. 29 between Oakville and St. Helena.
- Study methods to divert traffic from downtown St. Helena to reduce congestion and improve intra-county traffic flow.
- Countywide
  - Install safety improvements on rural roads and highways throughout the county including but not limited to new signals, roundabouts, wildlife barriers, shoulders widening, softening sharp curves, etc.

Action Item: CIR-2.2.1. Work with the Napa County Transportation Planning Agency and other agencies to fund and implement the improvements identified.

See Policy CIR-2.3 listed previously in this matrix.

See Draft General Plan page 129

Guide to Abbreviations

Agri—Agricultural Preservation and Land Use Element
CC—Community Character Element
ED—Economic Development Element
SAF—Safety Element
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3.0-1435
### 3.0 Comments and Responses to Comments

#### Napa County General Plan Policy Location Matrix

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Location/Item in 1983 General Plan</th>
<th>Location in Updated General Plan</th>
<th>Comments</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2a. Continue efforts to improve Silverado Trail between Franciscan Street and S.R. 29 in Calistoga as a two lane arterial, consistent with applicable design standards for a two lane Highway with a design speed of 45 miles per hour. The 45 miles per hour design speed is a County Transportation Planning Guideline. It should be considered a minimum to affect the desired safety benefits. In conjunction with these improvements, attention is directed to银 operations, such as separate left turn lanes where justified by projected or observed traffic generation at existing or new activity centers along Silverado Trail.</td>
<td>See Policy CIR-23, listed previously in this matrix. See Draft General Plan page 152.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
| 2b. Control the location, functional design, and spacing (relative to other roadways) of new roadways for new and expanding developments along S.R. 29 (Huronville to Calistoga) and Silverado Trail (north to Franciscan Street) to optimize roadway capacity and minimize the interference caused by side vehicle and pedestrian traffic. As discussed in Chapter 2, as the level of the "commercial" development increases, along with its associated traffic, (mostly unsynchronized intersections), roadway capacity decreases. Therefore, the approval of new or expanded developments should continue to be contingent upon a proper analysis of potential impacts relating to the development, especially with respect to driveway location and spacing with respect to other roadways and crossing roadways. Said controls and assessments should not be limited only to S.R. 29 and Silverado Trail, but should be applicable to other local arterial roadways. It would be appropriate to implement such controls in concert with Policy Guidelines 2a and 2b, and with the Goals and Policies of the Land Use Element. | Policy AgUI-106. The following conditions shall be applied as appropriate to future development to improve the flow of traffic on Hwy 29:  
- Construction of additional lanes  
- Construction of frontage roads  
-贡献 on a fair-share basis towards construction of a new continuous center turn lane | See also Policy CIR-23, listed previously in this matrix. See Draft General Plan page 152. |
| 2c. Implement a program of highway signage to direct drivers using the Silverado Trail to reach certain destinations, to remove traffic from the sensitive sections of S.R. 29. | Policy RDS-30. A clear, attractive and comprehensive road signage system, together with other forms of public information, should be designed, installed and distributed to facilitate the public's use and enjoyment of parks and historical, archaeological and cultural resources. | See Draft General Plan page 241. |

#### Guide to Abbreviations

- AgUl—Agricultural Preservation and Land Use Element
- CC—Community Character Element
- ED—Economic Development Element
- SAF—Safety Element
- CIR—Circulation Element
- CON—Conservation Element
- RDS—Recreation and Open Space Element
- Reference is "Current" use to the 1983 General Plan

---
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**Napa County General Plan Policy Location Matrix**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Location/Item in 1983 General Plan</th>
<th>Location in Updated General Plan</th>
<th>Comments</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>3a. In lieu of the projected increase in the use of existing County Highways, continue to perform periodic inspections, preventive maintenance, safety, and related activities, to the fullest extent possible with available and projected financial resources. For example: current projects include Petaluma Forest Road and Silverado Trail. To partially alleviate congestion and improve safety, the section of S.R. 29 north of Calistoga should be included in the DPW's current safety improvements projects.</td>
<td>See Policy CIR-23, listed previously in this matrix. See Draft General Plan page 152.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

#### 3. Transit and Pedestrian Services

**Planning Goal 3**

**To encourage and support the development of local and regional transit services that effectively meet the needs of all segments of the population.**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Policy Guidelines</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>3a. All public owned transit vehicles should be fully accessible and responsive to the needs of the elderly and handicapped population.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

This language is not specifically included in the Updated General Plan. The goal or policy may be addressed in different terms, the action noted may have been completed since the last General Plan Update, or the goal or policy may no longer be needed.

**Goal of Transportation**

**To provide transportation services that are effective in serving the needs of all segments of the population.**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Policy Guidelines</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>3b. Opportunities for coordinating the delivery of paratransit services should be maximized.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

This language is not specifically included in the Updated General Plan. The goal or policy may be addressed in different terms, the action noted may have
3.0 COMMENTS AND RESPONSES TO COMMENTS

NAPA COUNTY GENERAL PLAN POLICY LOCATION MATRIX.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>LOCATION/TIM IN 1985 GENERAL PLAN</th>
<th>LOCATION/UPD.GEN PLN</th>
<th>COMMENTS</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>3a. The County should support efforts to coordinate the schedule between the fixed route transit system in Napa and Greyhound bus lines, to improve intra County and inter County transit services.</td>
<td></td>
<td>been completed since the last General Plan Update, or the goal or policy may no longer be needed.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3b. Expand the service coverage area for paratransit services operating in Napa County.</td>
<td></td>
<td>This language is not specifically included in the Updated General Plan, The goal or policy may be addressed in different terms, the action noted may have been completed since the last General Plan Update, or the goal or policy may no longer be needed.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3c. Efforts should be made to link local transit services with transit systems in adjacent counties, to meet regional travel needs.</td>
<td></td>
<td>This language is not specifically included in the Updated General Plan, The goal or policy may be addressed in different terms, the action noted may have been completed since the last General Plan Update, or the goal or policy may no longer be needed.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Guide to Abbreviations

Ag—Agricultural Preservation and Land Use Element
CC—Community Character Element
ED—Economic Development Element
SAF—Safety Element

CIR—Circulation Element
CON—Conservation Element
ROS—Recreation and Open Space Element
References to "current" use to the 1985 General Plan

DRAFT—Subject to Revision
Page 33 of 130
April 2, 2007

NAPA COUNTY GENERAL PLAN POLICY LOCATION MATRIX.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>LOCATION/TIM IN 1985 GENERAL PLAN</th>
<th>LOCATION/UPD.GEN PLN</th>
<th>COMMENTS</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>3. The County and Cities should work cooperatively with interested wineries, local merchants and other private sector interests in evaluating opportunities for providing transit services to major recreational areas.</td>
<td></td>
<td>See Draft General Plan page 133</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3b. To encourage rail and other forms of travel, the County and Cities should encourage developers to participate in transit improvements. Such improvements could provide justification for reducing the number of parking spaces provided for commercial and recreational/visitor oriented development projects.</td>
<td></td>
<td>See Draft General Plan page 131 and 133</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>152-175P</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>152-176P</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

4. Air Transportation

Planning Goal 4

To maintain the Napa County Airport as a general aviation facility. | | See Draft General Plan page 133 |
| Policy CIR 3.11: Maintain Napa County Airport as a general aviation facility and avoid land use conflicts via land use compatibility planning and by ensuring appropriate reviews of land use decisions by the Airport Land Use Commission. | | |

Policy Guidelines

Guidance to Abbreviations

Ag—Agricultural Preservation and Land Use Element
CC—Community Character Element
ED—Economic Development Element
SAF—Safety Element

CIR—Circulation Element
CON—Conservation Element
ROS—Recreation and Open Space Element
References to "current" use to the 1985 General Plan
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## 3.0 Comments and Responses to Comments

### Napa County General Plan Policy Location Matrix

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Location/Row in 1983 General Plan</th>
<th>Location/Row in Updated General Plan</th>
<th>Comment</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>4A. Additional aircraft storage facilities should be provided to accommodate the expected increase in aircraft movement.</td>
<td>CIR—Circulation Element</td>
<td>This language is not specifically included in the Updated General Plan. The goal or policy may be addressed in different terms, the action noted may have been completed since the last General Plan Update, or the goal or policy may no longer be needed.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4B. The surrounding land uses should be consistent with airport activity and consistent with Policy 1.1 (Airport Approach Zones of the Land Use Element of the General Plan).</td>
<td>CIR—Circulation Element</td>
<td>This language is not specifically included in the Updated General Plan. The goal or policy may be addressed in different terms, the action noted may have been completed since the last General Plan Update, or the goal or policy may no longer be needed.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4C. The County should implement approved recommendations from the Master Plan for Napa County Airport.</td>
<td>Circulation Goal</td>
<td>For maximum safety, all land uses within airport areas shall be reviewed for compatibility with the adopted plans for the Napa Airport and other general aviation facilities in the county.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### 5. Rail Service

**Planning Goal 5**

Guide to Abbreviations

- **AgE—Agricultural Preservation and Land Use Element**
- **CC—Community Character Element**
- **ED—Economic Development Element**
- **SAF—Safety Element**

**Draft—Subject to Revision**
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Napa County General Plan Policy Location Matrix

To encourage the use of the existing rail in Napa County for the transport of goods and products. Policy Guidelines

- 5a. The County should support all efforts to maintain and upgrade freight rail in Napa County. Policy CIR-3.1: Preserve rail corridor and the Napa River as regional transportation assets, encouraging and not precluding future use for recreational travel as well as the movement of passengers and goods. See Draft General Plan page 132

- 5b. All rail lines and rights-of-way should be reserved for future transportation needs. See Policy CIR-3.1 listed previously in this matrix. See Draft General Plan page 132

- 5c. To maximize opportunities for rail freight services, industrial development which could be served by rail should be concentrated in American Canyon Area on sites accessible to the railroad. This language is not specifically included in the Updated General Plan. The goal or policy may be addressed in different terms, the action noted may have been completed since the last General Plan Update, or the goal or policy may no longer be needed. See Draft General Plan page 133

- 5d. The County should monitor the availability of railroad lines. Abandoned rights-of-ways should be considered for use as pedestrian and bicycle paths. Policy CIR-3.5: Where they are not needed for other transportation purposes, abandoned right of ways should be used for alternative uses such as public transport routes, bicycle paths, or pedestrian trails. See Draft General Plan page 133

### Guide to Abbreviations

- **AgE—Agricultural Preservation and Land Use Element**
- **CIR—Circulation Element**
- **CC—Community Character Element**
- **ED—Economic Development Element**
- **SAF—Safety Element**
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### NAPA COUNTY GENERAL PLAN POLICY LOCATION MATRIX

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>LOCATION/FRAME IN 1983 GENERAL PLAN</th>
<th>LOCATION IN UPDATED GENERAL PLAN</th>
<th>COMMENTS</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>To support and encourage the use of the Napa River for the transport of industrial goods and products.</td>
<td>See Circulation Goal 3 and Policy CIR-3.1 listed previously in this matrix. See Draft General Plan page 122.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Policy Guidelines</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6a. The County should support projects to improve clearance and water depths in the navigable reaches of the Napa River.</td>
<td>See Policy CIR-3.1 listed previously in this matrix. See Draft General Plan page 122.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6b. The County should investigate new opportunities for travel on Napa River for recreational purposes and for the movement of goods.</td>
<td>See Circulation Goal 3 and Policy CIR-3.1 listed previously in this matrix. See Draft General Plan page 122.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7. Nonmotorized transportation</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Planning Goal: 7</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>To develop an integrated system of hiking paths and bicycle lanes where it is safe and financially feasible.</td>
<td>Policy CIR-3.2 Increase the attractiveness and use of energy-efficient forms of transportation such as public transit, walking, and bicycling. Objective CIR-3.1 Increase the number of miles of onstreet bicycle lanes and routes by X miles through 2020. See Draft General Plan page 132.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Policy Guidelines</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7a. Hiking paths and bicycle lanes should be developed to meet both transportation and recreation needs. They should provide access to residential, employment,</td>
<td>Policy RCS-12: By 2030, increase the number and length of nonmotorized, off-street trails available for walkers, joggers, bicyclists and equestrians. See Draft General Plan page 152-180P 152-181P.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Guide to Abbreviations</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AgUL--Agricultural Preservation and Land Use Element</td>
<td>CIR--Circulation Element</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CC--Community Character Element</td>
<td>CON--Conservation Element</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EED--Economic Development Element</td>
<td>KOS--Recreation and Open Space Element</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SAF--Safety Element</td>
<td>References to &quot;current&quot; are to the 1983 General Plan</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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### 3.0 Comments and Responses to Comments

#### Napa County General Plan Policy Location Matrix

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>LOCATION/ITEM IN 1983 GENERAL PLAN</th>
<th>LOCATION IN UPDATED GENERAL PLAN</th>
<th>COMMENT</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>7. A bicycle safety program for use in local schools and law enforcement agencies should be developed through a joint participation program including the County, Cities, and Unified School District.</td>
<td></td>
<td>addressed in different terms, the action noted may have been completed since the last General Plan Update, or the goal or policy may no longer be needed.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7g. The County and Cities should continue providing bicycle storage and locking facilities near public buildings, parks, and schools. Development should be encouraged to provide such facilities in shopping and commercial areas. Bicycle parking should be provided free of charge. Funding sources such as bicycle license fees and meter revenues should be considered.</td>
<td></td>
<td>this language is not specifically included in the Updated General Plan, the goal or policy may be addressed in different terms, the action noted may have been completed since the last General Plan Update, or the goal or policy may no longer be needed.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7h. Pedestrian and bicycle access should be integrated into all parking lots and considered in the formulation of development proposals and public projects.</td>
<td></td>
<td>See Draft General Plan page 132</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LIGU—Agricultural Preservation and Land Use Element</td>
<td>CIR-Circulation Element</td>
<td>References to “current” are to the 1983 General Plan</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CC—Community Character Element</td>
<td>CON—Conservation Element</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EDE—Economic Development Element</td>
<td>ROS—Recreation and Open Space Element</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SAF—Safety Element</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Guide to Abbreviations**

Napa County General Plan Update

Final Environmental Impact Report

County of Napa

December 2007

Page 40 of 130

April 2, 2007

3.0-1440
### 3.0 Comments and Responses to Comments

#### Napa County General Plan Policy Location Matrix

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Location in 1985 General Plan</th>
<th>Location in Updated General Plan</th>
<th>Comments</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Policy CC-12:** The County opposes the construction of any new billboards, and supports the removal of existing billboards. See Draft General Plan page 154.

**5. Opportunities should be explored for joint public/private participation in developing locations for roadside rest, picnic areas and vista points.**

- See Policy CC-11 listed previously in this matrix. See Draft General Plan page 9153

**6. Access and commercial development along scenic highways should be limited to prevent strip commercial development.**

- This language is not specifically included in the updated General Plan. The goal or policy may be addressed in different terms, the action noted may have been completed since the last General Plan Update, or the goal or policy may no longer be needed. See Draft General Plan page 154

**7. On scenic corridors, utilities should be placed underground, where possible, and utility poles, located outside the right-of-way should be camouflaged with the planting of trees and shrubbery.**

- See Policy CC-14 listed previously in this matrix. See Draft General Plan page 153

**8. Environmental assessment should evaluate if a scenic corridor or wilderness would be impacted and if warranted, mitigations should be developed.**

- Policy CC-29: Consistent with the County's Viewshed Protection Program, new developments in hillside areas should be designed to minimize their visibility from the County's scenic roadways and discourage new encroachments on natural ridgelines. See Draft General Plan page 153

**Guide to Abbreviations**

- AgLU—Agricultural Preservation and Land Use Element
- CCR—Conservation Element
- CD—Community Character Element
- ELD—Economic Development Element
- ISP—Open Space Plan
- SAF—Safety Element

**Conservation and Open Space Element**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Preservation of Natural Resources</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Wildlife and Fishery Habitat Areas</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Planning Goal</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>To conserve and improve wildlife and fishery habitat in cooperation with governmental agencies, private associations and individuals in Napa County.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Conservation Policy**

- (a) All Fishery and Wildlife Habitats:

1. Residential, commercial, industrial, recreational, agricultural projects including wineries but not including redevelopment of existing vineyard projects, and water development projects should include management plans for fishery and wildlife and, including provisions for:
   - a) Employ supplemental planting and maintenance of grasses, shrubs and trees of similar quality and quantity to provide adequate vegetation cover to keep the watersheds, especially stream side, in good condition and to provide shelter and food for wildlife.
   - b) Provide protection for wildlife habitat.
   - c) Provide replacement habitat of like quantity and quality utilizing native or adapted species.
   - d) Enhance existing habitat values through restoration and replanting as part of discretionary project review and approval.

**Policy CC-11:** Residential, commercial, industrial, recreational, agricultural projects including wineries but not including redevelopment of existing vineyard projects, and water development projects shall avoid impacts to fisheries and wildlife habitat to the maximum extent feasible. Where impacts cannot be avoided, projects shall include effective management plans including provisions to:

- a) Maintain the following essentials for fish and wildlife resources:
  - Sufficient dissolved oxygen in the water.
  - Adequate amounts of proper food.
  - Adequate amounts of feeding, escape and nesting habitat.
  - Proper temperature through maintenance and enhancement of streamside vegetation, volume of flow, and velocity of water.

- b) Employ supplemental planting and maintenance of grasses, shrubs and trees of similar quality and quantity

**Guide to Abbreviations**

- AgLU—Agricultural Preservation and Land Use Element
- CCR—Conservation Element
- CD—Community Character Element
- ELD—Economic Development Element
- ISP—Open Space Plan
- SAF—Safety Element
## 3.0 Comments and Responses to Comments

### Napa County General Plan Policy Location Matrix

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Location in 1983 General Plan</th>
<th>Location in Updated General Plan</th>
<th>Comments</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>3.0</td>
<td>Provide adequate vegetation cover to keep the watersheds, especially stream side areas, in good condition and to provide shelter and food for wildlife.</td>
<td>Provide protection for wildlife habitat through buffering or other means.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Provide replacement habitat of like quantity and quality utilizing native species.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Improve wildlife habitat values through restoration and replanting as part of discretionary permit review and approval.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Provide an adequate release flow of water to preserve fish populations.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

2) Provide the following essentials for fish and wildlife resources:
- Sufficient oxygen in the water.
- Adequate amounts of proper food.
- Adequate amounts of feeding, escape and nesting habitat.
- Proper temperature through maintenance and enhancement of streamside vegetation, chemical content, salt content and velocity of water.

3) Adopt and enforce state woodland protection ordinances and other appropriate ordinances.

Guides to Abbreviations
- AgLiv—Agricultural Preservation and Land Use Element
- CC—Community Character Element
- E—Economic Development Element
- SA—Safety Element

DRAFT—Subject to Revision

---

### Napa County General Plan Policy Location Matrix

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Location in 1983 General Plan</th>
<th>Location in Updated General Plan</th>
<th>Comments</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>4.0</td>
<td>Provide financial and other incentives to encourage voluntary dedication in easement or fee title to the County of Napa or its designee (such as a local non-profit land trust) of significant habitat areas, as appropriate, to ensure long-term protection for fish and wildlife resources.</td>
<td>Policy CONH-4: The County will use financial and other incentives to encourage voluntary dedication in easement or fee title to the County of Napa or its designee (such as a local non-profit land trust) of significant habitat areas, as appropriate, to ensure long-term protection for fish and wildlife resources and agricultural lands and open space.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

5) The County will protect the public interest in drainage systems and water impoundments from sedimentation, pollution, and contamination and ensure that urban, agricultural and resource development projects utilize sound short-term and long-term erosion control and other appropriate watershed protection measures. The County, working in conjunction with the Natural Resource Conservation Service, will establish standards for terracing, contour planting, and maintenance of permanent crops on slopes exceeding five percent as provided by the County’s Conservation Regulations.

Policy CONH-31: The County shall work to improve and maintain the vitality and health of the Napa River. Specifically, the County shall:
- Promote and support the use of recycled water whenever possible, including the use of tertiary treated water, to help preserve and recharge groundwater aquifers.
- Support completion of the federal, state, and local government flood control projects.
- Reduce phosphorus loads through education, monitoring, and phosphorus elimination programs (e.g., watershed education and monitoring programs identified in the Water Quality Improvement Plan and Napa County Resource Conservation District (RCD) Programs, and pollution reduction goals outlined in Napa County’s Phase II National Pollution Discharge Elimination System (NPDES) General Permit from the State Water Board).
- Protect the County’s municipal water supply reservoirs to ensure clean and reliable drinking water consistent with State regulations. Continue implementation of current conservation regulations relevant to these areas, such as vegetation retention requirements, consultation of water purveyor system owners, implementation of erosion controls to minimize water pollution, and prohibition of detrimental recreational uses.
- Use all available sources of assistance to protect and enhance the Napa River to meet or exceed water quality standards.

New Policy from the Napa River Ad Hoc Subcommittee.

Various other policies in the Conservation Element address other aspects of water, drainage, and sediementation.

See Draft General Plan page 200.

---

Napa County General Plan Update
Final Environmental Impact Report
December 2007

County of Napa
### 3.0 Comments and Responses to Comments

#### Napa County General Plan Policy Location Matrix

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Location/Plan in 1983 General Plan</th>
<th>Location/Plan in Updated General Plan</th>
<th>Comments</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Quality standards imposed by State and Federal authorities (e.g., pursuance of and federal funding opportunities to assist in the identification, testing and improvement of individual septic systems, as well as community waste disposal systems, and to support watershed monitoring/sampling and scientific understanding to inform and develop effective and targeted management options in an adaptive and locally driven manner. )</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Support voluntary cooperative efforts in watershed planning to identify and establish habitat enhancement goals on various reaches of the Napa River mainstem and its tributaries, including but not limited to the development of localized watershed management plans, project identification and implementation and monitoring to support adaptive management (e.g., Rice Friendly Farming/Green Certification, Rutherfurd Dust Restoration Team, Resource Conservation District’s Stewardship Program, on/of site habitat protection and mitigation programs, and other active efforts currently planned or now underway).</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Support environmentally sustainable watershed management practices and beneficial management practices that protect surface and groundwater quality and quantity (e.g., cover crop management, integrated pest management IPM, and informed surface water withdrawals based upon informative real-time stream flow monitoring).</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Protect and enhance important headwater watersheds that support larger downstream channels, streams and watersheds.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Action from CON 2011-1:** Amend the Conservation Regulations to offer incentives such as a streamlined approval process to vineyard developments that would either (1) have no significant impacts, or (2) would incorporate erosion control measures, habitat conservation measures, and other environmentally sustainable practices.

**Guide to Abbreviations:**
- AgLU—Agricultural Preservation and Land Use Element
- CC—Community Character Element
- E Economic Development Element
- SAF—Safety Element

**Draft Subject to Revision**

Page 45 of 130

**Napa County General Plan Policy Location Matrix**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Location/Plan in 1983 General Plan</th>
<th>Location/Plan in Updated General Plan</th>
<th>Comments</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>To ensure that no significant impacts would occur.</td>
<td>See various Conservation Policies, beginning on page 171.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>See list of &quot;Protected Plants and Animals in Napa County.&quot;</td>
<td>See Draft General Plan page 193</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Guidance from Conservation Policies:**
- CON 2014: To offset possible losses of fishery and wildlife habitat due to development projects, developers shall be responsible for mitigation. Such mitigation measures may include financial incentives, providing and permanently maintaining similar quality and quantity of replacement habitat, enhancing existing habitat areas or paying in-kind funds to an approved wildlife habitat improvement and acquisition fund. Re-placement habitat may occur either on site or at approved offsite locations, but preference shall be given to on-site replacement.
- CON 2016: All public and private projects shall be required to avoid impacts to wetlands if feasible. If avoidance is not feasible, projects shall achieve no net loss of wetlands, consistent with state and federal regulations.

**Guide to Abbreviations:**
- AgLU—Agricultural Preservation and Land Use Element
- CC—Community Character Element
- E Economic Development Element
- SAF—Safety Element

**Draft Subject to Revision**

Page 46 of 130

April 2, 2007
3.0 COMMENTS AND RESPONSES TO COMMENTS

NAPA COUNTY GENERAL PLAN POLICY LOCATION MATRIX

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Location/Policy in 1983 General Plan</th>
<th>Location in Updated General Plan</th>
<th>Comment</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>(b) Riparian Woodland Habitat:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1) Natural vegetation retention areas along perennial and intermittent streams shall vary in width with steepness of the terrain, the nature of the undercover, and type of soil.</td>
<td>Policy CON-17: Consistent with longstanding practice in Napa County, natural vegetation retention areas along perennial and intermittent streams shall vary in width with steepness of the terrain, the nature of the undercover, and type of soil. The design and management of natural vegetation areas shall consider habitat and water quantity needs, including the needs of native fish and wildlife.</td>
<td>See Draft General Plan page 194</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2) Enforce riparian woodland protection ordinance.</td>
<td></td>
<td>This language is not specifically included in the Updated General Plan. The goal or policy may be addressed in different terms, the action noted may have been completed since the last General Plan update, or the goal or policy may no longer be needed.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(c) Reservoir Habitat: Encourage waterfront in shallow, open shoreline area of reservoirs by planting, when possible, appropriate vegetation for waterfront food.</td>
<td>Policy CON-20: Encourage waterfront in shallow, open shoreline area of reservoirs by planting, when possible, appropriate vegetation for waterfront food.</td>
<td>See Draft General Plan page 194</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(d) Marshland Habitat (See also air quality):</td>
<td></td>
<td>This language is not specifically included in the Updated General Plan. The goal or policy may be addressed in different terms, the action noted may have been completed since the last General Plan update, or the goal or policy may no longer be needed.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1) Return salt extraction ponds to marshlands or other nonurban uses for recreation, fisheries and wildlife habitat at the termination of salt extraction activity.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Guides to Abbreviations

ApU—Agricultural Preservation and Land Use Element
CC—Community Character Element
E—Economic Development Element
SA—Soil Activity Element
CR- Circulation Element
CON—Conservation Element
ROI—Recreation and Open Space Element
References to "current" are to the 1983 General Plan

DRAFT—Subject to Revision

Page 47 of 130

NAPA COUNTY GENERAL PLAN POLICY LOCATION MATRIX

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Location/Policy in 1983 General Plan</th>
<th>Location in Updated General Plan</th>
<th>Comment</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2) Utilize reclaimed wastewater of salinity control and management of marshlands, meadows and salt ponds.</td>
<td>Policy CON-21: Maintain and improve marshland habitat in the southern part of the county through a variety of appropriate measures, including: a) Utilize reclaimed wastewater of salinity control and management of marshlands, meadows and salt ponds. b) Establish County policy for promoting, when possible, wildlife habitat use of marshland areas such as Coon Island, Fly Bay, Delta Slough, the area between Napa Slough and South Slough, Tagon Slough Peninsula (Carson) Napa Plant Site, full Islands, all of the barn areas between the top of the levee and center of the slough and nearby marshland and meadows. c) Encourage environmental study area, viewing platforms, and wildlife preserve at the Carson Napa Plant Restoration Site, Tagon Slough Area. Work with the California Department of Fish and Game to implement this item. d) Discourage the location or construction of structures on land of property because of environmental health problems, potential flood hazard and impacts to wildlife habitat.</td>
<td>See Policy CON-21 listed previously in this matrix. See Draft General Plan page 195</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3) Establish County Policy for promoting, when possible, wildlife habitat use of marshland areas such as Coon Island, Fly Bay, Delta Slough, the area between Napa Slough and South Slough, Tagon Slough Peninsula, full Islands, all of the barn areas between the top of the levee and center of the slough and nearby marshland and meadows.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4) Encourage environmental study area, viewing platforms, wildlife preserve on Bull Island and Tagon Slough Area.</td>
<td></td>
<td>See Policy CON-21 listed previously in this matrix. See Draft General Plan page 195</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5) Discourage the location or construction of structures in wildlife habitat.</td>
<td></td>
<td>See Policy CON-21 listed</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Guides to Abbreviations

ApU—Agricultural Preservation and Land Use Element
CC—Community Character Element
E—Economic Development Element
SA—Soil Activity Element
CR—Circulation Element
CON—Conservation Element
ROI—Recreation and Open Space Element
References to "current" are to the 1983 General Plan
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3.0-1444
### Napa County General Plan Policy Location Matrix

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>LOCATION/TDN IN 1983 GENERAL PLAN</th>
<th>LOCATION IN UPDATED GENERAL PLAN</th>
<th>COMMENTS</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>3.0-1445</td>
<td>previously listed in this matrix. See Draft General Plan page 195</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4) Reduce wash areas and tidal freshwaters to minimum of 40 acres per dwelling unit.</td>
<td>This language is not specifically included in the Updated General Plan. The goal or policy may be addressed in different terms, the action noted may have been completed since the last General Plan Update, or the goal or policy may no longer be needed.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>e) Oak Woodland - Grass and Hardwoods Habitats:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1) Support hardwood cutting criteria that require adequate stands of oak trees for wildlife and slope stabilization, soil protection and soil production be left standing.</td>
<td>Policy CON-22: Maintain and improve oak woodland habitat for wildlife, slope stabilization, soil protection, and slope stabilization. a) Preserve, to the maximum extent feasible, oak trees and other significant vegetation that occur near the head of drainage or depressions on north facing slopes to maintain diversity of vegetation type and habitat. b) Comply with the Oak Woodlands Preserves Act (PCG Section 21083.4) regarding oak woodland preservation to conserve the integrity and diversity of oak woodlands, and within the maximum extent feasible existing oak woodland and chaparral communities and other significant vegetation on or near residential, commercial, and industrial areas. c) Provide appropriate replacement of native species: planting new or adaptive vegetation when retention of existing vegetation is not feasible.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Guide to Abbreviations:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AgUH—Agricultural Preservation and Land Use Element</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CC—Community Character Element</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ED—Economic Development Element</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SAF—Safety Element</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Policy CON-22 listed previously in this matrix. See Draft General Plan page 195</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2) Preserve, to the maximum extent feasible, oak trees and other significant vegetation that occurs near the head of drainagae or depressions on north facing slopes to maintain diversity of vegetation type and wildlife habitat.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3) Maintain the fullest extent possible a mixture of oak species, which is needed to ensure oak production. Black, canyon, live and Brewer oaks as well as blue, white, scrub, and live oaks are common associations.</td>
<td>This language is not specifically included in the Updated General Plan. The goal or policy may be addressed in different terms, the action noted may have been completed since the last General Plan Update, or the goal or policy may no longer be needed.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4) Where possible, encourage preservation of remaining native Valley Oak and Live Oats. Where preservation is not possible, encourage appropriate replacement.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5) Retain to the maximum extent feasible existing oak woodland and chaparral communities and individual Valley Oak, Live Oak and other significant vegetation as part of residential, commercial, industrial and agricultural land division approvals.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6) Provide appropriate replacement native or adaptive vegetation, when retention of existing vegetation is found to be Infeasible.</td>
<td>See Policy CON-22 listed previously in this matrix. See Draft General Plan page 195</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Guide to Abbreviations:
- AgUH—Agricultural Preservation and Land Use Element
- CC—Community Character Element
- ED—Economic Development Element
- SAF—Safety Element
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County of Napa
December 2007

Napa County General Plan Update
Final Environmental Impact Report

3.0-1445
3.0 COMMENTS AND RESPONSES TO COMMENTS

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>LOCATION IN NEW 1983 GENERAL PLAN</th>
<th>LOCATION IN OLD 1983 GENERAL PLAN</th>
<th>COMMENTS</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>3) Coastal Forest and Conifer Habitat:</td>
<td></td>
<td>195</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1) Napa River and Its Tributaries:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>a) Implement sediment reduction measures in sand and gravel operations and other high sediment producing land uses because salinites stimulate oxygen consuming algae in the river.</td>
<td>Policy CON-28: Maintain and Improve fisheries habitat by following a variety of appropriate measures, including the following for specific habitat areas (also see Water policies, below):</td>
<td>See Draft General Plan page 196</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>b) Encourage feasibility study of reclamation of waste water as means of keeping adequate water flow to support fish life and reduce pollution of the river.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>c) Prevent the removal of stream side vegetation to reduce the potential to increase water temperatures and salinization and improve fishery habitat.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>d) Promote good forest management.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>g) Rattlesnake Habitat:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1) Napa River and Its Tributaries:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>a) Implement sediment reduction measures in sand and gravel operations and other high sediment producing land uses because salinites stimulate oxygen consuming algae in the river.</td>
<td>Policy CON-28: Maintain and Improve fisheries habitat by following a variety of appropriate measures, including the following for specific habitat areas (also see Water policies, below):</td>
<td>See Draft General Plan page 196</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>b) Encourage feasibility study of reclamation of waste water as means of keeping adequate water flow to support fish life and reduce pollution of the river.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>c) Prevent the removal of stream side vegetation to reduce the potential to increase water temperatures and salinization and improve fishery habitat.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>d) Promote good forest management.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Guide to Abbreviations

AgriU—Agricultural Preservation and Land Use Element
CC—Community Character Element
ED—Economic Development Element
SA—Safety Element
CON—Conservation Element
ROS—Recreation and Open Space Element
References to "current" use to the 1983 General Plan

Napa County General Plan Update
County of Napa
Final Environmental Impact Report
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3.0 COMMENTS AND RESPONSES TO COMMENTS

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Location/Row in 1983 General Plan</th>
<th>Location in Update General Plan</th>
<th>Comments</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2) Utilize reclaimed wastewater for salinity control of wetlands and ditches where needed.</td>
<td></td>
<td>Support 152-199P</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3) Evaluate proposed marinas and harbors with regard to alternative sites with first priority for wildlife habitat and impact on scarce and/or unique resources.</td>
<td></td>
<td>See Policy CON-25 listed previously in this matrix. See Draft General Plan page 197</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4) Dredging for marina construction and maintenance requires a heavy public subsidy while serving small portion of the total citizenry. Consideration should be given to having their construction and maintenance dredging done by private enterprise rather than public agencies.</td>
<td></td>
<td>See Policy CON-25 listed previously in this matrix. See Draft General Plan page 197</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Areas Required for Ecological and other Scientific Study Purposes</td>
<td>Planning Goal</td>
<td>Policy CON-27: The County encourages the preservation of off-site habitat areas, and habitat connectivity through Draft Policy CON-27 is derived from current.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Encourage preservation and scientific study of prime examples of plentiful features and rare or unique features. (See Policy CON-25 listed previously in this matrix. See Draft General Plan page 197)

Guide to Abbreviations
- AgU—Agricultural Protection and Land Use Element
- CC—Community Character Element
- E—Economic Development Element
- S—Safety Element
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NAPA COUNTY GENERAL PLAN POLICY LOCATION MATRIX

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Location/Row in 1983 General Plan</th>
<th>Location in Update General Plan</th>
<th>Comments</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Conservation Policy</td>
<td></td>
<td>See Policy CON-27 listed previously in this matrix. See Draft General Plan page 198</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1) The destruction of vegetation should be prohibited for commercial purposes or other purposes except by County permit with a subsequent replacement program:</td>
<td>Described as &quot;other methods&quot; in Policy CON-27 listed previously in this matrix. See Draft General Plan page 198</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2) Filling, excavation or material alteration of the landscape should be prohibited:</td>
<td>Described as &quot;other methods&quot; in Policy CON-27 listed previously in this matrix. See Draft General Plan page 198</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3) The obstruction of stream flow by non-road facilities should be regulated by County permit or prohibited:</td>
<td>Described as &quot;other methods&quot; in Policy CON-27 listed previously in this matrix. See Draft General Plan page 198</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4) Installation of urban structures and related facilities</td>
<td></td>
<td>Described as &quot;other methods&quot;</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Guide to Abbreviations
- AgU—Agricultural Protection and Land Use Element
- CIR—Conservation Element
- CC—Community Character Element
- E—Economic Development Element
- S—Safety Element
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December 2007

3.0-1447
## 3.0 Comments and Responses to Comments

### Napa County General Plan Policy Location Matrix

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Location/Line in 1983 General Plan</th>
<th>Location in Updated General Plan</th>
<th>Comments</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>such as residential, commercial and industrial buildings and advertising of any nature, should be prohibited.</td>
<td>In Policy CON-27 listed previously in this matrix.</td>
<td>See Draft General Plan page 198</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5) Mining, excavation, drilling or otherwise exploring for mineral, geothermal, solid, gravel or hydrocarbon resources should be prohibited.</td>
<td>Described as “other methods” in Policy CON-27 listed previously in this matrix.</td>
<td>See Draft General Plan page 198</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6) Prefer specific plans (within the meaning of Sections 65561.2 of the Government Code), establish plan lines or open space easements with limited access rights to enable scientific study of representative samples for plaintiff and geological features, fish and wildlife habitats, historic and archaeological sites and the least disturbed watersheds.</td>
<td>This language is not specifically included in the Updated General Plan. This goal or policy may be addressed in different terms, the action noted may have been completed since the last General Plan Update, or the goal or policy may no longer be needed.</td>
<td>See Policy CON-28 listed previously in this matrix. See Draft General Plan page 198</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6c) Provide protective measures for these sites and critical areas. The location and significance of these features is not fully understood. As they are discovered, they should be identified on an environmental constraints map so that appropriate steps can be taken to protect them, where necessary, to prevent destruction by water pollution, visual distractions, excessive numbers of parasites, etc.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6d) Protect and enhance existing or potential areas for ecological and other scientific purposes such as Los Pasados State Forest, Clear Creek Wildlife Preserve, Napa Marsh area, Cedar Ridge, and Cedar Valley, Milliken Weir, Kimball Carson watershed, Napa College property near Dry Creek Road, Skyline Regional Park and properties.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Guide to Abbreviations**
- AGDLU—Agricultural Preservation and Land Use Element
- CC—Community Character Element
- ECE—Economic Development Element
- SAW—Soil and Water Element
- CON—Conservation Element
- RCS—Recreation and Open Space Element
- Reference to “current” are to the 1983 General Plan

**DRAFT—Subject to Revision**
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### Napa County General Plan Policy Location Matrix

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Location/Line in 1983 General Plan</th>
<th>Location in Updated General Plan</th>
<th>Comments</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>owned by the Nature Conservancy and appropriate federal, state and local government property.</td>
<td>been completed since the last General Plan Update, or the goal or policy may no longer be needed.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(e) Encourage applicants for discretionary permits to place areas containing habitat for special status plant or animal species in conservation easements, with the assumption of conservation easements described in Chapter 4 (Section 816 et seq.) of Part 2 Division 2 of the California Civil Code.</td>
<td>See Policy CON-27 listed previously in this matrix. See Draft General Plan page 198</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Managed Production of Resources</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Natural Resource Lands for Forestry and Woodcutting</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Protect and conserve Napa County’s remaining forests and woodlands; allowing reasonable use of private land.</td>
<td>See Policy CON-16 listed previously in this matrix. See Draft General Plan page 194</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Conservation Policy</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(a) Coastal Forest and Minor Conifer Habitat: Follow Conservation Policy for oak woodland - grass and hardwood habitat and riparian woodland habitat. Encourage active forest management practices including timber harvesting to preserve existing forests.</td>
<td>Policy CON-70: Encourage and support properly owned requests for use of the Timber Preserve (TP) zoning district, as allowed by county code. See Draft General Plan page 214</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(b) Oak Woodland - Grass and Hardwood:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1) Support hardwood-cutting criteria to leave the retention of adequate stands of oak trees for wildlife and follow cutting patterns recommended by the State Department of Fish and Game and other studies.</td>
<td>See Policy CON-22 listed previously in this matrix. See Draft General Plan page 195</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Guide to Abbreviations**
- AGDLU—Agricultural Preservation and Land Use Element
- CC—Community Character Element
- ECE—Economic Development Element
- SAW—Soil and Water Element
- CON—Conservation Element
- RCS—Recreation and Open Space Element
- Reference to “current” are to the 1983 General Plan
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*Napa County General Plan Update*  
*County of Napa Final Environmental Impact Report*  
*December 2007*  

3.0-1448
### 3.0 COMMENTS AND RESPONSES TO COMMENTS

#### NAPA COUNTY GENERAL PLAN POLICY LOCATION MATRIX

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>LOCATION/FNIA IN 1983 GENERAL PLAN</th>
<th>LOCATION IN UPDATED GENERAL PLAN</th>
<th>COMMENTS</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2. Maintain a mixture of oak species when needed to ensure acorn production. Black, canyon, live and Brewer. Oak as well as blue, white, scrub, and live oaks are common associations.</td>
<td>^This language is not specifically included in the updated General Plan. The goal or policy may be addressed in different terms, the action noted may have been completed since the last General Plan Update, or the goal or policy may no longer be needed.(^{3.0-1449})</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. In timber cleaning areas, where possible, leave stand natural groups of oaks, one-half to five acres for food, denning, nesting and shelter. Measure variety of these groups to maintain annual acorn production.</td>
<td>^This language is not specifically included in the updated General Plan. The goal or policy may be addressed in different terms, the action noted may have been completed since the last General Plan Update, or the goal or policy may no longer be needed.(^{3.0-1449})</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. Retain appropriate numbers of hardwood trees to ensure regeneration. Encourage timber plantations for fuelwood production.</td>
<td>^This language is not specifically included in the updated General Plan. The goal or policy may be addressed in different terms, the action noted may have been completed since the last General Plan Update, or the goal or policy may no longer be needed.(^{3.0-1449})</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. Retain and retaining of oaks and all other appropriate species to maintain biodiversity.</td>
<td>^This language is not specifically included in the updated General Plan. The goal or policy may be addressed in different terms, the action noted may have been completed since the last General Plan Update, or the goal or policy may no longer be needed.(^{3.0-1449})</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Guide to Abbreviations**
- AgU—Agricultural Preservation and Land Use Element
- C.C.—Community Character Element
- E.E.—Economic Development Element
- S.A.—Sculpture Element
- C.D.—Circulation Element
- C.D.—Conservation Element
- R.O.—Recreation and Open Space Element
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### NAPA COUNTY GENERAL PLAN POLICY LOCATION MATRIX

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>LOCATION/FNIA IN 1983 GENERAL PLAN</th>
<th>LOCATION IN UPDATED GENERAL PLAN</th>
<th>COMMENTS</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>(c) Riparian Woodland Habitat:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1. Nature vegetation areas along perennial and intermittent streams shall vary in width with steepness of the terrain, the nature of the undercutting, and type of soil.</td>
<td>^This language is not specifically included in the updated General Plan. The goal or policy may be addressed in different terms, the action noted may have been completed since the last General Plan Update, or the goal or policy may no longer be needed.(^{3.0-1449})</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. To offset possible additional losses of riparian woodlands due to development projects and conversions, developers shall provide and maintain similar quality and quantity of replacement habitat in the lands funds to an approved wildlife habitat improvement and acquisition fund. While on-site replacement is preferred, replacement habitat shall be located other site or off-site as approved by the County.</td>
<td>Policy CON-24: To offset positive additional losses of riparian woodlands due to development projects and conversions, developers shall provide and maintain similar quality and quantity of replacement habitat in the lands funds to an approved wildlife habitat improvement and acquisition fund. While on-site replacement is preferred, replacement habitat may be located other site or off-site as approved by the County.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Enforce County regulations, which protect riparian woodlands.</td>
<td>^This language is not specifically included in the updated General Plan. The goal or policy may be addressed in different terms, the action noted may have been completed since the last General Plan Update, or the goal or policy may no longer be needed.(^{3.0-1449})</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Guide to Abbreviations**
- AgU—Agricultural Preservation and Land Use Element
- C.C.—Community Character Element
- E.E.—Economic Development Element
- S.A.—Sculpture Element
- C.D.—Circulation Element
- C.D.—Conservation Element
- R.O.—Recreation and Open Space Element
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**County of Napa**

**December 2007**

**Napa County General Plan Update**

**Final Environmental Impact Report**

3.0-1449
### 3.0 Comments and Responses to Comments

#### Napa County General Plan Policy Location Matrix

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Location/Theme in 1983 General Plan</th>
<th>Location in Updated General Plan</th>
<th>Comments</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Rangeland</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Planning Goal</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Identify, improve and conserve Napa County's rangeland.</td>
<td>Policy CON.3: The County shall identify, improve, and conserve Napa County's rangeland through the following measures:</td>
<td>Longer be needed.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>a) Providing a permanent means of preservation of open space areas for rangeland.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>b) Encouraging responsible brush removal techniques with adequate environmental safeguards, leaving undisturbed islands and peninsulas to provide cover for wildlife.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>c) Staging land conversion operations to minimize adverse environmental impact on the watershed.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>d) Encouraging livestock management activities to avoid long-term destruction of rangeland productivity and watershed capacity through overgrazing, erosion, or damage to vegetation.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>e) Encouraging replanting of depleted areas to restore rangeland productivity and to increase biological resource values.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>f) Coordinating rangeland management programs with those of other counties, the State of California, and the federal government in areas where vegetation conversion programs are planned.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>g) Protecting trees and shrubs for wildlife habitat and aesthetic purposes and encouraging alternate uses, such as wildlife and recreation if feasible without undue environmental damage or graining thereof caused.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>See Policy CON.3 listed previously in this matrix.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

#### Guide to Abbreviations

- **AgP-** Agricultural Preservation and Land Use Element
- **CC-** Community Character Element
- **ED-** Economic Development Element
- **M-** Safety Element
- **CON-** Conservation Element
- **CS-** Circulation Element
- **ROS-** Recreation and Open Space Element
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### 3.0 COMMENTS AND RESPONSES TO COMMENTS

#### NAPA COUNTY GENERAL PLAN POLICY LOCATION MATRIX

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Location in 1983 General Plan</th>
<th>Location in Updated General Plan</th>
<th>Comments</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>S</strong>oils and reduce conflict with the agricultural operations and economy.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(b) Encourage retained water use for vegetation enhancement, frost protection and irrigation to enhance agriculture and grazing.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>guide to abbreviations:</td>
<td>Ag/LU—Agricultural Preservation and Land Use Element</td>
<td>CR—Circulation Element</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CC—Community Character Element</td>
<td>CON—Conservation Element</td>
<td>RDS—Recreation and Open Space Element</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SA—Safeguards Element</td>
<td>References to &quot;Current&quot; are to the 1983 General Plan</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DRAFT—Subject to Revision</td>
<td>Page 62 of 130</td>
<td>April 2, 2007</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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### 3.0 Comments and Responses to Comments

#### Napa County General Plan Policy Location Matrix

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Location/Item in 1983 General Plan</th>
<th>Location/Item in Updated General Plan</th>
<th>Comments</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>[c] Provide a permanent means of preservation of open space land for agricultural production by utilizing, whenever possible, methods such as the Williamson Act, exclusive permanent agriculture zoning or acquisition by purchase, gift, grant, bequest, device, devise or otherwise, the fee or any lesser interest or right in real property and lease-back to agriculturalists.</td>
<td>Policy CON-2: The County shall pursue a variety of techniques and practices to achieve the County’s Conservation Open Space policies, including: a) Exclusive permanent agriculture zoning or transfer of development rights. b) Acquisition through purchase, gift, grant, bequest, devise, devise or otherwise, the fee or any lesser interest or right in real property. c) Williamson Act or other incentives to maintain land in agricultural production or other open space uses. d) Requiring mitigation of development impacts, either on-site or off-site, in locations within the County to minimize the number and/or magnitude of impacts when impacts cannot be avoided.</td>
<td>See also Policy CON-2 listed previously in this matrix. Contains elements of current Conservation/ Agricultural Land Policies. See Draft General Plan page 187.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(d) Protect trees and shrubs for wildlife habitat and aesthetic purposes and encourage alternate uses, such as wildlife and recreation if feasible without undue environmental damage when grading is phased out.</td>
<td>See Policy CON-2 listed previously in this matrix. See Draft General Plan page 188.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(e) Require that existing significant vegetation be retained and incorporated into agricultural projects to reduce soil erosion and to retain wildlife habitat. When retention is found to be feasible, replanting of native or adapted vegetation shall be required.</td>
<td>See Policy CON-2 listed previously in this matrix. See Draft General Plan page 187.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(f) Encourage inter-agency and inter-disciplinary liaison to continuously monitor and evaluate pesticide and herbicide programs on all phases of the environment and extend programs to air and wildlife and to recommend changes as needed to prevent any environmental degradation.</td>
<td>See Policy CON-2 listed previously in this matrix. See Draft General Plan page 187.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(g) Minimize pesticide and herbicide use and encourage research and use of integrated pest control methods such as cultural practices, biological control, host resistance and the like.</td>
<td>See Policy CON-2 listed previously in this matrix.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Guide to Abbreviations*
- AgP—Agricultural Preservation and Land Use Element
- CC—Community Character Element
- EDE—Economic Development Element
- SAT—Safety Element

---

**NAPA COUNTY GENERAL PLAN POLICY LOCATION MATRIX.**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Location/Item in 1983 General Plan</th>
<th>Location/Item in Updated General Plan</th>
<th>Comments</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>other factors.</td>
<td></td>
<td>See Draft General Plan page 187.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(h) Encourage Williamson Act contracts for agricultural lands adjoining cities by adopting and implementing policies such as large lot zoning, urban limit lines, etc., to limit urban expansion and encourage development of vacant land in areas already urbanized.</td>
<td>See Policy CON-2 listed previously in this matrix. See Draft General Plan page 187.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(i) Encourage the establishment of a green belt of land used for agriculture, wildlife habitat, recreational or other suitable open space purposes in the American Canyon Area along North Slough, Hogan Creek, American Canyon Creek, and the Eucalyptus Tree Grove to the west of Oak Hill.</td>
<td>This language is not specifically included in the Updated General Plan. The goal or policy may be addressed in different terms, the action noted may have been completed since the last General Plan Update, or the goal or policy may no longer be needed.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(j) Establish minimum lot sizes of not less than 40 acres in prime soil areas and 160 acres in nonprime soil and watershed areas for the purpose of preserving agricultural open space uses in appropriate locations.</td>
<td>See Draft General Plan page 34.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Guide to Abbreviations*
- AgP—Agricultural Preservation and Land Use Element
- CC—Community Character Element
- EDE—Economic Development Element
- SAT—Safety Element
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**Napa County General Plan Update**

County of Napa

**Final Environmental Impact Report**

December 2007

3.0-152
### NAPA COUNTY GENERAL PLAN POLICY LOCATION MATRIX

#### Location from 1983 General Plan | Location in Updated General Plan | Comment
--- | --- | ---

**3.0 COMMENTS AND RESPONSES TO COMMENTS**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Comment</th>
<th>Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| Acres may be created for the sole purpose of developing form labor camps by a local government agency authorized to own or operate form labor camps as long as the division is accomplished by securing the written consent of a local government agency authorized to own or operate form labor camps that it will accept a conveyance of the fee interest of the parcel to be created and shall comply with law, including the fee interest of such parcel directly to the local government agency, or the fee interest of such parcel directly with the local government agency. (Note: This text is derived from Measure J.)

Every lease or deed creating such parcels must contain language ensuring that if the parcel is not used as a form labor camp within three years of the conveyance or lease being executed or permanently ceases to be used as a form labor camp by a local government agency authorized to develop form labor camps, the parcel will automatically revert to, and merge into, the original parent parcel. (Note: This text is derived from Measure J.)

Maximum Building Intensity:

One dwelling per parcel (except for second units of limited size as envisioned by State law, and except as specified in Housing Element). Nonresident building intensity is non-applicable. (Note: This text is derived from Measure J.)

Policy AgLU-19: The following standards shall apply to lands designated as Agricultural Resource on the Land Use Map of the General Plan:

- Intent: To identify areas in the fertile valley and foothill areas of the County in which agriculture is and should continue to be the predominant land use, where uses incompatible with agriculture should be precluded and where the limitation of urban type uses would be detrimental to the continuity of agriculture and the maintenance of open space which are economic and aesthetic attributes and assets of the County of Napa. (Note: This text is derived from Measure J.)

- General Uses: Agriculture, processing of agricultural products, single family dwelling, minimum parcel size of 40 acres, except that parcels with a minimum size of 2.5 acres may be created for the sole purpose of developing form labor camps by a local government agency authorized to own or operate form labor camps as long as the division is accomplished by securing the written consent of a local government agency authorized to own or operate form labor camps that it will accept a conveyance of the fee interest of the parcel to be created and thereby conveying the fee interest of such parcel directly to the local government agency, or the fee interest of such parcel directly in whole or in part to the local government agency.

- Maximum Building Intensity: One dwelling per parcel (except for second units of limited size as envisioned by State law, and except as specified in Housing Element). Nonresident building intensity is non-applicable. (Note: This text is derived from Measure J.)

Watershed or Groundwater Recharge Land

To improve the management and protection of the County's water resources.

- Policy CON-30: The County will work to protect Napa County's watersheds and public and private water reserves to accomplish the following purposes: a) clean drinking water, for public health and safety, b) support of the eco-system, c) recreation, and d) scenic beauty, and for open space.

See Draft General Plan page 300

---

**Guide to Abbreviations**

- AgLU—Agricultural Preservation and Land Use Element
- CCR—Circulation Element
- CC—Community Character Element
- CON—Conservation Element
- EDE—Economic Development Element
- R05—Recreation and Open Space Element
- SAF—Safety Element
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**County of Napa**

**Napa County General Plan Update**

**December 2007**

**Final Environmental Impact Report**

3.0-1453
### 3.0 COMMENTS AND RESPONSES TO COMMENTS

#### NAPA COUNTY GENERAL PLAN POLICY LOCATION MATRIX

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>LOCATION IN 1983 GENERAL PLAN</th>
<th>LOCATION IN UPDATED GENERAL PLAN</th>
<th>COMMENTS</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Conservation Policy</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(a) Protect potential ground water recharge areas from urban encroachment because of the potential need to replenish underground water tables to prevent land subsidence or for other reasons.</td>
<td>See Policy CON-05 listed previously in this matrix. See Draft General Plan page 203.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(b) Evaluate land use policies and encourage the density and type of land use that will provide a stable vegetation cover to improve water quality, reduce contamination, pollution and siltation within boundaries of wetlands for existing and potential reservoirs.</td>
<td>Policy CON-04. The County will take appropriate steps to protect surface water quality, including the following: a) Preserve riparian areas by buffering pursuant to the stream setback policy included above and pursue retention, maintenance and enhancement of existing native vegetation along all intermittent and perennial streams. b) Encouraging flood control reduction projects to give full consideration to scenic, fish, wildlife, and other environmental benefits when computing costs of alternative methods of flood control. c) Maintain minimum lot sizes of not less than 160 acres in agriculture, forested and open space (AFOS) designated areas to reflect desirable densities based on access, slope, productivity capabilities for agriculture and forestry, sewage disposal and water supply, wildlfe habitat and other environmental considerations. d) In conformance with NPDQ requirements, prohibit grading and excavation unless it can be demonstrated that such activities will not result in significant soil erosion, sifting of lower stages or waterways, soil damage, flooding problems, or damage to wildlife and fishery habitats. e) Adopt development standards, in conformance with NPDQ Phase II requirements, for post construction storm water control. f) Requiring replanting and/or restoration of riparian vegetation as part of any discretionary permit or erosion control plan approved by the County.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

#### Guide to Abbreviations

AgU—Agricultural Preservation and Land Use Element  
CoC—Community Character Element  
EcD—Economic Development Element  
SAF—Safety Element

DRAFT—Subject to Revision  
Page 67 of 130  
April 2, 2007

---

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>LOCATION IN 1983 GENERAL PLAN</th>
<th>LOCATION IN UPDATED GENERAL PLAN</th>
<th>COMMENTS</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| AgU—Agricultural Preservation and Land Use Element  
CoC—Community Character Element  
EcD—Economic Development Element  
SAF—Safety Element | Policy CON-07: Encourages the maximum protection of all environmental values at solid waste disposal sites by the adoption of standards of planning, design, construction, operation and maintenance of the disposal site that would include: 1) Location away from residential areas; 2) Screening from view; 3) Good road access, not through residential areas; 4) No inhabited areas downstream from the site because dual and odor problems can occur in even the most carefully conducted operations; 5) Location to prevent flooding and pollution and contamination of surface and ground water; 6) High frost depth standards. | This language is not specifically included in the Updated General Plan. The goal or policy may be addressed in different terms, the action noted may have been completed since the last General Plan Update, or the goal or policy may no longer be needed. |

---

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>LOCATION IN 1983 GENERAL PLAN</th>
<th>LOCATION IN UPDATED GENERAL PLAN</th>
<th>COMMENTS</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| CoC—Community Character Element  
EcD—Economic Development Element  
SAF—Safety Element | Policy CON-08: Encourages the maximum protection of all environmental values at solid waste disposal sites by the adoption of standards of planning, design, construction, operation and maintenance, including: 1) Location away from residential areas; 2) Screening from view; 3) Good road access, not through residential areas; 4) No inhabited areas downstream from the site because dual and odor problems can occur in even the most carefully conducted operations; 5) Location to prevent flooding and pollution and contamination of surface and ground water; 6) frost depth standards. | Derived from current Conservation/Protection of Water Quality and Water Resources Planning Goal and Policies in Draft General Plan Page 213. |

---

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>LOCATION IN 1983 GENERAL PLAN</th>
<th>LOCATION IN UPDATED GENERAL PLAN</th>
<th>COMMENTS</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| CoC—Community Character Element  
EcD—Economic Development Element  
SAF—Safety Element | Policy CON-09: Encourages the establishment of a student oriented research center. Some research is already being done by students from Pacific Union College in Angwin, the University of California at Davis, Napa College and some of the high schools, but additional data is needed to | This language is not specifically included in the Updated General Plan. The goal or policy may be addressed in different terms, |

---
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### 3.0 Comments and Responses to Comments

**Napa County General Plan Policy Location Matrix**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Location/Type in 1983 General Plan</th>
<th>Location in Updated General Plan</th>
<th>Comment</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Determination of baseline and long-term recording procedures for reservoir, ground and surface water quality monitoring, rainfall, and temperature records.</td>
<td></td>
<td>The action noted may have been completed since the last General Plan Update, or the goal or policy may no longer be needed.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(f) Re-examine land use policies in light of the steadily expanding body of knowledge and findings forthcoming from several current and proposed Federal, State, regional and local monitoring, feasibility and storming programs. The Legislature's enactment of the Porter-Cologne Act has vested within the State Water Resources Control Board specific authority to promulgate specific policies regarding many aspects of water quality in categories such as: 1) Water reclamation and reuse; 2) Discharge to bays and estuaries; 3) Discharge to surface freshwater and ground water; 4) Waste water management in rural and urban areas; 5) Disposal of solid wastes; 6) Thermal wastewaters; 7) Siltation; 8) Storm water drainage; 9) Vessel wastes; 10) Recreational vehicle wastes.</td>
<td></td>
<td>This language is not specifically included in the Updated General Plan. The goal or policy may be addressed in different terms, the action noted may have been completed since the last General Plan Update, or the goal or policy may no longer be needed.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mineral Deposits</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Parenting Goal</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>To identify the mineral needs and mineral resources of the County and provide for the wise use and management of these resources in a manner compatible with environmental considerations.</td>
<td>Policy CON-46: The County shall seek to identify the need for resources and provide for the sustainable use and management of the resources in a manner compatible with environmental conditions.</td>
<td>See Draft General Plan page 214</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Conservation Policy</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(c) Identify the location and extent of the County's mineral resources.</td>
<td>Policy CON-72: Identify, improve, and conserve Napa County's sand and gravel resources, preventing removal of</td>
<td>See Draft General Plan page 215</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Guide to Abbreviations</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AgU—Agricultural Preservation and Land Use Element</td>
<td>CIR—Circulation Element</td>
<td>References to &quot;current&quot; are to the 1983 General Plan</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CC—Community Character Element</td>
<td>CON—Conservation Element</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>E—Economic Development Element</td>
<td>RO—Recreation and Open Space Element</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SAF—Safety Element</td>
<td>DRAFT—Subject to Revision</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

---
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### 3.0 Comments and Responses to Comments

#### NAPA COUNTY GENERAL PLAN POLICY LOCATION MATRIX

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>LOCATION/ITEM IN 1983 GENERAL PLAN</th>
<th>LOCATION/ITEM IN UPDATED GENERAL PLAN</th>
<th>COMMENT</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>(c) Establish an information center for both published and unpublished data.</td>
<td></td>
<td>This language is not specifically included in the Updated General Plan. The goal or policy may be addressed in different terms, the action noted may have been completed since the last General Plan Update, or the goal or policy may no longer be needed.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>LOCATION/ITEM IN 1983 GENERAL PLAN</th>
<th>LOCATION/ITEM IN UPDATED GENERAL PLAN</th>
<th>COMMENT</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>(d) Establish an information center for both published and unpublished data.</td>
<td></td>
<td>This language is not specifically included in the Updated General Plan. The goal or policy may be addressed in different terms, the action noted may have been completed since the last General Plan Update, or the goal or policy may no longer be needed.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>LOCATION/ITEM IN 1983 GENERAL PLAN</th>
<th>LOCATION/ITEM IN UPDATED GENERAL PLAN</th>
<th>COMMENT</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>(e) Serve as a clearing house for technically trained persons in the U.S. Geological Survey and other federal agencies, the State Division of Mines, universities and industry, to integrate their mineral development and conservation program into the fabric of the County’s General Plan.</td>
<td></td>
<td>This language is not specifically included in the Updated General Plan. The goal or policy may be addressed in different terms, the action noted may have been completed since the last General Plan Update, or the goal or policy may no longer be needed.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>LOCATION/ITEM IN 1983 GENERAL PLAN</th>
<th>LOCATION/ITEM IN UPDATED GENERAL PLAN</th>
<th>COMMENT</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>(f) Maintain an inventory of potentially productive mineral deposits in Napa County.</td>
<td></td>
<td>See Policy CON-71 listed previously in this matrix. See Draft General Plan page 316</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>LOCATION/ITEM IN 1983 GENERAL PLAN</th>
<th>LOCATION/ITEM IN UPDATED GENERAL PLAN</th>
<th>COMMENT</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>(g) Time the long-term production of Aggregates Resource Areas identified by the State pursuant to Public Resources Code Section 2762 by:</td>
<td></td>
<td>See Policy CON-71 listed previously in this matrix. See Draft General Plan page 215</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Guide to Abbreviations**

- CA—Agricultural Preservation and Land Use Element
- CC—Community Character Element
- E—Economic Development Element
- SD—Safety Element

**Draft—Subject to Revision**

Page 71 of 130  
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**NAPA COUNTY GENERAL PLAN POLICY LOCATION MATRIX**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>LOCATION/ITEM IN 1983 GENERAL PLAN</th>
<th>LOCATION/ITEM IN UPDATED GENERAL PLAN</th>
<th>COMMENT</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>(h) Maintain the conservation and development of identified mineral deposits (see Figure 14).</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>LOCATION/ITEM IN 1983 GENERAL PLAN</th>
<th>LOCATION/ITEM IN UPDATED GENERAL PLAN</th>
<th>COMMENT</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>(h) Maintain the conservation and development of identified mineral deposits (see Figure 14).</td>
<td></td>
<td>Policy CON-56: Encourage the use of bio-fuels and geothermal energy resources where viable and environmentally sustainable. See Draft General Plan page 216</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>LOCATION/ITEM IN 1983 GENERAL PLAN</th>
<th>LOCATION/ITEM IN UPDATED GENERAL PLAN</th>
<th>COMMENT</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>(i) Continue to enforce established policy on geothermal energy exploration and development (Napa County Code Section 10400 et. seq.) (Mostly in the Calistoga Area) considering the potential adverse environmental effects such as noise pollution, air pollution, water pollution, and poorly located transmission lines that can accompany improper geothermal development.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>LOCATION/ITEM IN 1983 GENERAL PLAN</th>
<th>LOCATION/ITEM IN UPDATED GENERAL PLAN</th>
<th>COMMENT</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>(i) Continue to enforce established policy on geothermal energy exploration and development (Napa County Code Section 10400 et. seq.) (Mostly in the Calistoga Area) considering the potential adverse environmental effects such as noise pollution, air pollution, water pollution, and poorly located transmission lines that can accompany improper geothermal development.</td>
<td></td>
<td>Policy CON-56: Encourage the use of bio-fuels and geothermal energy resources where viable and environmentally sustainable. See Draft General Plan page 216</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>LOCATION/ITEM IN 1983 GENERAL PLAN</th>
<th>LOCATION/ITEM IN UPDATED GENERAL PLAN</th>
<th>COMMENT</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>(j) Prevent removal of streambed sand and gravel in any manner that would cause adverse effects on water quality, fishery and streamside vegetation resources.</td>
<td></td>
<td>Policy CON-73: Resource extraction activities (e.g., mining and geothermal development) shall fully address environmental implications, such as air pollution, visual distractions, alteration of nearby streams, increase in surface runoff, removal of underground water by pumping, increase in erosion or landslide hazard, disposal of chemical wastes, creation of impervious layers and surface compaction, extent of vegetation removal and site rehabilitation procedures. See Draft General Plan page 215</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>LOCATION/ITEM IN 1983 GENERAL PLAN</th>
<th>LOCATION/ITEM IN UPDATED GENERAL PLAN</th>
<th>COMMENT</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>(k) Same Conservation Policy as mineral deposits.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Outdoor Recreation**

---

**Guide to Abbreviations**

- CA—Agricultural Preservation and Land Use Element
- CC—Community Character Element
- E—Economic Development Element
- SD—Safety Element
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### 3.0 COMMENTS AND RESPONSES TO COMMENTS

#### NAPA COUNTY GENERAL PLAN POLICY LOCATION MATRIX

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Location/Plan in 1983 General Plan</th>
<th>Location in Updated General Plan</th>
<th>Comments</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Recreational Land</strong></td>
<td><strong>Recreational Resource</strong></td>
<td><strong>See Draft General Plan page 285 and 286</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Planning Code</strong></td>
<td><strong>ROS Goal 1</strong>: To ensure an extensive landscape of open spaces in which recreation, the protection of natural, cultural and archaeological resources, agricultural production and private property are mutually supportive and complementary. <strong>ROS Goal 2</strong>: To create and maintain a high-quality system of parks, trails and recreation areas; interpretive and environmental education facilities.</td>
<td><strong>See Draft General Plan page 152-210P</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Conservation Policy</strong></td>
<td><strong>[a]</strong> Implement the recommendations of the adopted Napa County Park and Recreation Plan, which identifies the recreation and open space needs and potentials of the County including the relationships of County needs and potential to one-wide, regional and State facilities.</td>
<td><strong>This language is not specifically included in the Updated General Plan. The goal or policy may be addressed in different terms, the action noted may have been completed since the last General Plan Update, or the goal or policy may no longer be needed.</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>[b]</strong> Augment site selection for roadside rest areas.</td>
<td><strong>This language is not specifically included in the Updated General Plan. The goal or policy may be addressed in different terms, the action noted may have been completed since the last General Plan Update, or the goal or policy may no longer be needed.</strong></td>
<td><strong>This language is not specifically included in the Updated General Plan. The goal or policy may be addressed in different terms, the action noted may have been completed since the last General Plan Update, or the goal or policy may no longer be needed.</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>[c]</strong> Encourage wildlife habitat improvement for hunting or</td>
<td><strong>This language is not specifically included in the Updated General Plan. The goal or policy may be addressed in different terms, the action noted may have been completed since the last General Plan Update, or the goal or policy may no longer be needed.</strong></td>
<td><strong>This language is not specifically included in the Updated General Plan. The goal or policy may be addressed in different terms, the action noted may have been completed since the last General Plan Update, or the goal or policy may no longer be needed.</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Guide to Abbreviations**

- ALU—Agricultural Preservation and Land Use Element
- CC—Community Character Element
- CD—Community Development Element
- CIA—Conservation Element
- ROS—Recreation and Open Space Element

References to “current” are to the 1983 General Plan.

---

NAPA COUNTY GENERAL PLAN POLICY LOCATION MATRIX

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Location/Plan in 1983 General Plan</th>
<th>Location in Updated General Plan</th>
<th>Comments</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>non-consumptive wildlife uses such as photography and maintaining food chains and checks and balances of natural habitats.</strong></td>
<td><strong>specifically included in the Updated General Plan. The goal or policy may be addressed in different terms, the action noted may have been completed since the last General Plan Update, or the goal or policy may no longer be needed.</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>(d)</strong> Provide recreational and open space opportunities around recreation ponds, ground water recharge basins, flood control channels and similar works by maximizing scenic and wildlife habitats by retaining natural vegetation, including supplementary landscaping, acquiring additional land for open space purposes and by shaping the structure to have a more attractive form and greater usefulness for open space activities.**</td>
<td><strong>This language is not specifically included in the Updated General Plan. The goal or policy may be addressed in different terms, the action noted may have been completed since the last General Plan Update, or the goal or policy may no longer be needed.</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>(e)</strong> Promote development of local State Parks for recreation.**</td>
<td><strong>This language is not specifically included in the Updated General Plan. The goal or policy may be addressed in different terms, the action noted may have been completed since the last General Plan Update, or the goal or policy may no longer be needed.</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>(f)</strong> Promote non-motorized riding and hiking trails.**</td>
<td><strong>See Policy ROS-12 and Action Item ROS-12.1</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>(g)</strong> Provide appropriately located areas for off-road vehicle use. Encourage public agencies to regulate off-road use on privately owned lands.**</td>
<td><strong>See Draft General Plan page 237</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Guide to Abbreviations**

- ALU—Agricultural Preservation and Land Use Element
- CC—Community Character Element
- CD—Community Development Element
- CIA—Conservation Element
- ROS—Recreation and Open Space Element

References to “current” are to the 1983 General Plan.
### Napa County General Plan Policy Location Matrix

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Location/Area in 1983 General Plan</th>
<th>Location in Updated General Plan</th>
<th>Comments</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Areas of Outstanding Historical and Archaeological Value</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td>goal or policy may be addressed in different terms, action noted may have been completed since the last General Plan update, or the goal or policy may no longer be needed.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Planning Goal</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Encourage preservation and scientific study of areas of unique historical and archaeological value.</td>
<td>See Goal CC-3 listed previously in this matrix.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Conservation Policy</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(a) Prepare priority list identifying critical areas and features threatened by destruction.</td>
<td>See Draft General Plan page 142</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(b) Prepare specific plans (within the meaning of Sections 65451-2 of the Government Code), and establish plan lines or other appropriate devices to protect sites and a</td>
<td>This language is not specifically included in the Updated General Plan.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Guide to Abbreviations**
- AgU—Agricultural Preservation and Land Use Element
- CR—Circulation Element
- CC—Community Character Element
- S—Economic Development Element
- P—Public Health Element
- SO—Open Space Element
- KN—Kinderhook

### Napa County General Plan Policy Location Matrix

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Location/Area in 1983 General Plan</th>
<th>Location in Updated General Plan</th>
<th>Comments</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Areas of Scenic Value</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td>goal or policy may be addressed in different terms, action noted may have been completed since the last General Plan update, or the goal or policy may no longer be needed.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Planning Goal</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Encourage preservation of and provide visual access to the natural beauty of Napa County, thereby enriching the lives of its citizens and enhancing and maintaining one of the County's primary industries, the tourist industry.</td>
<td>See Goal CC-1 listed previously in this matrix.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Conservation Policy</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(a) Identify and preserve the areas' architectural and historical landmarks.</td>
<td>See Goal CC-3 and Policy CC-17 listed previously in this matrix.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Guide to Abbreviations**
- AgU—Agricultural Preservation and Land Use Element
- CR—Circulation Element
- CC—Community Character Element
- S—Economic Development Element
- SO—Open Space Element
- KN—Kinderhook
### Napa County General Plan Policy Location Matrix

**Location/Item in 1983 General Plan** | **Location in Updated General Plan** | **Comments**
--- | --- | ---
(b) Discourage the installation of new overhead utility lines and develop programs for undergrounding existing overhead lines. | See Policy CC-14 listed previously in this matrix.
See Draft General Plan page 184

(c) Minimize the number of individual telecommunications facilities and sites present through the encouragement where appropriate of co-location and the development of multi-user sites. | See Policy CC-12 listed previously in this matrix.
See Draft General Plan page 184

(d) Develop a program for highway beautification (see Scenic Highways Element). | This language is not specifically included in the Updated General Plan. The goal or policy may be addressed in different terms, the action noted may have been completed since the last General Plan Update, or the goal or policy may no longer be needed.

(e) Develop comprehensive sign standards and regulations to fit the unique character and need of the area. | Policy CC-27: Signs should be used primarily to provide necessary information and business identification rather than the advertisement of goods and services. Sign site limits and locational requirements should be designed to avoid or proliferation of signs.

(f) Land use patterns should include visual consideration to prevent the destruction of visual quality. The landscape can easily become a hodgepodge of rooftops, flying mobile homes, power lines and poles. Therefore, the appropriate density and cluster subdivision design form should be carefully planned. | This language is not specifically included in the Updated General Plan. The goal or policy may be addressed in different terms, the action noted may have been completed since the last General Plan Update, or the goal or policy may no longer be needed.

---

**Guide to Abbreviations**

- **AgU**—Agricultural Preservation and Land Use Element
- **CC**—Community Character Element
- **EED**—Economic Development Element
- **SAP**—Safety Element
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**Location/Item in 1983 General Plan** | **Location in Updated General Plan** | **Comments**
--- | --- | ---
(g) Implement Conservation Policies (c), (d), (e), and (f) from 16 "Areas Required for Ecological and Other Scientific Study Purposes" as applicable to areas of outstanding scenic value as high priority. | This language is not specifically included in the Updated General Plan. The goal or policy may be addressed in different terms, the action noted may have been completed since the last General Plan Update, or the goal or policy may no longer be needed.

(h) Develop co-operative programs with adjacent counties applicable to the siting of telecommunications facilities on the respective forming their common borders with Napa County. | See Policy CC-12 listed previously in this matrix.
See Draft General Plan page 184

(i) Develop co-operative programs with the towns and cities within the County applicable to the siting of telecommunications facilities within each other's View sheds. | See Policy CC-12 listed previously in this matrix.
See Draft General Plan page 184

(j) Develop co-operative programs with the state and federal land-holding agencies within the County applicable to the siting of telecommunications facilities on their lands. | See Policy CC-12 listed previously in this matrix.
See Draft General Plan page 184

**Policy Health and Safety**

Areas that Require Special Management or Regulation Because of Hazardous or Special Conditions

Planning Goal

---

**Guide to Abbreviations**

- **AgU**—Agricultural Preservation and Land Use Element
- **CC**—Community Character Element
- **EED**—Economic Development Element
- **SAP**—Safety Element
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### 3.0 Comments and Responses to Comments

#### Napa County General Plan Policy Location Matrix

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Location in 1983 General Plan</th>
<th>Location in Updated General Plan</th>
<th>Comments</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Provide for public health and safety where soil, geology, land slope, fire hazard, marshes, flood plains, or other hazards make building for human occupancy hazardous.</td>
<td>Safety Goal 1: Safety considerations will be part of the County’s education, outreach, planning and operations in order to reduce loss of life, injuries, damage to property and economic and social dislocation resulting from the, flood, geologic and other hazards.</td>
<td>See Draft General Plan page 270</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Conservation Policy**

| (a) Untitled lands having existing or potentially severe erosion characteristics, excepting Oak Hill, to low density or no development. Erosion can contribute to landslides, floods, water pollution and landscape scars. Less land area is disturbed and subjected to the forces of erosion by limited development activity. | This language is not specifically included in the Updated General Plan. The goal of policy may be addressed in different terms. The action noted may have been completed since the last General Plan Update, or the goal or policy may no longer be needed. | See Policy CON-2 listed previously in this matrix. See Draft General Plan page 187 |

| (b) Reduce erosion by the retention of trees, brush and grass, use pruning or vegetative cover on bars, steep, erodible areas should be undertaken as a conservation measure wherever possible. | | See Policy SAF-3 listed previously in this matrix. See Draft General Plan page 270 |

| (c) Excepting Oak Hill, prohibit development on lands having severe construction limitations. Although known hazards, adverse soil conditions for foundations and shrub-root behavior, slope over 15%, circulation, and utility problems are not insurmountable obstacles to development, they often require costly and continuous maintenance practices after development, which may have to be sold by the general public. Alternative use, such as controlled recreation, wildlife management or agriculture should be encouraged on land having extensive or unusual construction limitations. Where grading, drainage, recreational and conservation uses of areas with natural streams, ponds, or woodlands should be encouraged. | | |

**Guide to Abbreviations**

- AgLU—Agricultural Preservation and Land Use Element
- CC—Community Character Element
- ESD—Economic Development Element
- SAF—Safety Element
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**Napa County General Plan Policy Location Matrix**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Location in 1983 General Plan</th>
<th>Location in Updated General Plan</th>
<th>Comments</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Encouraged, installation of small dams in suitable areas can be a recreational asset as well as a conservation asset by serving as sediment and flood water retention facilities.</td>
<td>Policy SAF-6: Consistent with County ordinances, require a geotechnical study for new projects and modifications of existing projects or structures located in or near known geologic hazard areas; and restrict new development atop or outside identified active seismic faults in order to prevent catastrophic damage caused by movement along the fault.</td>
<td>See Draft General Plan page 271</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

| (d) Require geological engineering investigations and building code revisions within potential hazardous areas and areas subjected to amplified earthquake motion or subsurface liquefaction such as valley alluvial soils or marshlands. | | |

| (e) Adopt and enforce a grading ordinance and top soil removal ordinance. | See Goal CON-7 and Policy CON-34 listed previously in this matrix. See Draft General Plan pages 199 and 202 |

| (f) Protect the public interest in drainage systems and water impoundments from sedimentation, silting, and contamination and ensure that urban, agricultural and resource development projects utilize sound short-term and long-term erosion control measures. | This language is not specifically included in the Updated General Plan. The goal or policy may be addressed in different terms. The action noted may have been completed since the last General Plan Update, or the goal or policy may no longer be needed. | |

**Flood Plains**

| Planning Goals | | |
|----------------|----------------|
| (a) Restrict and regulate urban development in areas of flood risk. | Safety Goal 4: To protect residents and businesses from hazards caused by flooding. | See Draft General Plan page 274 |

**Guide to Abbreviations**

- AgLU—Agricultural Preservation and Land Use Element
- CC—Community Character Element
- ESD—Economic Development Element
- SAF—Safety Element
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<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Location Item in 1983 General Plan</th>
<th>Location in Updated General Plan</th>
<th>Comments</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>(b) Protect the vegetation and animal habitats of the waterways and flood plains from encroachment of urban development.</td>
<td>See Policy CR-175. see future.</td>
<td>see Draft General Plan page 263</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(c) Protect existing areas of urban development from flooding.</td>
<td>See Policy CR-26. see future.</td>
<td>see Draft General Plan page 274</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Conservation Policy.</td>
<td></td>
<td>152-214P</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(d) Limit and regulate structures in the floodway and flood plain of all unincorporated areas subject to flooding. In the 100 year flood, as identified in HEC Floodway and Flood Plain Insurance Rate Maps.</td>
<td>See Policy CR-255.</td>
<td>see Draft General Plan page 274</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(b) Adopt flood plain zoning in all applicable areas, and investigate the compatibility of zoning areas adjacent to flood plains for recreational uses. Flood plains along streams which feed Lake Berryessa, the Napa River, and the Sulphur springs are zoned for agricultural uses in the majority.</td>
<td>This language is not specifically included in the Updated General Plan. The goal or policy may be addressed in different terms, the action noted may have been completed since the last General Plan Update, or the goal or policy may no longer be needed.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(c) Continue to encourage provision for flood insurance. The Napa County Flood Control and Water Conservation District and the Napa County Board of Supervisors have obtained Federal Government approval for Napa County for flood insurance and have agreed, in return, to enact local land use and control measures for areas having special flooding problems. The controls are to be consistent with Federal criteria.</td>
<td>This language is not specifically included in the Updated General Plan. The goal or policy may be addressed in different terms, the action noted may have been completed since the last General Plan Update, or the goal or policy may no longer be needed.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Guide to Abbreviations**

AgU—Agriculture, Preservation and Land Use Element  
CR—Community Character Element  
EC—Economic Development Element  
SAF—Safety Element  
SIR—Special Interest and Recreation Element  
RO—Recreation and Open Space Element  
References to “current” are to the 1983 General Plan
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### 3.0 Comments and Responses to Comments

#### Napa County General Plan Policy Location Matrix

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Location 1 in 1983 General Plan</th>
<th>Location 2 in 2003 General Plan</th>
<th>Comment</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Woodland-grass and brush areas that are heavily felled.</td>
<td>SAF-16 listed previously in this matrix. See Draft General Plan page 272.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Conservation Policy**

(a) Encourage environmentally sound programs for protection against fire hazard. Include in program for protection against fire hazard and fire protection planning consideration of the protective-effective "firebreak" topography, land use, traffic flow, safe ingress and egress, water system, fuel breaks, closed check-containment structures and roadsides, use of fire resistant building materials, clearly designated street names and numbers, and emergency hotspots.

(b) Reserve open space lands subject to high fire risk to the FR (Fire Risk) Combustion District.

**Protection of Water Quality and Water Reservoirs**

- Protect the county's watersheds and public water reservoirs to accomplish the following purposes: For clean drinking water, for public health and safety, for support of the ecosystem, for recreation, for scenic beauty, and for open space.

- See Policy CON-35 listed previously in this matrix. See Draft General Plan page 203.

**Planning Goal**

Guide to Abbreviations

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Abbreviation</th>
<th>Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>AgLU</td>
<td>Agricultural Preservation and Land Use Element</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CC</td>
<td>Community Character Element</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>E</td>
<td>Economic Development Element</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SAF</td>
<td>Safety Element</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CM</td>
<td>Circulation Element</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CON</td>
<td>Conservation Element</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ROS</td>
<td>Recreation and Open Space Element</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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Napa County General Plan Policy Location Matrix

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Location 1 in 1983 General Plan</th>
<th>Location 2 in 2003 General Plan</th>
<th>Comment</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Conservation Policy</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(a) Protect streams from encroachment by establishment of &quot;offical Plan Lines&quot;, riparian woodland ordinances and protection procedures, stream obstruction zoning, stream setbacks, floodplain zoning and other appropriate methods.</td>
<td>See Policy CON-34 listed previously in this matrix. See Draft General Plan page 202.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

(b) Encourage flood control agencies to give full consideration to scenic, fish, wildlife, and other environmental benefits when computing costs of alternative methods of flood control.

(c) Establish minimum lot sizes of not less than 160 acres to encourage rural densities in rural, non-agricultural areas and to reflect developable densities based on access, slope, productive capabilities for agriculture and forestry, sewage disposal, and water supply, wildlife habitat and other environmental impact considerations.

Policy AgLU-18: The following standards shall apply to lands designated as Agriculture, Watershed, and Open Space on the Land Use Map of this General Plan in an effort to provide areas where the predominant use is agriculturally oriented, where watershed areas, rangelands, floodplain tributaries, geologic hazards, soil conditions and other constraints make the land relatively unsuitable for urban development, where urban development would adversely impact on all such use; and where the protection of agriculture, watersheds, and floodplain tributaries from fire, pollution, and erosion is essential to the general health, safety, and welfare. (Note: This text is derived from Measure J.)

General Uses: Agriculture, processing of agricultural products, single family dwelling. (Note: This text is derived from Measure J.)

Minimum Parcel Size: 160 acres, except that parcels with a minimum size of 2 acres may be created for the sole purpose of developing farm labor camps by a local government agency authorized to own or operate farm labor camps as long as the division is accomplished by securing the written consent of a local government agency authorized to own or operate farm labor camps that it will accept a conveyance of the fee interest of the...
### 3.0 Comments and Responses to Comments

#### Napa County General Plan Policy Location Matrix

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Location Plan in 1983 General Plan</th>
<th>Location in Updated General Plan</th>
<th>Comments</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>c) Encourage cautious use of chemical treatment of reservoirs to prevent undue damage to fish and wildlife resources.</td>
<td></td>
<td>See Policy CON-25 listed previously in this matrix.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>d) Discourage scattered development which contributes to continued dependence on the private automobile as the only means of convenient transportation.</td>
<td></td>
<td>See Policy AgU-20 listed previously in this matrix.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>e) Prevent filling of existing dray areas, berm areas, salt ponds, wetlands and marsh areas because these areas are important for public health and safety as they provide water surface evaporation areas, which serve as important wildlife and habitat, and as habitat for waterfowl, and they support oxygen producing plants. If all the marshlands and evaporation ponds in Napa County were filled and urbanized.</td>
<td></td>
<td>See Policy CON-25 listed previously in this matrix.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Guide to Abbreviations**

- AgU—Agricultural Preservation and Land Use Element
- CC—Community Character Element
- E Economic Development Element
- SAT—Safety Element
- CON—Conservation Element
- COS—Circulation Element
- KOS—Recreation and Open Space Element

---
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**Final Environmental Impact Report**

3.0-1463
### NAPA COUNTY GENERAL PLAN POLICY LOCATION MATRIX

1. **3.0 COMMENTS AND RESPONSES TO COMMENTS**

   1. **LOCATION IN 1983 GENERAL PLAN**
   2. **LOCATION IN UPDATED GENERAL PLAN**
   3. **COMMENTS**

   **152-218P cont'd**

   **Open Space to Guide Urban Growth**

   **Preserve and create an open space system that will maintain community identity.**

   **This language is not specifically included in the Updated General Plan. The goal or policy may be addressed in different terms, the action noted may have been completed since the last General Plan Update, or the goal or policy may no longer be needed.**

   **Conservation Policy**

   **a) Maintain community identity by preserving the open spaces not designated for urban uses on the Land Use Plan Map (Figure 14) which distinguish and separate various**

   **This language is not specifically included in the Updated General Plan. The goal or policy may be addressed in different terms, the action noted may have been completed since the last General Plan Update, or the goal or policy may no longer be needed.**

   **Guide to Abbreviations**

   - AgU—Agricultural Preservation and Land Use Element
   - CC—Community Character Element
   - EDe—Economic Development Element
   - SAF—Safety Element
   - CM—Circulation Element
   - CON—Conservation Element
   - ROS—Recreation and Open Space Element
   - References to "current" are to the 1983 General Plan

### NAPA COUNTY GENERAL PLAN POLICY LOCATION MATRIX

1. **LOCATION IN 1983 GENERAL PLAN**
2. **LOCATION IN UPDATED GENERAL PLAN**
3. **COMMENTS**

   **goal or policy may be addressed in different terms, the action noted may have been completed since the last General Plan Update, or the goal or policy may no longer be needed.**

   **b) Use open space not designated for urban uses on the Land Use Plan Map (Figure 14) to preserve and enhance the unique characteristics of each community in Napa County.**

   **This language is not specifically included in the Updated General Plan. The goal or policy may be addressed in different terms, the action noted may have been completed since the last General Plan Update, or the goal or policy may no longer be needed.**

   **c) Design residential development to reflect natural processes as well as engineering and economic considerations.**

   **This language is not specifically included in the Updated General Plan. The goal or policy may be addressed in different terms, the action noted may have been completed since the last General Plan Update, or the goal or policy may no longer be needed.**

   **d) Preserve open space not designated for urban uses on the Land Use Plan Map (Figure 14) needed to separate conflicting land uses.**

   **This language is not specifically included in the Updated General Plan. The goal or policy may be addressed in different terms, the action noted may have been completed since the last General Plan Update, or**
### Napa County General Plan Policy Location Matrix

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>LOCATION/ITEM IN 1983 GENERAL PLAN</th>
<th>LOCATION IN UPDATED GENERAL PLAN</th>
<th>COMMENTS</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>(a) Foster a sense of outdoor spaciousness for the widest possible range of people, with particular attention to the needs of low-income groups, and persons with limited mobility.</td>
<td>the goal or policy may no longer be needed.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(b) Include the creation and preservation of appropriate open space as an integral part of the planning and development process.</td>
<td>This language is not specifically included in the Updated General Plan. The goal or policy may be addressed in different terms, the action noted may have been completed since the last General Plan Update, or the goal or policy may no longer be needed.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(c) Encourage development that is designed so as to include linkages between the major open space areas.</td>
<td>This language is not specifically included in the Updated General Plan. The goal or policy may be addressed in different terms, the action noted may have been completed since the last General Plan Update, or the goal or policy may no longer be needed.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(d) Encourage the use of agriculture, particularly tree and open field crops, to provide visually pleasing open space.</td>
<td>This language is not specifically included in the Updated General Plan. The goal or policy may be addressed in different terms, the action noted may have been completed since the last General Plan Update, or the goal or policy may no longer be needed.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Guide to Abbreviations**

- CC—Community Character Element
- EDC—Economic Development Element
- SAF—Safety Element
- CM—Circulation Element
- CON—Conservation Element
- ROS—Recreation and Open Space Element

References to "current" use of the 1983 General Plan
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### 3.0 Comments and Responses to Comments

**Napa County General Plan Policy Location Matrix**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Location/Plan in 1983 General Plan</th>
<th>Location in Updated General Plan</th>
<th>Comments</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>hazards. Safety Goal 3: Recognizing that Napa County is an environment in which the natural processes in the county's wild areas, protect homes and businesses from fire and wildlife and minimize potential losses. Safety Goal 4: To protect residents and businesses from hazards caused by flooding. Safety Goal 5: To protect residents and businesses from hazards caused by human activities.</td>
<td>See Draft General Plan page 271, 272 and 274</td>
<td>152-220P</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Goal A/Policies:**

1. Include when necessary a geologic/seismic evaluation as part of required environmental reports.

   - See Policy SAF-8 listed previously in this matrix. See Draft General Plan page 271

3. Require a geologic/seismic report
   - a. When warranted by the results of a geologic/seismic evaluation.
   - b. For new residential developments, roads or highways proposed to be located on parcels which contain identifiable landslide or sinkholes, and
   - c. For all proposed structures and facilities open to the public and serving 100 persons or more.

   - See Policy SAF-8 listed previously in this matrix. See Draft General Plan page 271

   - This language is not specifically included in the

   **Guide to Abbreviations**

   Ab — Agricultural Preservation and Land Use Element
   CC — Community Character Element
   E — Economic Development Element
   SAF — Safety Element
   CIR — Circulation Element
   CON — Conservation Element
   RDS — Recreation and Open Space Element
   References to "current" as to the 1983 General Plan
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**Napa County General Plan Policy Location Matrix**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Location/Plan in 1983 General Plan</th>
<th>Location in Updated General Plan</th>
<th>Comments</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Updated General Plan, the goal or policy may be addressed in different terms, the action noted may have been completed since the last General Plan Update, and the goal or policy may no longer be needed.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

   - This language is not specifically included in the Updated General Plan. The goal or policy may be addressed in different terms, the action noted may have been completed since the last General Plan Update, and the goal or policy may no longer be needed.

5. Encourage the completion of an inventory of existing structures such as schools, etc. and encourage strengthening where needed to improve public safety.

   - This language is not specifically included in the Updated General Plan. The goal or policy may be addressed in different terms, the action noted may have been completed since the last General Plan Update, and the goal or policy may no longer be needed.

6. Identified active faults incorporated in the County's Seismic Safety Plan Element and the immediate adjacent areas, excepting Oak Hill, should be restricted to open space uses such as agriculture, parks, trails, or wildlife habitat.

   - See Policy SAF-8 listed previously in this matrix. See Draft General Plan page 271

7. Development proposals covered in policy 2 to be reviewed by the County Department of Public Works prior to issuance of a building permit.

   - This language is not specifically included in the Updated General Plan. The goal or policy may be addressed in different terms, the action noted may have been completed since the last General Plan Update, and the goal or policy may no longer be needed.

8. Develop a program for on-site inspection of grading

   - This language is not

**Guide to Abbreviations**

Ab — Agricultural Preservation and Land Use Element
CC — Community Character Element
E — Economic Development Element
SAF — Safety Element
CIR — Circulation Element
CON — Conservation Element
RDS — Recreation and Open Space Element
References to "current" as to the 1983 General Plan
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### NAPA COUNTY GENERAL PLAN POLICY LOCATION MATRIX

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>LOCATION/ITEM IN 1985 GENERAL PLAN</th>
<th>LOCATION IN UPDATED GENERAL PLAN</th>
<th>COMMENT</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>work for developments in questionable areas to assure that building planes are not undercut, that proper fill material is carefully placed and compacted.</td>
<td>specifically included in the updated General Plan. The goal or policy may be addressed in different terms, the action noted may have been completed since the last General Plan update, or the goal or policy may no longer be needed.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9. Encourage planting of vegetation on unstable slopes to protect structures at lower elevations. Utilize native plants for landscaping in the hills, to eliminate the need for supplemental watering which can promote earth movement.</td>
<td>Policy SAF-9: As part of the review and approval of development and public works projects, encourage planting of vegetation on unstable slopes where this technique will protect structures at lower elevations and minimize the potential for erosion or landslides. Native plants should be considered for this purpose, since they reduce the need for supplemental watering which can promote earth movement.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10. Study the development of safety standards for all land within a zone subject to inundation or erosion from river-retening structures that might fail as a result of an earthquake.</td>
<td>This language is not specifically included in the updated General Plan. The goal or policy may be addressed in different terms, the action noted may have been completed since the last General Plan update, or the goal or policy may no longer be needed.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11. Rezone open space lands subject to extreme geologic hazards and geologically sensitive lands to the: GR (Geological Risk) Combination District.</td>
<td>This language is not specifically included in the updated General Plan. The goal or policy may be addressed in different terms, the action noted may have been completed since the last General Plan update, or</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Guide to Abbreviations**
- AGDU—Agriculture Preservation and Land Use Element
- CC—Community Character Element
- EID—Economic Development Element
- SAF—Safety Element
- CR—Circulation Element
- CON—Conservation Element
- EOS—Erosion and Open Space Element
- References to “current” are to the 1985 General Plan

### NAPA COUNTY GENERAL PLAN POLICY LOCATION MATRIX

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>LOCATION/ITEM IN 1985 GENERAL PLAN</th>
<th>LOCATION IN UPDATED GENERAL PLAN</th>
<th>COMMENT</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>GOAL:</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Promote intergovernmental cooperation directed towards lessening known hazards and defining uncertain hazards.</td>
<td>Policy SAF-11: The County supports and will promote intergovernmental cooperation to reduce known hazards. See Draft General Plan page 270 and 273. Policy SAF-55: The County will seek to coordinate with State and Federal agencies for use of land and facilities to reduce risks and avoid unreimbursed costs related to emergency preparedness and response.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>POLICIES:</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1. Encourage State and Federal governments to require lending institutions to require earthquake insurance on all residential structures as a condition to the granting of a loan on such properties. The insurance could be included with a broad coverage natural disaster insurance program.</td>
<td>This language is not specifically included in the updated General Plan. The goal or policy may be addressed in different terms, the action noted may have been completed since the last General Plan update, or the goal or policy may no longer be needed.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Encourage the purchase of National Flood Insurance, which also covers damage from mudflows.</td>
<td>This language is not specifically included in the updated General Plan. The goal or policy may be addressed in different terms, the action noted may have been completed since the last General Plan update, or the goal or policy may no longer be needed.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Guide to Abbreviations**
- AGDU—Agriculture Preservation and Land Use Element
- CC—Community Character Element
- EID—Economic Development Element
- SAF—Safety Element
- CR—Circulation Element
- CON—Conservation Element
- EOS—Erosion and Open Space Element
- References to “current” are to the 1985 General Plan
### 3.0 Comments and Responses to Comments

#### Napa County General Plan Policy Location Matrix

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Location Item in 1983 General Plan</th>
<th>Location in Updated General Plan</th>
<th>Comments</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>3. Promote a joint program between all local governmental units in Napa County to employ such additional expertise as needed to provide technical information in regard to seismic hazards, to provide technical assistance, and, over time, to prepare detailed geologic hazard maps of the County for planning purposes.</td>
<td>Policy SAF-2: Individuals and businesses should have access to up-to-date information and be able to make informed decisions about potential safety hazards and the level of risk they are willing to accept. Action Item SAF-2.1: Participate in local, regional and state education programs regarding fire, flood and geologic hazards. Policy SAF-13: The County’s seismic fault maps and applicable state seismic data should be reviewed annually to ensure that they reflect the latest information available. Action Item SAF-13.1: Updated maps should be made available to the public at County offices, on the County’s website, and through other appropriate channels. See also Policy SAF-1 listed previously in this matrix. See Draft General Plan page 220 and 222.</td>
<td>152-223P</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. Assess the potential hazard from the possible rupture or collapse of aboveground tanks holding large quantities of liquids; whether water, wine or petroleum products.</td>
<td>Policy SAF-20: All new development shall comply with established fire safety standards. Design plans shall be referred to the appropriate fire agency for comment as to: 1) Adequacy of water supply, 2) Site design for fire department access in and around structures, 3) Ability for a safe and efficient fire department response, 4) Site specific fire protection. See Draft General Plan page 273.</td>
<td>152-2223P</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. Promote land use, transportation, utility, and flood control policies that would discourage urban development in washlands and drained wetlands in the Southern part of Napa County.</td>
<td>This language is not specifically included in the Updated General Plan. The goal or policy may be readdressed in different terms, the action noted may have been completed since the last General Plan Update, or the goal or policy may no longer be needed.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Guide to Abbreviations**
- AGU—Agricultural Preservation and Land Use Element
- CC—Community Character Element
- EDC—Economic Development Element
- SAF—Safety Element
- CO—Circulation Element
- CON—Conservation Element
- RE—Recreation and Open Space Element
- References to “current” are to the 1983 General Plan.

---

**Napa County General Plan Policy Location Matrix**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Location Item in 1983 General Plan</th>
<th>Location in Updated General Plan</th>
<th>Comments</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>6. Review program proposed in the 1974 California Urban Geology Master Plan for their applicability to Napa County.</td>
<td>This language is not specifically included in the Updated General Plan. The goal or policy may be readdressed in different terms, the action noted may have been completed since the last General Plan Update, or the goal or policy may no longer be needed.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7. Develop a geologic mapping program in cooperation with U.S.G.S., California Division of Mines and Geology and other Federal, State and Regional agencies to identify geologic hazards; including fault zones (both active and inactive), landslides, and landslide-prone areas in Napa County.</td>
<td>See Policy SAF-13 listed previously in this matrix. See Draft General Plan page 272.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8. Encourage the State and Federal governments to develop dam safety programs including the preparation of contingency plans for urbanized areas in the proximity of existing and future dams.</td>
<td>This language is not specifically included in the Updated General Plan. The goal or policy may be readdressed in different terms, the action noted may have been completed since the last General Plan Update, or the goal or policy may no longer be needed.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9. Encourage local governments to develop: a. search and rescue programs, b. emergency communication system, c. emergency services and facilities programs.</td>
<td>This language is not specifically included in the Updated General Plan. The goal or policy may be readdressed in different terms, the action noted may have been completed since the last General Plan Update, or the goal or policy may no longer be needed.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Guide to Abbreviations**
- AGU—Agricultural Preservation and Land Use Element
- CO—Circulation Element
- CC—Community Character Element
- EDC—Economic Development Element
- SAF—Safety Element
- CON—Conservation Element
- RE—Recreation and Open Space Element
- References to “current” are to the 1983 General Plan.
### 3.0 Comments and Responses to Comments

#### Napa County General Plan Policy Location Matrix

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Location/Item in 1983 General Plan</th>
<th>Location in Updated General Plan</th>
<th>Comments</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>10. Encourage implementation of the following procedural recommendations (Joint California Legislative Committee on Seismic Safety, 1972):</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>a. Property Reports, State law (commencing with Section 38580 of the government Code), now permits local jurisdictions to require sellers of property to obtain a residential property report from the city or county prior to the sale of a zoned parcel of residential or single-family residential land or prior to the sale of a residential unit in a residential or single-family residential area. The purpose of the law is to make sure that purchasers are aware of local regulations and special restrictions pertaining to a residence and parcel prior to consummation of a sale. It is recommended that this local option be exercised by the County. Local reports should include in addition to other information available city or county information with respect to geologic and seismic conditions.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>b. Local Agency Formation Commission's charge from the State should be reviewed to make certain that adequate attention is given to seismic safety processes.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>c. Federal Grant and Loan Programs such as those of the HUD that result in a significant amount of construction should be reviewed with respect to seismic safety as well as other geologic hazards.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11. Consider as a part of the County Zoning Ordinance the development of a geologic hazard combined zone.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12. Consider requiring dynamic analysis of design.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

#### Guide to Abbreviations

- AgUI—Agricultural Preservation and Land Use Element
- CC—Community Character Element
- E—Economic Development Element
- SAT—Safety Element
- Circulation Element
- Conservation Element
- ROG—Recreation and Open Space Element
- References to “current” use to the 1983 General Plan

---

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Location/Item in 1983 General Plan</th>
<th>Location in Updated General Plan</th>
<th>Comments</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>specifications and plans for proposed buildings.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Goal C: Participate in public education programs.</td>
<td>See Policy SAP-2 and Action Item SAP-2.1 listed previously in this matrix. See Draft General Plan page 279.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Goal C Policies: 1. Prepare written materials to inform the general public, developers and home builders of potential seismic problems in Napa County.</td>
<td>See Action Item SAP-3.1 listed previously in this matrix. See Draft General Plan page 276.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### 3.0 COMMENTS AND RESPONSES TO COMMENTS

#### NAPA COUNTY GENERAL PLAN POLICY LOCATION MATRIX

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>LOCATION/TIME IN 1983 GENERAL PLAN</th>
<th>LOCATION IN UPDATED GENERAL PLAN</th>
<th>COMMENTS</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2. Encourage schools to teach first aid as a required subject, to prepare students for emergency/hazard situations.</td>
<td></td>
<td>This language is not specifically included in the updated General Plan. The goal or policy may be addressed in different terms, the action noted may have been completed since the last General Plan update, or the goal or policy may no longer be needed.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Goal:**

- **Goal A:** Combine safety considerations into the planning process in order to reduce the loss of life, injuries, damage to property and economic and social dislocation resulting from fire, flood, geologic and other hazards.
  - See Safety Goal I listed previously in this matrix.
  - See Draft General Plan page 270.

- **Goal B:** Promote intergovernmental cooperation directed towards implementing known hazards and defining uncertain hazards over the next 5 to 12 years.
  - See Policy SAF-11 and Policy SAF-15 listed previously in this matrix.
  - See Draft General Plan page 270 and 275.

- **Goal C:** Participate in local, regional and state education programs regarding fire, flood and geologic hazards.
  - See Policy SAF-11 and Policy SAF-15 listed previously in this matrix.
  - See Draft General Plan page 270 and 275.

- **Goal D:** Provide intergovernmental cooperation directed towards providing for a continuing high level of public services and coordination of services during a disaster.
  - See Policy SAF-33 listed previously in this matrix.

#### Guide to Abbreviations

- AGUL—Agricultural Preservation and Land Use Element
- CC—Community Character Element
- E—Economic Development Element
- SAF—Safety Element
- CHC—Circulation Element
- CON—Conservation Element
- ROS—Recreation and Open Space Element
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**NAPA COUNTY GENERAL PLAN POLICY LOCATION MATRIX**

**Policies**

**Fire Hazards**

1. Adopt standards to restrict urban development in high wildfire hazard areas as identified by the Fire Hazard Severity Scale.
   - Policy SAF-16: Compliant with building and the codes development in high wildfire hazard areas are designed to minimize hazards to life and property.
   - Action Item SAF-16-1: Develop site criteria and construction standards for development in high fire hazard areas, and adopt standards to restrict urban development (as defined in the Land Use Element) in high wildfire hazard areas unless adequate fire services are provided.
   - Action Item SAF-16-2: Continue to implement “Napa Forester” through information and education programs, community outreach, and fuel modification.

2. Develop a prescribed-fuel management program (including prescribed burn) for managing the hazardous areas, to reduce wildfire hazard, improve watershed capabilities, promote wildlife habitat diversification and improve grazing.
   - Policy SAF-17: The County supports the use of prescribed-fuel management programs, including prescribed burns and brush clearing, for managing the hazardous areas, to reduce wildfire hazard, improve watershed capabilities, promote wildlife habitat diversification and improve grazing.
   - See also Action Item SAF-16-1.
   - See Draft General Plan page 272.
   - See Draft General Plan page 273.

3. Adapt regulations for clearance around structures, minimum road widths, evacuation routes and maximum road grades.
   - See Policy SAF-16 listed previously in this matrix.
   - See Draft General Plan page 275.

4. Develop stringent site criteria and construction standards for construction in high fire hazard areas and prohibit
   - See Policy SAF-16 listed previously in this matrix.
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### Napa County General Plan Policy Location Matrix

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Location/Item in 1983 General Plan</th>
<th>Location in Updated General Plan</th>
<th>Comments</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>3.0-1471</td>
<td></td>
<td>See Draft General Plan page 272</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. Develop a countywide fuel break program to separate wildland fire hazard areas, provide access for fire suppression equipment, and improve safety of firefighters.</td>
<td>See Action item SAF-16.3 listed previously in this matrix. See Draft General Plan page 272</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. Support a cooperative program to be started between the insurance providers and all agencies involved with the wildlife problem, whereby financial incentives can be gained by homeowners and developers through either tax rebates or reduced insurance costs.</td>
<td>This language is not specifically included in the Updated General Plan. The goal or policy may or may no longer be needed.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7. Support the State requiring property owners to comply with recommended fire standards before any low cost emergency loans are approved to rebuild in hazardous wildland areas.</td>
<td>This language is not specifically included in the Updated General Plan. The goal or policy may or may no longer be needed.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8. Recommend changes in existing law to require the Real Estate community to notify the proper parties in all real estate transactions of the inherent dangers when moving into a hazardous fire area as part of the full disclosure notification.</td>
<td>This language is not specifically included in the Updated General Plan. The goal or policy may or may no longer be needed.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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### Napa County General Plan Policy Location Matrix

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Location/Item in 1983 General Plan</th>
<th>Location in Updated General Plan</th>
<th>Comments</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>9. Support the location of a State Conservation Camp in Napa County and the use of local jail inmates to provide people for fuel breaks and fire prevention.</td>
<td>Been completed since the last General Plan Update, or the goal or policy may no longer be needed.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10. Work with local agencies and 4H to develop a program of fire reduction by animal grazing on a rotational/seasonal basis.</td>
<td>This language is not specifically included in the Updated General Plan. The goal or policy may or may no longer be needed.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11. Remove open space lands subject to high fire risk to the 37F (Fire Risk) Combination District.</td>
<td>This language is not specifically included in the Updated General Plan. The goal or policy may or may no longer be needed.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Guide to Abbreviations**

- APLU—Agricultural Preservation and Land Use Element
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### 3.0 COMMENTS AND RESPONSES TO COMMENTS

#### NAPA COUNTY GENERAL PLAN POLICY LOCATION MATRIX

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Location/Item in 1983 General Plan</th>
<th>Location in Updated General Plan</th>
<th>Comments</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. Amend the Uniform Building Code to regulate the design and construction of buildings in those flood hazard areas designated by fire officials in accordance with 'Fire Safe' standards.</td>
<td>✓ See Policy SAF-20 listed previously in this matrix. See Draft General Plan page 273</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Adopt the Uniform Fire Code to establish Fire Protection standards.</td>
<td>This language is not specifically included in the Updated General Plan. The goal or policy may be addressed in different terms. The action noted may have been completed since the last General Plan Update, or the goal or policy may no longer be needed.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Require all new development and existing development to comply with established fire safety standards.</td>
<td>✓ See Policy SAF-20 listed previously in this matrix. See Draft General Plan page 273</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. Direct the County Counsel, in cooperation with the Conservation, Development and Planning Department and County Engineer to investigate the feasibility of the mandatory occupancy reductions for identified fire hazardous buildings.</td>
<td>This language is not specifically included in the Updated General Plan. The goal or policy may be addressed in different terms. The action noted may have been completed since the last General Plan Update, or the goal or policy may no longer be needed.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. Study feasibility of requiring mandatory fire inspections of residences at time of sale.</td>
<td>This language is not specifically included in the</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Guide to Abbreviations**
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**NAPA COUNTY GENERAL PLAN POLICY LOCATION MATRIX**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Location/Item in 1983 General Plan</th>
<th>Location in Updated General Plan</th>
<th>Comments</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>6. Advocate and support efforts for local resolution for federal review of internal Revenue Service regulations to limit utilization of accelerated depreciation schedules, as they apply to substandard buildings.</td>
<td>This language is not specifically included in the Updated General Plan. The goal or policy may be addressed in different terms. The action noted may have been completed since the last General Plan Update, or the goal or policy may no longer be needed.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7. Advocate legislation providing for tax incentives on building improvements to encourage the repair or demolition of fire hazardous buildings.</td>
<td>This language is not specifically included in the Updated General Plan. The goal or policy may be addressed in different terms. The action noted may have been completed since the last General Plan Update, or the goal or policy may no longer be needed.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8. Adopt a County Ordinance requiring the preparation of disaster response plans for buildings over 3 stories and 100 feet tall, indoor public assembly facilities, and facilities housing dependent populations to include: (a) response plans prepared by building management personnel and submitted to county building officials and emergency response agencies for review.</td>
<td>This language is not specifically included in the Updated General Plan. The goal or policy may be addressed in different terms. The action noted may have been completed since the last General Plan Update, or the goal or policy may no longer be needed.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Guide to Abbreviations**
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- CS—Circulation Element
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### 3.0 Comments and Responses to Comments

#### Napa County General Plan Policy Location Matrix

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Location/Plan in 1983 General Plan</th>
<th>Location in Updated General Plan</th>
<th>Comments</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>(b) Building security personnel trained in disaster response functions designed to support the efforts of police and fire agencies.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9. Direct County fire officials to expand fire education programs.</td>
<td></td>
<td>See Action item SAF-16.2 listed previously in this matrix.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10. Advocate by fiscal resolution revisions in the State Penal Code to impose criminal liability on property owners for fires resulting from identified and uncorrected fire hazards.</td>
<td></td>
<td>This language is not specifically included in the Updated General Plan. The goal or policy may be addressed in different forms, the action noted may have been completed since the last General Plan Update, or the goal or policy may no longer be needed.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

#### Research to Reduce Fire Losses

1. Encourage continued research in the field of the safety of. | Policy SAF-19: The County supports the development and use of new technology in the suppression and prevention of fires. | |
2. Strengthen existing codes and ordinances pertaining to fire hazards. | | |

#### Geologic Hazards

1. Proposed extensions of urban or rural land uses, including but not limited to new residential developments, roads or highways and all structures proposed to be open to the public and serving 50 persons or more, into areas characterized by (1) slopes over 15 percent, (2) identified landslides, (3) former marshlands and (4) fault zones should be evaluated with regard to the safety hazard prior to land use decisions such as General Plan amendments, rezone, or project approvals. | Policy SAF-10: No extensive grading shall be permitted on slopes over 15 percent where landslides or other geologic hazards are present unless the hazard is eliminated or reduced to a safe level. | See Policy SAF-19 listed previously in this matrix. See Draft General Plan page 273 |
2. No extensive grading shall be permitted on slopes over 15 percent where landslides or other geologic hazards are present as identified on Napa County’s Environmental Sensitivity Maps or would exist following construction unless the hazard is eliminated or reduced to a safe level as evidenced by engineered plans submitted to and approved by the County Public Works Department. | | |
3. Lots on hillsides formed for resale as lots, rather than as part of a subdivision development, should be large enough to provide flexibility in finding a stable buildable site and driveway location of a future time. | Policy SAF-11: Newly created hillside parcels should be large enough to provide flexibility in finding a stable buildable site and driveway location. | See Draft General Plan page 271 |
4. The County should not accept dedication of roads (a) on or jeopardized by landslides, (b) in hilly areas or (c) in areas subject to liquefaction, subsidence or settlement, which, in the opinion of the Public Works Department, would require an excessive degree of maintenance and repair costs. | Policy SAF-12: The County shall not accept dedication of roads (a) on or jeopardized by landslides, (b) in hilly areas or (c) in areas subject to liquefaction, subsidence or settlement, which, in the opinion of the Public Works Department, would require an excessive degree of maintenance and repair costs. | See Draft General Plan page 271 |
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### 3.0 Comments and Responses to Comments

#### Napa County General Plan Policy Location Matrix

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Location/ determination in 1983 General Plan</th>
<th>Location in Updated General Plan</th>
<th>Comments</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>3. The Building Inspection Division should analyze its slope failure records and, based on its findings, should recommend any needed improvements in the grading ordinance.</td>
<td>This language is not specifically included in the Updated General Plan. The goal or policy may be addressed in different terms, the action noted may have been completed since the last General Plan Update, or the goal or policy may no longer be needed.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. Urban development in reclaimed wetlands should be discouraged.</td>
<td>This language is not specifically included in the Updated General Plan. The goal or policy may be addressed in different terms, the action noted may have been completed since the last General Plan Update, or the goal or policy may no longer be needed.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7. Rezone open space lands subject to extreme geologic hazards and geologically sensitive lands to the Geologic Hillside Conservation District.</td>
<td>This language is not specifically included in the Updated General Plan. The goal or policy may be addressed in different terms, the action noted may have been completed since the last General Plan Update, or the goal or policy may no longer be needed.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Flood Hazards</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1. A uniform set of flood damage prevention standards should be established by the cooperative efforts of all County, State and Federal Agencies with responsibilities for flood control.</td>
<td>This language is not specifically included in the Updated General Plan. The goal or policy may be addressed in different terms, the action noted may have been completed since the last General Plan Update, or the goal or policy may no longer be needed.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Guide to Abbreviations**

- ARI—Agricultural Resource and Land Use Element
- COAC—Conservation Element
- EDC—Economic Development Element
- SAF—Safety Element
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<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Location/ determination in 1983 General Plan</th>
<th>Location in Updated General Plan</th>
<th>Comments</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Road control works and development in flood-prone areas in Napa County.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Road control works and development in flood-prone areas in Napa County.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. The unincorporated areas of the County which are subject to the provisions of the Flood Insurance Program (Ordinance 1697—Flood Plain Management) provides that new development will be safe from one percent flooding occurrence. This is done by reservation from constructing in designated floodways and requiring new construction in the flood plains to be above the 100-year flood elevation.</td>
<td>Policy SAF-25: New construction in flood plains shall be placed above the 100-year flood elevation.</td>
<td>See Draft General Plan page 104 for details.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Planning Department and Flood Control District review of any significant project proposed for areas in the County which are not presently in Flood Zones should include an evaluation of the potential flood impacts that may result from the project.</td>
<td>Policy SAF-24: The review of new proposed projects should include an evaluation of the potential flood impacts that may result from the project.</td>
<td>See Draft General Plan page 104 for details.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. In order to protect lives and property, intensive urban and suburban development should not be permitted in wetland areas unless flood protection in such areas is constructed to the standards of the Federal Disaster Protection Act of 1973.</td>
<td>This language is not specifically included in the Updated General Plan. The goal or policy may be addressed in different terms, the action noted may have been completed since the last General Plan Update, or the goal or policy may no longer be needed.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. The County Flood Control District should proceed with drainage improvements in areas subject to flooding from inadequate facilities, and insure that additional new drainage facilities, including road culverts and bridges, are constructed to the standards of the Federal Disaster Protection Act of 1973.</td>
<td>This language is not specifically included in the Updated General Plan. The goal or policy may be</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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### 3.0 COMMENTS AND RESPONSES TO COMMENTS

#### NAPA COUNTY GENERAL PLAN POLICY LOCATION MATRIX

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>LOCATION IN 1983 GENERAL PLAN</th>
<th>LOCATION IN UPDATED GENERAL PLAN</th>
<th>COMMENTS</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>designed to pass the flow specified in the Napa County Ordinance Code.</td>
<td>addressed in different forms, the action noted may have been completed since the last General Plan update, or the goal or policy may no longer be needed.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. Development proposals should be reviewed with reference to the dam failure inundation maps in order to determine evacuation routes.</td>
<td>Policy EMF-26: Development proposals should be reviewed with reference to the dam failure inundation maps in order to determine evacuation routes.</td>
<td>Zec Draft General Plan page 274</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7. The County will protect the public interest in drainage systems and water impoundments from sedimentation, siltation and contamination and ensure that urban, agricultural and resource development projects utilize sound short-term and long-term erosion control measures.</td>
<td>This language is not specifically included in the Updated General Plan. The goal or policy may be addressed in different forms, the action noted may have been completed since the last General Plan update, or the goal or policy may no longer be needed.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

#### Electromagnetic Field (EMF) Hazards

1. The County will adopt EMF exposure standards based on the federal, state, and scientific standards/guidelines that presently exist. These standards shall be periodically reviewed in light of the standards/guidelines henceforth promulgated by these other organizations and amended as necessary. | Policy SAF-27: New residential development should be designed to reduce exposure of residents to electromagnetic fields (EMF) produced by high-voltage power lines to acceptable levels. Residential development (and other sensitive land uses such as schools, hospitals, child care sites) that would expose persons to excessive EMF should generally not be permitted. | See Draft General Plan page 274 |

2. Construction of facilities that are capable of producing EMF levels that exceed the County's adopted EMF standards of any property line, in a structure designed for human occupancy, or in an outdoor area regularly utilized by people shall not be allowed. | | See Policy SAF-27 listed previously in this matrix. |

Guide to Abbreviations
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### NAPA COUNTY GENERAL PLAN POLICY LOCATION MATRIX

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>LOCATION IN 1983 GENERAL PLAN</th>
<th>LOCATION IN UPDATED GENERAL PLAN</th>
<th>COMMENTS</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>3. Construction of new structures designed for human occupancy and development of outdoor facilities used on a regular basis by people should be discouraged in areas where expected EMF exposures exceed the County’s adopted EMF standards.</td>
<td></td>
<td>See Policy SAF-27 listed previously in this matrix. See Draft General Plan page 274</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

#### Transportation Hazards

1. The following evacuation routes should be used in a state of disaster as one-way routes with isolated exits made to keep traffic moving (see also Figure 109):
   - a. SR 12, one way “West to East,” Napa Sonoma County line to junction of Old Sonoma Road. One way “West to East” on Old Sonoma Road to holding area (Bridgeview Jr. High School).
   - b. SR 29, one way “South to North,” Napa Sonoma County line to Calistoga from SR 128 Calistoga to Sonoma County. (Maximum capacity, 800 vehicles per hour).
   - c. SR 29, one way “South to North,” Napa Sonoma County line to Imola Traffic Signals. Route N 1 ½ north on SR 121 to Junction Frances Road and Shenandoah Trail, north on Shenandoah Trail to Junction of SR 29 at Calistoga north on SR 29 to Lake County. (Maximum capacity 750 vehicles per hour).
   - d. SR 29, one way “South to North,” Napa Sonoma County line to Outh Traffic Signals. Route N 1 ½ north on SR 121 to Junction Frances Road and Shenandoah Trail, north on Shenandoah Trail to Junction of SR 29 at Calistoga north on SR 29 to Lake County. (Maximum capacity 750 vehicles per hour).
2. State and federal agencies with responsibilities for regulating the transportation of hazardous materials should be requested to review regulations and procedures, in cooperation with the County, to determine means of mitigating the public safety hazard in Napa County. | This language is not specifically included in the Updated General Plan. The goal or policy may be addressed in different forms, the action noted may have been completed since the last General Plan update, or the goal or policy may no longer be needed. | |
3. When an emergency occurs in the transportation of hazardous materials, the County Office of Emergency | This language is not specifically included in the | |
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### 3.0 Comments and Responses to Comments

**Napa County General Plan Policy Location Matrix**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>LOCATION IN 1983 General Plan</th>
<th>LOCATION IN UPDATED GENERAL PLAN</th>
<th>COMMENTS</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Services should be notified as soon as possible.</td>
<td></td>
<td>Updated General Plan. The goal or policy may be addressed in different terms, the action noted may have been completed since the last General Plan update, or the goal or policy may no longer be needed.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. Industry should be encouraged to utilize underground pipelines, rail, and water transportation of hazardous materials to the greatest extent feasible to take advantage of the greater separation from the general public provided by these modes of transportation.</td>
<td></td>
<td>This language is not specifically included in the Updated General Plan. The goal or policy may be addressed in different terms, the action noted may have been completed since the last General Plan update, or the goal or policy may no longer be needed.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. The County shall cooperate with other local jurisdictions to develop intra-county evacuation routes to be used in the event of a disaster within Napa County.</td>
<td></td>
<td>Policy SAF-5: The County shall cooperate with other local jurisdictions to develop intra-county evacuation routes to be used in the event of a disaster within Napa County. See Draft General Plan page 371.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Emergency Water Supplies**

1. Update documentation and evaluation of emergency water supplies in the Napa Valley and in places such as Gordon Valley, Wooden Valley and Lake Berryessa areas, which might receive evacuees from other areas. | | This language is not specifically included in the Updated General Plan. The goal or policy may be addressed in different terms, the action noted may have been completed since the last General Plan update, or the goal or policy may no longer be needed. |

2. Adapt fundamental principles that can ensure a sanitary | | This language is not specifically included in the Updated General Plan. The goal or policy may be addressed in different terms, the action noted may have been completed since the last General Plan update, or the goal or policy may no longer be needed. |

---
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- ApLU—Agricultural Preservation and Land Use Element
- CC—Community Character Element
- ES—Economic Development Element
- SAF—Soil safety Element
- CR—Circulation Element
- CO—Conservation Element
- RO—Recreation and Open Space Element

References to "current" are to the 1983 General Plan.
### NAPA COUNTY GENERAL PLAN POLICY LOCATION MATRIX

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>LOCATION/ITEM IN 1983 GENERAL PLAN</th>
<th>LOCATION/ITEM IN UPDATED GENERAL PLAN</th>
<th>COMMENTS</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Of contaminated water will not reach the well. This following minimum distances (recommended by the California Department of Water Resources, 1981) are typical of good practice:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sewers, water line, electric line, or private utility —— 50 feet</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Subsurface sewage leaching field —— 100 feet</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Barnyards, feedlots and animal holding areas should be down slope from the well and at least 100 to 200 feet away, depending upon drainage conditions.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

3. Select wells as sources of emergency supply that are accessible at all times of the year. Some irrigation wells along unpaved roads may be relaively inaccessible, particularly following a prolonged period of rain, but would otherwise be acceptable sources of supply. Such wells should not necessarily be excluded from consideration, for if high pressure lines, portable irrigation pumps, or steel pipelines are available, water can be transmitted from these wells to more convenient locations. **This language is not specifically included in the updated General Plan. The goal or policy may be addressed in different terms, the action noted may have been completed since the last General Plan Update, or the goal or policy may no longer be needed.**

4. Select well water for emergency domestic use that does not contain bacteria or dissolved substances in sufficient concentration, or emit radiation at a sufficient rate to be harmful to human body. In Napa Valley, water from most deep wells seems to meet this requirement. **This language is not specifically included in the updated General Plan. The goal or policy may be addressed in different terms, the action noted may have been completed since the last General Plan Update, or the goal or policy may no longer be needed.**

5. Equip wells for emergency use with internal combustion engines as a source of alternate power. Electrical power will probably fail following some types of disasters. These wells pumped by electrically operated turbines may also be made serviceable by changing the pump heads to permit operation of the turbine by either belt-drive or direct-drive internal combustion engines, such as those that power tractors. Any pump powered by electricity may be made operable by connecting a portable generating plant of appropriate size and capacity to the pump motor. **See Draft General Plan page 276.**

---

### Guide to Abbreviations
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- CCN: Conservation and Open Space Element
- References to "Current" are to the 1983 General Plan
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### 3.0 Comments and Responses to Comments

#### Napa County General Plan Policy Location Matrix

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Location Item in 1983 General Plan</th>
<th>Location in Updated General Plan</th>
<th>Comments</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>1. Improve the County's emergency services program with authorization to review and expedite implementation of appropriate federal, state, regional and local disaster recovery programs to include but not be limited to:</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td>See Draft General Plan page 276</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- improvement of potential mass care facilities, hospital reserve disaster inventory modules, packaged disaster hospitals, disaster assistance centers, multi-purpose staging areas, emergency water, food and medical supplies, instruction location and emergency operating centers.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Objectives of the program shall be part of the management philosophy of the county. Included in such a program shall be policies:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>a. To coordinate structural hazards inspection program and establish for the county's board of supervisors the necessary criteria for mitigation of hazards.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>b. To provide a basis for control and direction of emergency operations.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>c. To release disaster information in concurrence with other county boards of supervisors during or immediately after a disaster.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>d. To provide for the continuity of government in the event of a geologic disaster.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>e. To coordinate, repair and restore essential systems and services as required in an emergency.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>f. To provide for the protection, use and distribution of remaining resources as well as surplus property available from the federal government for local government use.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>2. Improve emergency service coverage for:</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>a. Reviewing and if appropriate, adopting the recommendations of the Division of Medical Science of the National Academy of Sciences and the National Highway Safety Bureau - Department of Transportation to serve as guidelines for improving existing emergency service coverage.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>b. Continued: the electronic dispatch system to handle</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Guide to Abbreviations</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AgP—Agriculture Preservation and Land Use Element</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CC—Community Character Element</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ED—Economic Development Element</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SAF—Safety Element</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CR—Cultural Resource Element</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CO—Conservation Element</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>R—Recreation and Open Space Element</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>References to “current” are to the 1983 General Plan</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DRAFT—Subject to Revision</td>
<td></td>
<td>Page 115 of 130</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Napa County General Plan Policy Location Matrix</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td>April 2, 2007</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

---

### Napa County General Plan Policy Location Matrix

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Location Item in 1983 General Plan</th>
<th>Location in Updated General Plan</th>
<th>Comments</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>1. Continue to effectuate improved station distribution, manpower and equipment by:</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>a. Considering feasibility of establishing countywide fire administration to coordinate the limited physical and manpower resources of the area.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>b. Establishing coordination between adjoining Counties to ensure compatible station distribution without gaps in service areas of stations located unnecessarily close to one another along county lines.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>2. Improve organization and financing by:</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>a. Encouraging feasibility studies of an area-wide approach to financing fire protection to more effectively cope with problems of Proposition 13.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>b. Recommending initiation of program targeting for each agency providing fire protection, either under the present local fire organizations or under a recommended area-wide organization.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>c. Requiring mandatory referral to fire officials for proposed development sites and design plans for comment as to:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1. Adequacy of water supply in relation to stand</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>This language is not specifically included in the Updated General Plan. The goal or policy may be addressed in different terms. The action noted may have been completed since the last General Plan Update, or the goal or policy may no longer be needed.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

---

### Rate of Development

- Policy SAF-39: The County’s emergency services program shall be authorized to review and expedite implementation of appropriate federal, state, regional, and local disaster recovery programs. This may include but not be limited to:
  - Preparation of potential hazards orders.
  - Hospital reserve disaster inventory modules.
  - Packaged disaster hospitals.
  - Disaster assistance centers.
  - Multi-purpose staging areas.
  - Emergency water, food and medical supplies.
  - Instruction location and emergency operating centers.
### 3.0 COMMENTS AND RESPONSES TO COMMENTS

#### NAPA COUNTY GENERAL PLAN POLICY LOCATION MATRIX.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>LOCATION/THEME IN 1983 GENERAL PLAN</th>
<th>LOCATION IN URBAN GENERAL PLAN</th>
<th>COMMENT</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>pipes, pipe size, pressure and system layout. (2) Site design for ability to move firemen and equipment in and around buildings. (3) Location for ability to safely and effectively move fire equipment and rescue vehicles to the site.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C. Continue Hospital Safety Planning</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1. Continue studies of existing hospital facilities for the adequacy of their earthquake resilience not only in relation to their structural design but also the geotechnical stability or seismological vulnerability of the site.</td>
<td>See Policy SAF-40 listed previously in this matrix. See Draft General Plan page 276.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Prevent the construction of vital critical facilities in areas of potentially hazardous ground movement, and encourage elimination or rehabilitation of all existing critical hospital facilities which have not been designed to be earthquake resistant.</td>
<td>This language is not specifically included in the Updated General Plan. The goal or policy may be addressed in different terms, the action noted may have been completed since the last General Plan Update, or the goal or policy may no longer be needed.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Provide an extra measure of earthquake resilience and a damage control of critical facilities, specifically included in the Updated General Plan. The goal or policy may be addressed in different terms, the action noted may have been completed since the last General Plan Update, or the goal or policy may no longer be needed.</td>
<td>This language is not specifically included in the Updated General Plan. The goal or policy may be addressed in different terms, the action noted may have been completed since the last General Plan Update, or the goal or policy may no longer be needed.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
| D. Improve Mental Health Component of Disaster Program | | Guide to Abbreviations:  
Agri—Agricultural Preservation and Land Use Element  
CC—Community Character Element  
E—Economic Development Element  
SAF—Safety Element  
CD—Circulation Element  
CON—Conservation Element  
Rec—Recreation and Open Space Element  
References to "current" site to the 1983 General Plan  |
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#### NAPA COUNTY GENERAL PLAN POLICY LOCATION MATRIX.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>LOCATION/THEME IN 1983 GENERAL PLAN</th>
<th>LOCATION IN URBAN GENERAL PLAN</th>
<th>COMMENT</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. Continue active involvement of mental health professionals on the County's Emergency Medical Services Committee. Policy SAF-42: Mental health concepts and programs should be considered in any updates to the County's Emergency Services planning process, and the County shall seek to identify trained adults and other persons who may require special assistance in emergency situations. To the extent the County is aware of special needs populations requiring special assistance following a disaster, responders should be aware of those populations and implement programs to reach out to these persons.</td>
<td>See Draft General Plan page 277</td>
<td>152-238P</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Incorporate mental health concepts and programs in the County's Emergency Services planning process.</td>
<td>See Policy SAF-42 listed previously in this matrix. See Draft General Plan page 277</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
| E. Improve Emergency Housing Capacities | | Guide to Abbreviations:  
Agri—Agricultural Preservation and Land Use Element  
CC—Community Character Element  
E—Economic Development Element  
SAF—Safety Element  
CD—Circulation Element  
CON—Conservation Element  
Rec—Recreation and Open Space Element  
References to "current" site to the 1983 General Plan  |
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County of Napa  
Napa County General Plan Update  
December 2007  
Final Environmental Impact Report  
Page 3.0-1479
### 3.0 Comments and Responses to Comments

#### Napa County General Plan Policy Location Matrix

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Location Item in 1983 General Plan</th>
<th>Location in Updated General Plan</th>
<th>Comments</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>3. Support state and federal legislation designed to amend tax laws that currently result in inequitable financial impact on victims of disasters.</td>
<td></td>
<td>This language is not specifically included in the Updated General Plan. The goal or policy may be addressed in different terms, the action noted may have been completed since the last General Plan Update, or the goal or policy may no longer be needed.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1. Implement the 911 dial system by October, 1983.</td>
<td></td>
<td>This language is not specifically included in the Updated General Plan. The goal or policy may be addressed in different terms, the action noted may have been completed since the last General Plan Update, or the goal or policy may no longer be needed.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Consider the eventual establishment of one central communication headquarters and emergency operating center with a backup for disasters. The center would receive all alarms by telephone, alarm box, private systems and radio and would serve as the dispatch and communications headquarters for the area. The backup center would have earthquake-proof emergency power sources and construction.</td>
<td></td>
<td>This language is not specifically included in the Updated General Plan. The goal or policy may be addressed in different terms, the action noted may have been completed since the last General Plan Update, or the goal or policy may no longer be needed.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

#### Guide to Abbreviations
- AGU—Agricultural Preservation and Land Use Element
- CIR—Circulation Element
- CC—Community Character Element
- EED—Economic Development Element
- SAE—Safety Element
- GSO—Recreation and Open Space Element
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### Napa County General Plan Policy Location Matrix

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Location Item in 1983 General Plan</th>
<th>Location in Updated General Plan</th>
<th>Comments</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>3. Develop adhesive backed tags to disseminate telephone numbers for emergency fire and police services and radio frequencies in times of disasters.</td>
<td></td>
<td>This language is not specifically included in the Updated General Plan. The goal or policy may be addressed in different terms, the action noted may have been completed since the last General Plan Update, or the goal or policy may no longer be needed.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Ensure implementation and updating</td>
<td></td>
<td>This language is not specifically included in the Updated General Plan. The goal or policy may be addressed in different terms, the action noted may have been completed since the last General Plan Update, or the goal or policy may no longer be needed.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1. Upon adoption of this element, the county should establish a safety review committee to oversee the implementation of this element. This committee should be composed of the Director of the Conservation, Development and Planning Department, the Building Codes Administrator, the Director of Public Works and the Director of the Office of Emergency Services and at least one representative from police and fire protection service agencies.</td>
<td></td>
<td>This language is not specifically included in the Updated General Plan. The goal or policy may be addressed in different terms, the action noted may have been completed since the last General Plan Update, or the goal or policy may no longer be needed.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The Safety Element should be reviewed by the Conservation Development and Planning Department annually and should be comprehensively revised every five years or whenever substantially new scientific evidence or interpretations becomes available.</td>
<td></td>
<td>This language is not specifically included in the Updated General Plan. The goal or policy may be addressed in different terms, the action noted may have been completed since the last General Plan Update, or the goal or policy may no longer be needed.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The Napa Office of Emergency Services shall continue to update the Napa Emergency Plan of 1973 annually and review the Plan every four years.</td>
<td></td>
<td>This language is not specifically included in the Updated General Plan. The goal or policy may be addressed in different terms, the action noted may have been completed since the last General Plan Update, or the goal or policy may no longer be needed.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

#### Guide to Abbreviations
- AGU—Agricultural Preservation and Land Use Element
- CIR—Circulation Element
- CC—Community Character Element
- EED—Economic Development Element
- SAE—Safety Element
- GSO—Recreation and Open Space Element
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## 3.0 Comments and Responses to Comments

### Napa County General Plan Policy Location Matrix

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>LOCATION IN 1985 GENERAL PLAN</th>
<th>LOCATION IN UPDATED GENERAL PLAN</th>
<th>COMMENTS</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>good or policy may be addressed in different terms, the action noted may have been completed since the last General Plan Update, or the goal or policy may no longer be needed.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### County of Napa

#### Goal:
It shall be the goal of Napa County to have a circulation system and patterns of land use developed in a manner which minimizes the impacts of noise pollution from railroads, highways, industry, agricultural uses, airports, recreation areas, and to conduct its land use planning and development in such a manner as to minimize activities producing unacceptable noise pollution.

#### Policies:

1. Establish noise standards for future transportation facilities that meet the minimum standards required for the public health, welfare and safety.

   - Policy CC-40: Noise created by the construction of new transportation noise sources (such as new roadways or new rail services) shall be mitigated so as not to exceed maximum acceptable outdoor or indoor noise levels for existing noise-sensitive land uses. Mitigation may include the retrofitting of existing buildings with noise insulation to maintain interior quiet.

2. Enforce land use policies that discourage the construction of urban residential development and other noise-sensitive activities where noise levels are clearly unacceptable, such as near railroads, highways, industry, agricultural uses, airports and recreation areas.

3. Minimize future noise impacts in currently quiet areas.

   - Policy CC-38: The County shall require that appropriate noise mitigation measures be included when new residential developments are to be built in close proximity to significant noise sources.

4. Require noise mitigation measures to be included when new residential developments are to be built in close proximity to significant noise sources and develop an equitable system to allocate noise mitigation costs.

5. Require that environmental assessment documents for new projects include an analysis of existing and anticipated noise impacts if such are likely to impact on or be produced by the project(s).

6. Cooperate with the County’s cities to resolve mutual noise problems, such as by developing a uniform noise abatement ordinance and unified enforcement procedure.

7. Keep the Noise Element current with changing conditions and standards.

8. Inform prospective residents of agricultural-related noises.

---

**Guidelines to Abbreviations**

- AgAU—Agricultural Preservation and Land Use Element
- CC—Community Character Element
- C—Circulation Element
- e—Economic Development Element
- IM—Safety Element
- R—Recreation and Open Space Element
- S—Sustainability Element
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**Napa County General Plan Policy Location Matrix**

#### Updated General Plan.

The goal or policy may be addressed in different terms, the action noted may have been completed since the last General Plan Update, or the goal or policy may no longer be needed.

---

**Napa County General Plan Update**

**Final Environmental Impact Report**
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3.0-1481
### NAPA COUNTY GENERAL PLAN POLICY LOCATION MATRIX

**3.0 COMMENTS AND RESPONSES TO COMMENTS**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Location (new in 1983 General Plan)</th>
<th>Location in Updated General Plan</th>
<th>Comments</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>3.0-1482</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

- **3.0** Comments and Responses to Comments

- **Comments**
  - **New in 1983 General Plan**
  - **Location in Updated General Plan**
  - **Comments**

- **Policy CC-30:** The following are the County’s standards for acceptable outdoor noise levels for various types of land uses. The standards in this Policy shall be used in combination with the guidelines in Policy CC-37 to determine the compatibility of a proposed land use with existing or projected noise levels.

  - **a)** For the purposes of implementing this policy, standards for residential uses shall be measured at the housing unit in areas subject to noise levels in excess of the stated levels shown above.
  - **b)** Industrial noise limits are intended primarily for use at the boundaries of industrial areas rather than for noise reduction of the industrial use.
  - **c)** Where projected noise levels for a given location are not included in this element, site-specific noise modeling may need to be conducted in order to apply the County’s noise policies.

  - **Policy CC-36:** The following are the County’s standards for acceptable indoor noise levels for various types of land uses. New uses shall incorporate design features to ensure that these standards are met, based on the compatibility with the existing conditions.

- **Guidelines in Policy CC-37:**
  - **a)** Indoor noise levels shall be measured in terms of Community Noise Equivalent Level (CNE-)
  - **b)** Standards for public schools are not included in the guidelines for the State of California and are not regulated by the County.
  - **c)** Where projected noise levels for a given location are not included in this element, site-specific noise modeling may need to be conducted in order to apply the County’s noise policies.

- **Policy CC-34:** The County shall seek to limit excessive noise impacts of recreational uses, including recreational shooting ranges, motorcycles, and other noise-generating equipment—through the enforcement of applicable laws such as regulations for mufflers and limits on the location and/or extent of such uses.

---

**NAPA COUNTY GENERAL PLAN POLICY LOCATION MATRIX**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Location (new in 1983 General Plan)</th>
<th>Location in Updated General Plan</th>
<th>Comments</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

- **10.** Establish noise criteria in the specifications for County purchase of machines, equipment, and vehicles.

- **11.** Support needed legislation to state and federal governments to reduce noise generated by motor vehicles, boats, and aircraft.

---

**Guide to Abbreviations**

- AgL—Agricultural Preservation and Land Use Element
- CC—Community Character Element
- E—Economic Development Element
- I—Infills Element
- L—Safety Element
- UUC—Urbanized Urban Element
- CDS—Conservation Element
- COS—Recreation and Open Space Element
- Reference to “current” use in the 1983 General Plan
3.0 COMMENTS AND RESPONSES TO COMMENTS

NALA COUNTY GENERAL PLAN POLICY LOCATION MATRIX.

County of Napa
December 2007
Napa County General Plan Update
Final Environmental Impact Report

3.0-1483
3.0 COMMENTS AND RESPONSES TO COMMENTS

NAPA COUNTY GENERAL PLAN POLICY LOCATION MATRIX.

Table AgM-A-C

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Category</th>
<th>Share of Annual Allocation</th>
<th>Building Permit Availability (%)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>49.11</td>
<td>49.11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>14.66</td>
<td>14.66</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>14.66</td>
<td>14.66</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>14.66</td>
<td>14.66</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Unsold permits in Categories 1, 2 and 3 will be considered for redistribution once a year no later than November.

Table AgM-A-D

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Category of Regulated Development</th>
<th>Building Permit Distribution/Percent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Owner-Buyer (one building permit per year)</td>
<td>49% approved.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Short-Term Leased Building (5 or more permits for the discretionary review required) (final map must be reviewed)</td>
<td>14% discretionary review.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Long-Term Leased Building (5 or more permits for the discretionary review required)</td>
<td>14% discretionary review.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Available for Use (Written notice of agreement required)</td>
<td>17% discretionary review.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note that the following types of development are exempted from regulation of the Growth Management System: industrial, commercial, institutional uses (excluding vacant land), single-family, two-family, accessory buildings, guest cottages, units covered by development agreements approved prior to July 30, 1986, and units covered by development agreements approved prior to July 30, 1986, and units covered by development agreements approved prior to July 30, 1986.

In order to distribute the shares of the annual allocation to ensure fairness to all applicants, the following two-step distribution system is recommended. In the first step, building permits would be issued on a first-come, first-served basis. In the previous four years of this policy, the limited supply period for this category has been used. When the demand for permits in any category exceeds the supply available, the second step ensues, a lottery is initiated. For example, in Category 1 and 2, if within 31 additional building permits become available each year, each applicant whose name has been selected at random following the lottery will immediately receive a building permit. In the first step, a lottery is conducted for the Category 1 and 2 supply. Category 1 and 2 applicants whose places are fully occupied, or in the event that the total number of permits available is less than the number of applicants, will be issued permits until there are no more permits available in the Category 1 and 2 supply.

In the second step, building permits are issued on a lottery basis, subject to revision.
3.0 COMMENTS AND RESPONSES TO COMMENTS

NAPA COUNTY GENERAL PLAN POLICY LOCATION MATRIX.

A) Are approved for issuance of a building permit; but
B) None is available in their category; and
C) The backlog of approved applications exceeds the next available allocation of permits in that category.

All applicants approved in the first half of 2004 from the lottery as long as the new supply of permits lasts, will none of those approved applications is left. After all of those applications are assigned permits, the next required period of approved applications would be included in the lottery and those applications would be drawn from the lottery until all of those permits had been assigned permits. The lottery would continue until there was a surplus of permits available, which would allow the return to the first step process (first approved, first served), for example, to go for Category 1. Experiences a surplus of applications during the first half of 2004, and the last available permit is issued October 15, 2004. All Category 1 applications waiting to receive a permit between then and January 1, 2006 must wait until January 1st for permits to become available, at which time they could immediately be issued permits, if the backlog of fully approved applications is no more than 10. If there was a backlog of ten (10) approved applications as of January 1st, those applications would have permits reserved in their names which permits could be issued any time in the next 100 days. If those reserved permits were not issued in 100 days, they would revert to the Category 1 supply and be available to other applicants. If the backlog on January 1st was 77, there would be a deadline at the first opportunity. The first 79 applications drawn would have permits reserved as above, and the remaining eight would have to wait until January 1, 2006, at which time they would be guaranteed a reserved permit as above. In this example, there would be no Category 1 permits issued in 2003 except to those applicants in whose name a permit was reserved.

The advantages of this system are as follows:
1) Applicants for building permits would experience minimum frustration since they would have some degree of certainty as to when they would get their permits and could plan their construction accordingly.
2) Applicants would realize it was to their benefit to submit complete plans as soon as they could, especially when asked for necessary additional information.
3) Administrative work would be kept to a minimum, since there would be no need for the County to select or grade applications by arbitrary merit, the applicant who gets a permit would be random, except that these would be time reserved for permit issuance.
4) The most unworkable of the system would be where the government contracts. It is the supply of building permits which exceeds the demand for permits, there is no growth management control at all.

Very few details of the system are as follows:
1) Lobbies, when necessary, would be by category. Lobbies for Category 1, held annually until a backlog is eliminated, would be for single permits, drawn one at a time. Lobbies for Category 2, held in January (when necessary) would be for single permits, drawn one at a time. Lobbies for Category 3 and 4 would be held in January or later if necessary.
2) Fully approved applications would be listed by A-Z owner in a chronological order. All owners would be given an equal opportunity to be included in the lottery and one's place is kept on the lot by including the application and the permit in the lottery until they are drawn.
3) Only one permit per parcel (residential, business, corporation) could be included in each lottery. (This would not keep the contractor from building second homes, each under contract to a separate owner nor would it keep an individual from participating in a number of separate ventures)
4) All applications would be dropped into a box, one a time, by the lottery secretary, mixed and drawn one at a time by the lottery judge until all owners have been drawn and filled in the order in which they were drawn.
5) A list of the code is to be distributed prior to the drawing, during the drawing the sequential order in which the lots were drawn would be noted on the forms. All code would be drawn and listed, even if the number of permits available was exceeded, as each applicant would be given their permits in the order in which the lots were drawn.
6) The drawing operation must be conducted so as to be beyond reproach; the person who draws the numbers must be someone whose integrity and involvement with the process bear witness to his or her integrity and objectivity.

Guide to Abbreviations
ApS—Agricultural Recreation and Open Space Element
CC—Community Character Element
E—Economic Development Element
SAL—Salient Element

NAPA COUNTY GENERAL PLAN POLICY LOCATION MATRIX.

7) Once the underlying discretionary County permit is "used", the permittee shall have one year (other than 100 days) to make use of the reserved permits, including the building permits. After one year passes the permittee will be issued building permits as they become available consistent with the allocation procedures for new applicants.
8) At least permits are subject to the IRC non-use regulations provided, unimproved or unimproved permits will be subject to the supply of permits in the category. In which they were issued, but will be made available only through lottery, in order to avoid speculation.
9) Permits may be transferred to one of the other major types, or to another site or subdivision program. Some design changes can be acceptable; major structural changes, can be made only in case of redesign for energy efficiency or by down-sizing due to economic necessity.
3.0 COMMENTS AND RESPONSES TO COMMENTS

LETTER 152:  
PAAULA J. PETERSON, JUNE 15, 2007

Response 152-1 E/P: The commenter provides an introduction to her comment letter and states that the number of significant and unavoidable impacts identified in the EIR is unacceptable for all three of the primary alternatives. The County appreciates the input regarding the General Plan and EIR process and will consider the comment when considering approval of the General Plan. It should be noted that the General Plan covers 479,000 acres of unincorporated land in Napa County and growth projections and long-term visions into the year 2030; thus, a large number of significant and unavoidable impacts can be expected.

Response 152-2 E/P: The commenter states the documents that she reviewed and the meetings she attended as part of the General Plan process. The commenter states that there seems to be a “disconnect” between the project vision and goals and various alternatives, but she does not elaborate on the “disconnect.” The County will consider the comment when reviewing the General Plan policies prior to adoption of the document and certification of the EIR.

Response 152-3 E/P: The commenter states support for Save Rural Angwin and their comments, proposals, and map. The commenter suggests the Save Rural Angwin map be used in the AG/LU Element and that the Existing and Alternate maps shown in the Draft General Plan and Draft EIR all provide for building intensities not consistent with the circulation and other elements of the Plan. The commenter states support for the elimination of the urban bubbles.

The County appreciates the input regarding the General Plan process and Angwin area maps. The County will consider the comment when reviewing the General Plan policies prior to adoption of the document and certification of the EIR. The land use maps for the Angwin area have not been altered as a consideration in any project development process. Upon consideration of any project development process, the review process will consider consistency with the circulation and other elements of the General Plan.

Response 152-4 E: The commenter states that proposed road widening mitigations under the building intensities for Alternatives B, C, and E are infeasible. The commenter does not support mitigating to LOS D and suggests mitigating to LOS C. The commenter also states the increased traffic in Deer Park and Howell Mountain has increased toxic air contaminants (TACs) due to increased commuters and construction traffic.

The commenter misread Draft EIR Table 4.4-15. The projects listed in Table 4.4-15 would be necessary to reduce the level of significance to less than significant. However, these improvements are not included as part of the proposed land use alternatives or as mitigation measures in the Draft EIR because implementation of these measures would widen roadways and result in more severe environmental impacts associated with visual resources, water quality, noise, air quality, and growth inducement. Additionally, these improvements would be inconsistent with the vision set forth in the General Plan Update. The following statement from the Summary and Vision section of the proposed General Plan Update...
summarizes the County's provisions: “This General Plan will preserve and improve the quality of life and the rural character of the County by proactively addressing land use, traffic, and safety concerns in addition to sustaining the agricultural industry.”

The Level of Service C or better on all County roadways was not adopted by Napa County or added as a new policy in the Draft General Plan Update because surrounding areas of unincorporated Napa County have experienced large amounts of growth in recent years as have portions of the City of Napa, American Canyon, and Solano County, and the unincorporated portions of the County have experienced changes in jobs/housing balance. This growth and change to the jobs/housing balance has caused traffic volumes in unincorporated portions of the County, including SR 12 connecting between American Canyon and Solano County, to more than triple over the last 20 years. The County has no authority to control the increase in traffic traveling through unincorporated portions of the County due to regional growth patterns. Therefore, the adoption of a LOS C would not be an adequate level of service standard for traffic volumes considering expected regional growth patterns. Additionally, the vast majority of the LOS D or worse conditions would occur regardless of whether or not the General Plan is updated, since LOS D or worse conditions would occur due to the projected traffic from Napa County cities as well as from regional traffic volume increases.

Additionally, the Draft EIR includes several mitigation measures in Section 4.8, Air Quality, that mitigate and minimize exposure to TACs in the Howell Mountain and Deer Park area to a less than significant level. These mitigation measures include buffering nearby residences or sensitive receptors to TAC exposure.

Response 152-5 E: The commenter states that the fisheries and water studies assumptions do not include an evaluation of the Angwin Area. The commenter states that groundwater data should be collected for the Angwin area to assess impacts of increasing pumpage. The commenter states that groundwater depletion can result in the decrease or elimination of stream flows which contribute to poor fishery conditions and water quality problems. The commenter suggests that protections should be put in place to preclude the overdraft of the County's groundwater resources. The commenter is referred to Water Supply Master Response 3.4.1 for a response to water supply and groundwater depletion concerns, and which includes data on water supply sources for Angwin.

Response 152-6 E: The commenter states the Draft EIR does not adequately address water supply drainages due to proposed development in Alternatives A and C. The commenter states that discharges from development may cause increased storm water pollution and increases in impervious surfaces that would result in increased peak discharges. The commenter states that development could reduce the quality of creek corridors. Additionally, the Angwin area has been identified as a location of special-status animal species occurrences, and the accuracy of the occurrence data is low for the Angwin area.
Subsequent to the release of the Draft General Plan and Draft EIR, further modification has been made to the General Plan. These protective measures now include requirements for the County to comply with applicable Water Quality Control/Basin Plans as amended through the Total Maximum Daily Load (TMDL) process to improve water quality. In its efforts to comply, the County will ensure continued enforcement of the Napa County Conservation Regulations related to earth disturbing activities and ensure continued effectiveness on the NPDES program and prevention of storm water pollution. Additionally, the County will require that future projects and development activities comply with sediment and erosion control measures recommended in technical reports that demonstrate mitigation of soil erosion impacts and are protective to municipal water supply watersheds prior to the commencement of construction activities. These measures would ensure that development projects would address water supply drainages, increases in storm water and peak discharges, and impacts to surface water.

Additionally, the occurrence of special-status species in Angwin is located in Section 4.5, Biological Resources, in Tables 4.5-1 and 4.5-2 of the Draft EIR. The commenter has not provided any evidence to support her claim that the species data in Section 4.5 of the Draft EIR has a low accuracy of data for the Angwin area.

Response 152-7 E: The commenter states that the Draft EIR does not adequately address the potential purchase of the Angwin Airport by the County. The commenter states that any potential changes in use to the Angwin Airport could result in significant impacts.

The County is currently investigating the purchase of the Angwin Airport from the Pacific Union College but no decision has been made and it would be speculative to assume that any change in operations would result. Thus, consideration of a future modification of the operation of the airport is speculative and does not require consideration in the EIR (State CEQA Guidelines Section 15145).

Response 152-8 E: The commenter states that the Draft EIR does not adequately analyze cumulative impacts from timber conversion and well drilling and that these impacts could result in significant irreversible environmental changes and cumulative impacts. The commenter has not provided adequate evidence that the analysis of timber conversion and well drilling in the Draft EIR is inadequate. The commenter is referred to Impact 4.11.3 and mitigation measures MM 4.11.3a and b in Section 4.11, Hydrology and Water Quality, of the Draft EIR which addresses water quality impacts associated with timber harvesting and to Impact 4.14.1 and mitigation measure MM 4.14.1b in Section 4.14, Visual Resources/Light and Glare, of the Draft EIR for a discussion of timber conversion and mitigation requiring retention of trees along public roadways on forested lands proposed for conversion to vineyard or non-agricultural activity in order to retain the existing landscape characteristics of the site (as viewed from public roadways) and screen the proposed development. The commenter is also referred to Section 4.15, Hydrology and Water Quality, and mitigation measure MM 4.11.5d for a discussion of well drilling and mitigation requiring the County to include a policy in the General Plan that would prohibit the drilling or operation of any new wells in known areas of...
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saltwater intrusion until such time as a program has been approved and funded which will minimize or avoid expansion of salt water intrusion into useable groundwater supplies. Additionally, cumulative impacts associated with implementation of the General Plan are addressed in Section 5.0, Cumulative Impacts, of the Draft EIR, and significant and irreversible environmental effects are addressed under subsection 7.2 in Section 7.0, Long-Term Implications, of the Draft EIR.

Response 152-9 P: The commenter suggests adding a goal or policy for encouraging educational institutions to promote green technology programs and address global warming. The commenter is referred to Climate Change Master Response 3.4.4. Furthermore, climate change and greenhouse gas emissions are addressed under the Climate Protection and Sustainable Practices for Environmental Health section in the Conservation Element.

Response 152-10 P: The commenter states that the list of scenic roadways should be incorporated into the General Plan. Comment noted. The requested information has been added to the Community Character Element of the General Plan.

Response 152-11 P: The commenter wants the term “already developed area” to be further explained and replaced with “existing incorporated and city centered areas.” The County has revised the General Plan to incorporate this comment.

Response 152-12 E: The commenter states cumulative impacts are not adequately addressed in the Draft EIR for various technical sections, specifically water supply. The commenter has not provided adequate evidence that the analysis of cumulative impacts in the Draft EIR is inadequate. The commenter is referred to Water Supply Master Response 3.4.1 in this Final EIR and to Section 5.0, Cumulative Impacts, of the Draft EIR.

Response 152-13 E: The commenter states that the list of projects occurring within the County only includes approved or pending projects and does not include projects that are currently in the discussion stage or projects in adjacent regions such as Lake County. The commenter states that projects currently in the discussion stage will have significant impacts individually as well as cumulatively. The commenter states that policies related to the preservation of rural Napa County and natural resources are incomplete.

The Draft EIR evaluates the environmental effects of a range of alternatives that incorporate potential additional development in Angwin as well as re-designation of the Napa Pipe site for mixed use associated with the Revised General Plan Update (see Draft EIR Appendix B for a detailed description of the range of development considered in the Draft EIR), as well as considers pending development requests for both areas (as part of the cumulative impact analysis – see Draft EIR page 5.0-3). It should be noted that these alternatives are not intended to reflect any specific development proposal for Angwin or Napa Pipe. Specific development proposals for these areas are not part of the proposed General Plan Update and will require project-specific environmental review pursuant to CEQA.
As identified in Draft EIR pages 4.0-1 and -2 and 5.0-2 through -6, the cumulative impact analysis considers anticipated growth of the County and region (including the cities and adjoining counties - including Lake County) between 2005 and 2030 that encompasses residential growth in the unincorporated portion of the County, vineyard (10,000 to 12,500 additional acres) and winery (approximately 225 new wineries) growth, nonresidential growth, flood control improvements, future timber harvesting, and water quality improvement activities associated with the TMDLs for the Napa River. While specific approved or pending development projects are identified in the Draft EIR (see Draft EIR Table 5.0-2), Draft EIR 5.0-3 specifically notes that this list is not intended to be an all-inclusive list of development activities in the County. This description and approach to defining the cumulative setting in the Draft EIR meets the requirements of CEQA (see State CEQA Guidelines Section 15130[b]).

Response 152-14 E: The commenter states that the number of significant and unavoidable impacts in the Draft EIR is not consistent with Napa County’s Vision and Goals regarding quality of life. As stated in Response 152-1 above, the General Plan covers 479,000 acres of unincorporated land in Napa County and growth projections and long-term visions into the year 2030; thus, a large number of significant and unavoidable impacts can be expected. The County will consider the comment when reviewing the General Plan policies prior to adoption of the document and certification of the EIR.

Response 152-15 E: The commenter states that the CDC is listed twice and the CDPR (California Department of Parks and Recreation) is not listed. The following text on page 9.0-1 of the Draft EIR and will be changed as follows.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Abbreviation</th>
<th>Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>CDBG</td>
<td>Community Development Block Grant</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CDC</td>
<td>California Department of Conservation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CDC</td>
<td>California Department of Conservation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CDPR</td>
<td>California Department of Parks and Recreation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CDE</td>
<td>California Department of Education</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Response 152-16 E: The commenter states the resource protection alternative was not evaluated in as much detail as other alternatives. The commenter supports distilling the Draft EIR into one preferred alternative that represents the 1% Measure A growth control and is proximate to the environmentally superior alternative and placing the remaining alternatives in an appendix. The commenter is referred to Alternatives Master Response 3.4.2 for a discussion of the range of alternatives considered.

Response 152-17 P: The commenter suggests replacing the term “the Napa River” changed to “the Napa River and its tributaries.” The County will consider the comment when reviewing the General Plan policies prior to adoption of the document and certification of the EIR.

Response 152-18 P: The commenter requests that the statement “Napa County will become known for its successful strategies aimed at reforming global warming impacts” be incorporated into the Vision Statement of the General Plan. The County has revised the vision statement to incorporate the above comment.
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Response 152-20 P: The commenter states that Policies Ag/LU-20 and -21 should be deleted or modified due to their growth-inducing implications for Angwin and Pope Valley. The commenter is unclear why these policies would induce growth; however, the County will take this comment into account when finalizing the General Plan Update.

Response 152-21 P: The commenter suggests expanding the “Institutional” designation to private and public in Policy Ag/LU-48. The County feels that expanding this policy to private institutions is not appropriate.

Response 152-22 P: The commenter states support for proposed General Plan Policy Ag/LU-49. Because the commenter supports the proposed policy, no response is necessary.

Response 152-23 P: The commenter supports the elimination of “urban bubbles.” The commenter supports Policy Ag/LU-50 but does not support Policy Ag/LU-51. The policies have been revised to take into account this comment and other comments.

Response 152-24 P: The commenter requests the deletion of all proposed Angwin maps from the General Plan and Draft EIR and supports the inclusion of the Save Rural Angwin maps. Comment noted. The maps have been removed from the General Plan.

Response 152-25 P: The commenter suggests the sentence be changed on page 54 of the Agricultural Preservation and Land Use Element to “Drawn by the area’s rural character, new Angwin residents share with longtime residents a desire to retain the area’s natural beauty and sense of place.” The Agricultural Preservation and Land Use Element has been revised to incorporate this comment.

Response 152-26 P: The commenter supports the document submittal by Save Rural Angwin. For Policy Ag/LU-53, the commenter suggests adding “...should contain institutional uses (i.e., the college), residential uses allowed/approved in the County’s adopted housing element, and limited neighborhood-serving non-residential uses.” Commenter supports housing for the college and parcel-specific single-family homes, but opposes growth-inducing subdivisions. Policy Ag/LU-53 has been revised to incorporate portions of this comment and is reflected in new Policy Ag/LU-58.

Response 152-27 P: The commenter suggests changing text in Policy Ag/LU-58 to “…derived from its wooded setting and the scenic agricultural and open space lands viewed upon arrival into the Angwin basin from Napa Valley.” Policy Ag/LU-58 has been revised to incorporate this comment and is reflected in new Policy Ag/LU-64.

Response 152-28 P: The commenter does not support Policy Ag/LU-62. The County appreciates the input regarding the General Plan process. The County will consider the comment when reviewing the General Plan policies prior to adoption of the document and certification of the EIR.
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Response 152-29 P: The commenter suggests re-defining the purpose of the Public-Institutional (P-I) land use designations as per the proposal submitted by Save Rural Angwin. The County will consider the comment when reviewing the General Plan policies prior to adoption of the document and certification of the EIR.

Response 152-30 P: The commenter suggests deleting “such as Angwin” from sentence “Preference is to be given to...” on page 98 of the Agriculture Preservation and Land Use Element. The County will consider the comment when reviewing the General Plan policies prior to adoption of the document and certification of the EIR.

Response 152-31 E: The commenter requests the insertion of text “and private” in mitigation measure MM 4.1.1a of the Draft EIR to read as follows: “As part of consideration of subsequent projects, the County shall evaluate individual rezoning, development, and public projects and private projects to determine the potential for impacts on farmlands of concern under CEQA.” The commenter states the statement of “where feasible” at the end of the mitigation measure should discuss what is allowed. The commenter states that private multi-family residential projects should be held to the same standards.

The County deems that mitigation measure MM 4.1.1 is an adequate level of mitigation for Impact 4.1.1, and the term development encompasses private projects and multi-family projects. Therefore, private projects will be subject to analysis of the projects’ potential to impact farmland of concern under CEQA. The term “where feasible” refers to CEQA Guidelines which states that if economic, social, or other conditions make it infeasible to mitigate one or more significant effects on the environment of a project, the project may nonetheless be carried out or approved at the discretion of the lead agency if certain findings are made associated with project approval (e.g., Statement of Overriding Considerations) (CEQA Guidelines Section 151091 and 151093).

Response 152-32 E: The commenter states support for mitigation measure MM 4.1.1b. The County appreciates the input regarding the General Plan process. The County will consider the comment when reviewing the General Plan policies prior to adoption of the document and certification of the EIR.

Response 152-33 E: The commenter states that the implementation of mitigation measures MM 4.1.1a and b are not adequate for Impact 4.1.2; however, the commenter does not offer alternate mitigation measures that would be more effective than MM 4.1.1a and b. The County deems that MM 4.1.1a and b would provide an adequate level of mitigation for both Impact 4.1.1 and Impact 4.1.2 to reduce the impacts associated with the loss of agricultural land that would result from implementation of the General Plan to a less than significant level for Alternatives A and B. Additionally, these mitigation measures are consistent with case law related to the loss of agricultural land.

Response 152-34 E: The commenter disagrees with the conclusion that no mitigation is required for Impact 4.1.3. The commenter suggests “green belt buffers” or planning land uses in locations that are compatible with adjacent uses as mitigation.
Alternatives A, B, and C include provisions and policies from the General Plan to mitigate potential urban land uses adjacent to agricultural uses. These provisions, located in the Agricultural and Land Use Element, include the County’s Right to Farm Ordinance, which helps to moderate potential land use conflicts. This ordinance allows agricultural activities to continue because the County will not consider the inconveniences or discomforts arising from agricultural operations to be a nuisance if such operations are legal, consistent with accepted customs and standards, and operated in a non-negligent manner. The Right to Farm Ordinance protects the routine operational activities required to conduct agricultural activities. In addition to the Right to Farm Ordinance, Section 18.104.340 of the County Code specifically requires the provision of buffers and/or fencing between new outdoor recreation uses and existing agricultural uses. The County Code also requires setbacks between agricultural and residential uses. These provisions are adequate to mitigate any potential agricultural/land use conflicts.

Response 152-35 E: The commenter states that the significant and unavoidable level of significance for Impact 4.1.4 is inadequate and further mitigation measures should be identified or the scope of the project should be reduced. In this case the impact would result under all three alternatives but only in the areas designated on the General Plan Land Use Map as non-agricultural uses (e.g., the urban bubbles) where some agriculturally zoned parcels exist. As discussed on page 4.1-31 in Section 4.1, Agriculture, of the Draft EIR, none of the alternatives would result in new conflicts with Williamson Act contracts, but with zoning conflicts where land that is currently zoned for agricultural uses within the urban bubbles could be rezoned and developed as non-agricultural uses. Though CEQA requires an EIR to describe feasible mitigation measures which could minimize significant adverse effects, CEQA acknowledges that there are times when significant impacts cannot be reduced to a level of insignificance (CEQA Guidelines Section 15126.2(b)) and CEQA also specifies that if a mitigation measure cannot be legally imposed that the measure need not be proposed or analyzed (CEQA Guidelines Section 15126.4(a)(5)). In this case there are no feasible and legal mitigation measures that would reduce the impact to a level of insignificance.

CEQA Guidelines further state that if economic, social, or other conditions make it infeasible to mitigate one or more significant effects on the environment of a project, the project may nonetheless be carried out or approved at the discretion of the lead agency if certain findings are made associated with project approval (e.g., Statement of Overriding Considerations) (CEQA Guidelines Section 151091 and 151093).

Response 152-36 E: The commenter states that the Angwin “urban bubble” as currently drawn does divide the Angwin community. The proposed alternatives vary in land use and growth potential; however, none of these alternatives would substantially alter the County land use patterns or result in the development of a new physical feature (e.g., development of a new highway through an existing community) that would result in the physical division of established communities. The commenter has not provided adequate data and/or analysis substantiating her claim that the community of Angwin would be divided or that the analysis under Impact 4.2.1 is inadequate.
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Response 152-37 E: The commenter states support for mitigation measure MM 4.2.2. Because the commenter supports this mitigation measure, no further response is necessary.

Response 152-38 E: The commenter states that to approve a project which would result in the impacts addressed under Impact 4.3.1 would go against voter direction. The comment states that mitigation measure MM 4.3.1 reads like it was written for Triad developments all over the County. The County appreciates the input regarding the General Plan process. The County will consider the comment when reviewing the General Plan policies prior to adoption of the document and certification of the EIR.

Response 152-39 E: The commenter states that development should not be constructed in areas that would result in substantially increased commutes as discussed under Impact 4.3.2. Mitigation measure MM 4.3.2, which would apply to Alternative A, would help to ensure that job growth in the unincorporated County does not substantially out-pace dwelling unit production by requiring the County to adopt and implement a policy requiring new employment-generating development either to produce on- or off-site housing adequate to meet the demand for Napa County housing associated with the new employment, or to pay an in-lieu housing fee to assist the County with the development of subsidized housing for the neediest segment of the workforce. This new policy would provide a balance between jobs and housing in Napa County under Alternative A. The commenter is also referred to mitigation measures 4.4.1d through j in Section 4.4, Transportation, of the Draft EIR, which would also help to reduce commuter traffic on County roadways through encouraging carpooling, flex hours, and alternative modes of transportation.

Response 152-40 E: The commenter states that the impacts identified in Impact 4.3.2 are unacceptable and does not approve of growth that would result in impacts that cannot be mitigated. The commenter states support for MM 4.4.1a and notes that projects should not be approved if they would lower the LOS below level C.

Subsequent to the release of the Draft General Plan and Draft EIR, further modification has been made to the General Plan Circulation Element. These protective measures now include level of service standards for unincorporated portions of the County. The County shall seek to maintain an arterial Level of Service D or better on all county roadways. The County will work with the Napa County Transportation Authority, adjacent counties, the Metropolitan Transportation Commission, and the State of California to monitor traffic volumes and congestion on the roadway system in Napa County to ensure the level of service standard.

The Level of Service C or better on all County roadways was not adopted because surrounding areas to unincorporated Napa County have experienced large amounts of growth in recent years in portions of the City of Napa, American Canyon, and Solano County, and the unincorporated portions of the County have experienced changes in jobs/housing balance. This growth and change to the jobs/housing balance has caused traffic volumes in unincorporated portions of the County, including SR 12 connecting between American Canyon and Solano County, to more than triple over the last 20 years. The County has
3.0 Comments and Responses to Comments

no authority to control the increase in traffic traveling through unincorporated portions of the County due to regional growth patterns. Therefore, the adoption of an LOS C would not be an adequate level of service standard for traffic volumes considering expected regional growth patterns. Additionally, the vast majority of the LOS D or worse conditions would occur regardless of whether or not the General Plan is updated, since the resulting LOS D or worse conditions would occur due to the projected traffic from the cities in the County as well as regional traffic volume increases.

Response 152-41 E: The commenter states support for mitigation measure MM 4.4.1b. Because the commenter supports this mitigation measure, no response is required.

Response 152-42 E: The commenter states that the reference to Table 4.4-20 in mitigation measure MM 4.4.1c is incorrect and should be changed to Table 4.4-15. The County appreciates the correction of MM 4.4.1c. This mitigation is included in the Revised General Plan Update as Policy CIR-19, and the EIR now correctly references Table 4.4-15.

Response 152-43 E: The commenter suggests text changes to mitigation measure MM 4.4.1d for the support of transit services and development. Subsequent to the release of the Draft General Plan and Draft EIR, further modification has been made to the General Plan Circulation Element. These protective measures include standards for all developments along fixed transit routes. To ensure protective measures are implemented, the County Zoning Code will be updated to include requirements and standards for future development projects. Therefore, text changes to the mitigation measure would no longer apply.

Response 152-44 E: The commenter states support for mitigation measure MM 4.4.1e. The commenter suggests the insertion of “or improve ratio of” to MM 4.4.1e. The County appreciates the input regarding the General Plan process. Subsequent to the release of the Draft General Plan and Draft EIR, further modification has been made to the General Plan Circulation Element. These protective measures include support for programs to reduce single-occupant vehicle use and encourage alternative modes of transportation. To ensure measures are implemented, the County will work with major employers and the Napa County Transportation and Planning Agency to offer incentives for carpooling and other cost-efficient ground transportation alternatives. These measures would help to reduce single-occupant vehicle use or improve the ratio of use of alternative transportation.

Response 152-45 E: The commenter states support for mitigation measure MM 4.4.1f. Because the commenter supports this mitigation measure, no response is required.

Response 152-46 E: The commenter states support for mitigation measure MM 4.4.1g. Because the commenter supports this mitigation measure, no response is required.

Response 152-47 E: The commenter suggests deletion of “as feasible” from mitigation measure MM 4.4.1h. The County appreciates the input regarding the General Plan process. Subsequent to the release of the Draft General Plan and Draft EIR, further modification has been made to the General Plan Circulation Element. These protective measures define where sufficient or
feasible right-of-way is available, bicycle lanes should be added to county roadways when repaving or upgrading of the roadway occurs. Additional paving shall be provided only where the facility meets the "Regional Assessment System" adopted by the Napa County Transportation and Planning Agency. The County will encourage Caltrans to follow these same guidelines on state highways in Napa County.

Response 152-48 E: The commenter states support for mitigation measure MM 4.4.1i. Because the commenter supports this mitigation measure no response is required.

Response 152-49 E: The commenter states support for mitigation measure MM 4.4.1j. Because the commenter supports this mitigation measure, no response is required.

Response 152-50 E: The commenter states that projects with impacts identified in Impact 4.4.2 that would increase hazardous design features should not be approved. The County deems that mitigation measures MM 4.9.4 and MM 4.13.1.1a and 4.13.1.1b would provide an adequate level of mitigation for Impact 4.4.2 and reduce design hazards impacts to a less than significant level for all three alternatives.

Response 152-51 E: The commenter states for support for mitigation measures MM 4.4.1d through g. Because the commenter supports these mitigation measures, no response is required.

Response 152-52 E: The commenter states support for mitigation measure MM 4.4.4a. Because the commenter supports this mitigation measure, no response is required.

Response 152-53 E: The commenter suggests that text be inserted into mitigation measure MM 4.5.1a that states the following: "If the proposed project area has not been evaluated in the BDR or other current technical studies, such evaluation will be required prior to project authorization." The commenter states that special-status species could occur in areas where surveys were not done. Subsequent to the release of the Draft General Plan and Draft EIR, further modification has been made to the General Plan Conservation Element. These protective measures require that the County shall require a biological resources evaluation for projects in areas identified to contain or possibly contain listed plant and wildlife species based upon data provided in the Baseline Data Report (BDR) or other technical materials. The County shall also have programs to protect special-status species which would disseminate updated information as the state and federal governments’ lists of species change. The County deems that this policy will provide adequate protection for special-status species; therefore, the mitigation measure does not need to be revised.

Response 152-54 E: The commenter states support for mitigation measure MM 4.5.1b. Because the commenter supports this mitigation measure, no response is required.

Response 152-55 E: The comment notes that mitigation measure MM 4.5.1b should be clarified to say that supplemental planting must be appropriate native plant species. Subsequent to the release of the Draft General Plan and Draft EIR, further modification has been made to the General Plan Conservation Element. These protective measures require that supplemental planting
and maintenance of grasses, shrubs, and trees be of like quality and quantity to provide adequate vegetation cover. This policy would require that supplemental planting be completed with appropriate species of like quality and quantity of the surrounding area; therefore the mitigation measure does not need to be revised.

Response 152-56 E: The commenter would like to add language to mitigation measure MM 4.5.1b indicating that no project shall disrupt any nesting birds protected under CDFG Code Sections 3503, 3503.5, 3505, 3513, and 3800 and no take shall occur under CDFG Code sections 3511, 4700, or 4800. Subsequent to the release of the Draft General Plan and Draft EIR, further modification has been made to the General Plan Conservation Element. These protective measures would require temporary or permanent buffers of adequate size (based on the requirements of the subject special-status specie(s)) to avoid nest abandonment by nest birds, raptors, and bats associated with construction and site development activities. These policies are adequate to avoid any disruption to nesting birds or any “take” of bird species; therefore, the mitigation measure does not need to be revised.

Response 152-57 E: The commenter suggests that text be inserted into mitigation measure MM 4.5.1c that states the following, “…including any riparian and/or intermittent perennial stream or watercourse.” The commenter states that the uncertainty of groundwater availability should be addressed. The commenter is referred to Water Supply Master Response 3.4.1 for discussion of water supply and groundwater availability. Subsequent to the release of the Draft General Plan and Draft EIR, further modification has been made to the General Plan Conservation Element taking into consideration the commenter’s recommended text changes. These protective measures would include a Noxious Weed Ordinance which would include regulatory standards for construction activities that occur adjacent to natural areas, including riparian and/or intermittent streams or watercourses, to inhibit the establishment of noxious weeds through accidental seed import. Therefore, the mitigation measure does not need to be revised.

Response 152-58 E: The commenter suggests that text be inserted into mitigation measure MM 4.5.2a that states the following: “…that meet all federal and state regulations as well as Napa County Conservation Regulation Chapter 18.108.” The commenter states that the mitigation measure should list all of the page numbers where the sensitive biotic communities are discussed in the Draft EIR (e.g., pages 4.5-8 through 4.5-15 or pages 4.5-9, 4.5-13, and 4.5-14) and reference Table 4.5-2 of the Draft EIR in the mitigation measure. Subsequent to the release of the Draft General Plan and Draft EIR, further modification has been made to the General Plan Conservation Element. These protective measures include language that mitigation meets federal and state regulations as well as Napa County Conservation Regulation Chapter 18.108. The County appreciates the commenter’s recommended correction to mitigation measure MM 4.5.2a. However, this language is already included in mitigation measure MM 4.5.1b. The provisions of mitigation measure MM 4.5.2a has been incorporated into policies CON-17 and CON-24 and Action Item CON NR-7.
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Response 152-59 E: The commenter states support for mitigation measure MM 4.5.2a, the Oak Woodlands Preservation Act (PCR Section 21083.4). Because the commenter supports this mitigation measure, no response is required.

Response 152-60 E: The commenter states support for mitigation measure MM 4.5.2b. Because the commenter supports this mitigation measure, no response is required.

Response 152-61 E: The commenter suggests requiring a geotechnical report that assesses impacts on domestic water supplies and specifies the depth and nature of the soils and bedrock for projects under mitigation measure MM 4.5.2c. A geotechnical report is already a requirement under Chapter 18.108.027 of the County Code. Therefore, development projects would already be required to provide a geotechnical report, and the mitigation measure does not need to be revised.

Response 152-62 E: The commenter suggests that an impact discussion should be included in the Biology section that would discuss the County’s domestic water supply drainages, specific mitigation measures should be spelled out for ground disturbing activities, and geotechnical reports regarding present soils and bedrock should be identified and addressed. The commenter also notes that mitigation measure MM 4.5.3a should address pedestrian circulation patterns and destinations that would impact wildlife use patterns, particularly as potential development is adjacent to watercourses.

The commenter is referred to Water Supply Master Response 3.4.1. Regarding ground disturbing activities, the commenter is referred to Section 4.11, Hydrology and Water Quality, of the Draft EIR and to mitigation measures MM 4.11.2a, 4.11.2b, 4.11.3b, and 4.11.4. As stated in Response 152-61, a geotechnical report is already a requirement under Chapter 18.108.027 of the County Code. Additionally, mitigation measure MM 4.5.3a addresses the retention of wildlife movement corridors for individual projects, which would require that individual projects do not interrupt movement corridors by either pedestrian or vehicular transportation.

Response 152-63 E: The commenter states that mitigation measures for Impact 4.5.4 should adhere to USFW Recovery Plans, such as the Northern Spotted Owl and California Red Legged Frog Recovery Plans. Subsequent to the release of the Draft General Plan and Draft EIR, further modification has been made to the General Plan Conservation Element. These protective measures would require project applicants to demonstrate compliance with the provisions and regulations with applicable recovery plans for federally listed species, including the northern spotted owl and California red legged frog. Therefore, this mitigation measure does not need to be revised.

Response 152-64 E: The commenter suggests that the text “...and enforce” should be inserted into mitigation measure MM 4.6.1a. Subsequent to the release of the Draft General Plan and Draft EIR, further modification has been made to the General Plan Conservation Element. These protective measures would require establishment of fishery monitoring program(s) in order to track the current condition of special-status fisheries and associated habitats in the County’s watersheds. Additionally, protective measures would require implementation of corrective actions for water quality issues that are
identified as adversely impacting fisheries. These measures would ensure that fish monitoring programs are enforced and implemented by the County. The proposed text “and enforce” is not necessary because development proposals will be reviewed for compliance with all General Plan policies.

Response 152-65 E: The commenter states that future projects should not result in an increase in downstream sedimentation. The County deems that mitigation measures MM 4.6.1a and MM 4.6.1b are an adequate level of mitigation for Impact 4.6.1 and would avoid potential impacts resulting from increased sedimentation load. The commenter provides no data and/or analysis that MM 4.6.1a and MM 4.6.1b are not adequate to avoid impacts from increased sedimentation load.

Response 152-66 E: The commenter states that future projects should not lower or impact groundwater levels and should not result in any reduction in summer base flow contributions to either groundwater aquifer or receiving water (creeks, ponds, etc.) adjacent or downstream of the project site. The County has determined that mitigation measures MM 4.11.5e and 4.11.4 would mitigate this potential impact to a level of less than significant for all three alternatives. Additionally, the commenter is referred to Water Supply Master Response 3.4.1 for a discussion of water supply and groundwater availability.

Response 152-67 E: The commenter suggests the insertion of “…and maintenance of cool water temperature” into mitigation measure MM 4.6.5b. The commenter also suggests requiring a Conservation Plan.

Subsequent to the release of the Draft General Plan and Draft EIR, further modification has been made to the General Plan Conservation Element taking into consideration the commenter’s recommended text changes. These protective measures would require mitigation for discretionary projects that results in no net adverse effects to stream temperature, bed attributes, or habitat necessary for native fisheries health and may include restoration and improvement of impacted habitat areas. Therefore, this mitigation measure does not need to be revised.

Response 152-68 E: The commenter states that “shall be” is repeated twice in MM 4.6.6. The following corrections have been made to mitigation measure MM 4.6-6 on pages 2.0-25 and 4.6-34 of the Draft EIR:

- **MM 4.6.6** The County shall provide a policy in the General Plan that requires that subsequent development activities and roadway improvements not directly disturb the bed and bank of any waterway known or suspected to contain fishery resources to the maximum extent feasible. If avoidance is determined to be infeasible by the County, then BMPs and/or habitat restoration shall be incorporated (in consultation with California Department of Fish and Game, U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service and National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration National Marine Fisheries Service) into the project design that demonstrates no adverse impacts to fishery resources and allows for fish passage.
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Response 152-69 E: The commenter states support for mitigation measure MM 4.7.1a. Because the commenter supports this mitigation measure, no response is required.

Response 152-70 E: The commenter states support for mitigation measure MM 4.7.1b. Because the commenter supports this mitigation measure, no response is required.

Response 152-71 E: The commenter states support for mitigation measure MM 4.7.1c. Because the commenter supports this mitigation measure, no response is required.

Response 152-72 E: The commenter states support for mitigation measure MM 4.7.2b. Because the commenter supports this mitigation measure, no response is required.

Response 152-73 E: The commenter states that the mitigation for Impact 4.7.3 is insufficient if the result is still significant and unavoidable. The commenter also states that the Draft EIR makes a false assumption that the traffic mixes will remain the same under the Draft General Plan. The County does not have the ability to require, improve, or construct traffic noise attenuation features outside of the unincorporated area, which would be the only way to further reduce traffic-related noise along County roadways aside from limiting traffic on County roadways, which is not feasible. Additionally, placement of noise barriers (e.g., walls and berms) may be considered inconsistent with the fundamental principles of the General Plan Update of retaining the current character of the County and thus considered infeasible. Therefore, the proposed mitigation measures are feasible mitigations to assist in reducing traffic noise exposure impacts. The reader is referred to pages 4.4-25 through -31 in Section 4.4, Transportation, of the Draft EIR for the methodology used in the traffic analysis.

Though CEQA requires an EIR to describe feasible mitigation measures which could minimize significant adverse effects, CEQA does also allow for instances in which no feasible mitigation is available, mitigation cannot be legally imposed (CEQA Guidelines Section 15126.4(a)(5)) and significant effects cannot be avoided if the proposed project is implemented (CEQA Guidelines Section 15126.2(b)).

CEQA Guidelines further state that if economic, social, or other conditions make it infeasible to mitigate one or more significant effects on the environment of a project, the project may nonetheless be carried out or approved at the discretion of the lead agency if certain findings are made associated with project approval (e.g., Statement of Overriding Considerations) (CEQA Guidelines Section 151091 and 151093).

Response 152-74 E: The comment suggests the insertion of the text “...or when traffic volumes will increase as a development impact, or” and “…such roadway improvements be completed prior to project construction.” Additionally, the commenter suggests the removal of the “the extent feasible” from mitigation measure MM 4.7.4.
The County deems that the proposed mitigation measure MM 4.7.4 provides an appropriate level of mitigation for Impact 4.7.4 and mitigation measure MM 4.7.4 is adequate as written to reduce the impact. The reader is referred to Response 152-73 regarding the infeasibility of implementing further measures to attenuate traffic-related noise. Additionally, the issue of timing of when the improvements are constructed will be determined through the CEQA review of individual projects.

Response 152-75 E: The commenter states the term “temporarily” in Impact 4.7.6 should be further defined and comments that the temporary status in its current context could be very significant. The draft General Plan and Draft EIR provides land use designations for potential projects and does not provide environmental clearance for specific projects. Subsequent development within the County will be reviewed for a project’s potential to cause environmental impacts, including noise.

The term temporarily in this context refers to typical small residential, commercial, or office construction projects that do not generate significant noise impacts when standard construction noise control measures are enforced at the construction site and when the duration of the noise generating construction period is limited to one construction season (typically one year) or less.

Response 152-76 E: The commenter states support for mitigation measure MM 4.7.7. Because the commenter supports this mitigation, no response is necessary.

Response 152-77 E: The commenter questions why the County is choosing to exceed regional growth projections, particularly when it would result in increased emissions. The commenter states support for mitigation measure MM 4.8.1c, but suggests addressing impacts from specific projects outside of existing footprint (i.e., carry-over to access roads).

There is no requirement that the General Plan contain the same growth projections as ABAG. The commenter is referred to Alternatives Master Response 3.4.2 for ABAG projections. Impacts associated with increased emissions are adequately addressed and mitigated in Section 4.8, Air Quality, of the Draft EIR. Additionally, subsequent to the release of the Draft General Plan and Draft EIR, further modification has been made to the General Plan Conservation Element. These protective measures include additional language in reference to project-specific project air quality emissions impacts, including the participation in Bay Area Air Quality Management District air quality improvement programs. This additional language will also address the need to reduce project-specific air quality emissions in the vicinity of a proposed project and in adjacent areas.

Response 152-78 E: The commenter states support for mitigation measure MM 4.8.1d. Because the commenter supports this mitigation measure, no response is necessary.
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Response 152-79 E: The commenter suggests text changes to mitigation measure MM 4.8.2 from “providing information regarding” to “requiring.” Subsequent to the release of the Draft General Plan and Draft EIR, further modification has been made to the General Plan Conservation Element. These protective measures include additional language that addresses requiring low emitting fireplaces for future construction projects or home remodeling.

Response 152-80 E: The commenter suggests that mitigation measure MM 4.8.3a should be changed from application to “discretionary projects” to all projects. Subsequent to the release of the Draft General Plan and Draft EIR, further modification has been made to the General Plan Conservation Element. These protective measures include additional language that requires all discretionary projects to follow dust control measures.

Response 152-81 E: The commenter suggests changing hydoseed to appropriate native seeds for mitigation measure MM 4.8.3b. Subsequent to the release of the Draft General Plan and Draft EIR, further modification has been made to the General Plan Conservation Element. These protective measures include additional language that requires the establishment of non-invasive vegetative cover as soil stabilizers. The use of appropriate non-invasive vegetative cover will ensure the protection of native plant species to Napa County.

Response 152-82 E: The commenter suggests that the text “…and to any waterway” should be inserted into mitigation measure MM 4.8.3b for erosion control measures to prevent silt runoff. The commenter also suggests clarification of stabilizing vegetation to appropriate vegetation not resulting in non-native or noxious weeds.

Subsequent to the release of the Draft General Plan and Draft EIR, further modification has been made to the General Plan Conservation Element. These protective measures include additional language that requires the appropriate erosion control measures to prevent silt runoff to public roadways and any waterways. Additional language also requires that stabilizing vegetation consist of non-invasive vegetative cover, which will ensure existing vegetation will not be replaced with noxious weeds.

Response 152-83 E: The commenter suggests that a mitigation measure which would require monitoring or full mitigation should be required for Impact 4.9.1. This impact was found to be less than significant in the EIR analysis. Additionally, the routine 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 hazardous materials is regulated by the DTSC (22 Cal. Code Regs §§ 66001, et seq.). The use, storage, and transport of hazardous materials by developers, contractors, business owners, and others are required to be in compliance with local, state, and federal regulations during project construction and operation. Facilities that use hazardous materials are required to obtain permits and comply with appropriate regulatory agency standards and regulations designed to avoid hazardous material releases. All existing and future development in the unincorporated County would be required to comply with federal, state, and local regulations regarding the handling, transportation, disposal, and clean-up of hazardous materials. The County deems that these
existing regulations are adequate to mitigate for the transport of hazardous materials on area roadways. Therefore, no mitigation measure is required for this impact.

Response 152-84 E: The commenter states support for mitigation measure MM 4.9.2. Because the commenter supports this mitigation measure, no further response is necessary.

Response 152-85 E: The commenter suggests that mitigation measure MM 4.2.2 for Impact 4.9.3 should reference the Angwin Airport. Mitigation measure MM 4.2.2 was designed to reduce any land use conflicts between the draft General Plan and the Napa County Airport Land Use Compatibility Plan, not specific airports or airstrips. Provisions in the County Code (County Code Title 11 [Airport] and Chapter 18.80 [Airport Compatibility Combining District]) provide land use restrictions associated with the Angwin-Parrett Field Airport that mitigate hazards associated with locating land uses within the vicinity of public use airports or private airstrips.

Response 152-86 E: The commenter suggests clarification of adequate emergency access for evacuation in mitigation measure MM 4.9.4 to include appropriate ingress and egress for the entire population of the area not just subsequent development projects.

Adequate emergency access for future development projects will be evaluated under mitigation measures MM 4.13.1.1a and b and will be evaluated for compliance with County Code (Chapters 15.32 and 18.84) and Public Resources Code Sections 4290 and 4291 (e.g., provisions associated with development standards and restrictions regarding structure design, fuel modification zone design, adequacy of emergency access). These additional mitigation measures would ensure that adequate emergency access would be a requirement of subsequent development. The EIR for the General Plan Update cannot legally impose mitigation measures on existing development where ingress and egress does not meet current emergency access standards. The County’s Public Works Department as well as the Sheriffs Department, local fire departments, and CDF regularly review existing and proposed development projects for compliance with health and safety standards and make modifications to the County’s circulation system, including emergency access, as appropriate.

Response 152-87 E: The commenter states “not convinced” next to the significance determination for Impact 4.9.5. Additionally, the commenter recommends deleting the word “result” and the letter “d” from the word “increase” in the impact statement of Impact 4.9.5 to read as follows, “…could increase exposure of...”. This statement has been modified as recommended.

The Napa Firewise program is currently, and would continue to be, implemented under Alternatives A, B, and C in the proposed General Plan Update as well as under County Code provisions associated with building requirements (Chapter 15.32) and fire risk zones (Chapter 18.84) and Public Resources Code Sections 4290 and 4291. Subsequent development would be subject to these 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. The County has deemed that these provisions and standards would provide adequate mitigation to reduce the hazards from wildland fires.

Response 152-88 E: The commenter states support for mitigation measure MM 4.10.1. Because the commenter supports this mitigation measure, no further response is necessary.

Response 152-89 E: The commenter states support for mitigation measure MM 4.10.2. Because the commenter supports this mitigation measure, no further response is necessary.

Response 152-90 E: The commenter suggests changing the text in mitigation measure MM 4.10.4a from “considered” to “required.” The County deems that mitigation measure MM 4.10.4a is an adequate level of mitigation for Impact 4.10.4. Native planting should be considered for landscaping when areas have conditions that would support native species. Since release of the Draft EIR and the public draft of the proposed General Plan Update, the Conservation Element has been further revised to include the following additional policy provisions that further address biological resources in the County and native plants. This also includes incorporation of mitigation measures identified in Draft EIR Section 4.5, Biological Resources, (MM 4.5.1a through c, MM 4.5.2a through c, and MM 4.5.3a and b) into the Conservation Element. The Conservation Element now includes a measure that the County will preserve habitat for fish, wildlife, wildlife movement, and native vegetation to the maximum extent feasible and provide replacement or preservation of oak woodlands and native vegetation at a 2:1 ratio.

Response 152-91 E: The commenter states that mitigation measure MM 4.10.4c should include wastewater disposal in the mitigation and “septic/wastewater treatment” should be inserted. The term buildable site encompasses a large enough area to accommodate associated infrastructure, including septic/wastewater treatment, with a subdivision development. Additionally, Title 13, Division II of the County Code contains provisions for addressing wastewater and septic systems, and it regulates individual, private, and public sewage systems within the unincorporated portions of the County.

Response 152-92 E: The commenter states that Impact 4.10.7 should require soils analysis for mitigation and only approve projects that include wastewater disposal systems. The commenter states that these measures should preclude impacts to groundwater.

The impacts associated with the soils suitability for septic tanks can be reduced or avoided through proper site inspection and project monitoring and maintenance on a project-by-project basis. Site inspection should include percolation testing to determine the soil suitability. When soil suitability is identified, septic systems should be designed accordingly. Title 13, Division II of the County Code establishes specific design, location, capacity, and testing standards for the installation of septic systems that ensure proper operation and avoidance of impacts to groundwater resources. Compliance with the provisions of Title 13, Division II of the County Code would ensure that septic systems as
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a result of subsequent development are designed and operated adequately to avoid system failures and impact to groundwater resources.

Response 152-93 E: The commenter states that Impact 4.10.7 should require mitigation for projects that have the potential to impact surface water through non-point source pollutants. Impact 4.10.7 was found to be less than significant for all three alternatives. The commenter is referred to Impact 4.11.4 and mitigation measure MM 4.11.4, which address non-point source pollutants to downstream surface waters. Additionally, subsequent to the release of the Draft General Plan and Draft EIR, further modification has been made to the General Plan Conservation Element. These protective measures include additional language to protect surface water from non-point source pollutants. Therefore, no additional mitigation is required.

Response 152-94 E: The commenter states that mitigation measure MM 4.11.2a should require implementation of TMDL reports for all water sources. In addition to MM 4.11.2a, mitigation measures MM 4.11.2b and 4.11.3b address TMDL. Subsequent to the release of the Draft General Plan and Draft EIR, further modification has been made to the General Plan Conservation Element. Additional language has been added to policies that reflects the then-current status of the TMDL process. The County shall also comply with applicable Water Quality Control/Basin Plans as amended through the Total Maximum Daily Load (TMDL) process to improve water quality. The County deems that these measures to implement the TMDL process are adequate.

Response 152-95 E: The commenter states support for mitigation measure MM 4.11.3a. Because the commenter supports this mitigation measure, no further response is necessary.

Response 152-96 E: The commenter states that mitigation measure MM 4.11.3b should require implementation of TMDL reports for all water sources. The commenter is referred to Response 152-94.

Response 152-97 E: The commenter states support for mitigation measure MM 4.11.4. Because the commenter supports this mitigation measure, no further response is necessary.

Response 152-98 E: The commenter questions the timeframe for implementation for mitigation measure MM 4.11.4. The measure would be implemented through a streamlined permitting process which requires an application to be reviewed for completeness. The application requirement and reports that demonstrate compliance with described conditions under MM 4.11.4 must be provided in completeness before project approval of vineyard expansion projects.

Response 152-99 E: The commenter states that the project conditions under mitigation measure MM 4.11.4 should be applied to any development within the County.

Projects that come before the County for consideration are required to be evaluated for compliance with County policies, and if they meet the definition of a “project” under CEQA Guidelines Section 15378 they are
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also required to go through a project-specific environmental evaluation that provides a comprehensive analysis of environmental impacts and mitigation measures. It should also be noted that subsequent to the release of the Draft General Plan and Draft EIR, further modification has been made to the General Plan Conservation Element. Additional language has been added to policies to offer incentives such as a streamlined review process for new vineyard development and other projects that incorporate environmentally sustainable practices that avoid or mitigate significant environmental impacts. Therefore, MM 4.11.4 does not need to be expanded to apply to all projects in the County.

Response 152-100 E: The commenter states support for mitigation measure MM 4.11.4E. Because the commenter supports this mitigation measure, no further response is necessary.

Response 152-101 E: The commenter states support for mitigation measure MM 4.11.4E. Because the commenter supports this mitigation measure, no further response is necessary.

Response 152-102 E: The commenter states support for mitigation measure MM 4.11.4F. Because the commenter supports this mitigation measure, no further response is necessary.

Response 152-103 E: The commenter states support for mitigation measure MM 4.11.4G. Because the commenter supports this mitigation measure, no further response is necessary.

Response 152-104 E: The commenter states support for mitigation measure MM 4.11.4G. Because the commenter supports this mitigation measure, no further response is necessary.

Response 152-105 E: The commenter states that the project conditions under mitigation measure MM 4.11.4 should be applied to any development within the County. The commenter is referred to Response 152-99.

Response 152-106 E: The commenter states that the project conditions under mitigation measure MM 4.11.4 should be applied to any development within the County. The commenter is referred to Response 152-99.

Response 152-107 E: The commenter states support for mitigation measure MM 4.11.4H. Because the commenter supports this mitigation measure, no further response is necessary.

Response 152-108 E: The commenter states support for mitigation measure MM 4.11.4H. Because the commenter supports this mitigation measure, no further response is necessary.

Response 152-109 E: The commenter states support for mitigation measure MM 4.11.4H. Because the commenter supports this mitigation measure, no further response is necessary.

Response 152-110 E: The commenter states support for mitigation measure MM 4.11.4J. Because the commenter supports this mitigation measure, no further response is necessary.
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Response 152-111 E: The commenter states support for mitigation measure MM 4.11.4M. Because the commenter supports this mitigation measure, no further response is necessary.

Response 152-112 E: The commenter states support for mitigation measure MM 4.11.4M. Because the commenter supports this mitigation measure, no further response is necessary.

Response 152-113 E: The commenter states support for mitigation measure MM 4.11.4N. Because the commenter supports this mitigation measure, no further response is necessary.

Response 152-114 E: The commenter states stronger policies and actions that protect groundwater should be implemented for Impact 4.11.5. The commenter also states that well pumping that would accelerate overdraft should not be approved. The draft General Plan Update includes several policies including Policy CON-35 to protect water resources and groundwater recharges. The commenter is also referred to Water Supply Master Response 3.4.1 for a discussion of water supply and groundwater resources.

Response 152-115 E: The commenter states support for mitigation measure MM 4.11.5a. Because the commenter supports this mitigation measure, no further response is necessary.

Response 152-116 E: The commenter states support for mitigation measure MM 4.11.5c. Because the commenter supports this mitigation measure, no further response is necessary.

Response 152-117 E: The commenter states support for mitigation measure MM 4.11.5c.c. Because the commenter supports this mitigation measure, no further response is necessary.

Response 152-118 E: The commenter states support for mitigation measure MM 4.11.5d. Because the commenter supports this mitigation measure, no further response is necessary.

Response 152-119 E: The commenter states support for mitigation measure MM 4.11.5e. Because the commenter supports this mitigation measure, no further response is necessary.

Response 152-120 E: The commenter states that mitigation measure MM4.11.3b should address all watercourses in the County. The commenter is referred to Response 152-94.

Response 152-121 E: The commenter states that mitigation measure MM4.11.2a should address all watercourses in the County. The commenter is referred to Response 152-94.

Response 152-122E: The commenter states projects should not be allowed within 100-year flood hazard areas. The County appreciates the input regarding the General Plan process. The County will consider the comment when reviewing the General Plan policies prior to adoption of the document and certification of the EIR.
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The County will allow subsequent development within the 100-year flood hazard areas consistent with the County Floodplain Management Ordinances and the Code of Federal Regulations for the National Flood Insurance Program. The current County Code does not allow development within a defined floodway (unless within the footprint of the existing structure or certified by a registered engineer or architect to not result in any increase in base flood elevation) and does not allow development in the floodplain if the project would increase the base flood elevation by more than one foot, except in special cases. The current County code requires residential structures built within a FEMA-designated special flood hazard area to be elevated at least one foot above the elevation of the 100-year flood level to protect these structures from flood damage. The County deems that these provisions are adequate to reduce hazards associated with development in 100-year flood hazard areas.

Response 152-123 E: The commenter states that the Cultural Resources section was done well. The County appreciates the input regarding the General Plan process. Because the commenter does not recommend any changes, no further response is necessary.

Response 152-124 E: The commenter suggests the insertion of “…or disapproval of permit” at the end of mitigation measure MM 4.12.2. The County deems that MM 4.12.2. is an adequate level of mitigation for Impact 4.12.2 as written.

Response 152-125 E: Commenter states mitigation measure MM 4.13.1.1a for the construction of facilities in caves does not address Impact 4.13.1.1. This mitigation measure specifically requires that cave facilities be designed to meet fire suppression requirements, which would improve fire service provider’s ability to respond and fight cave fires.

Response 152-126 E: The commenter states support for mitigation measure MM 4.13.1.1b. Because the commenter supports this mitigation measure, no further response is necessary.

Response 152-127 E: The commenter states mitigation measure MM 4.13.2.1a should include the requirement to identify the funding source prior to project approval in addition to consultation with law enforcement agencies.

All law enforcement services in the County are funded through the County’s General Fund, individual city general funds, mutual aid agreements, and other sources (e.g., grants), which are generally anticipated to be an adequate funding mechanism to meet the NCSD and local police department’s projected staffing and service needs. However, it should be noted that funding levels of law enforcement services are ultimately decided by the Napa County Board of Supervisors and the local city and town councils for each incorporated city. The County has deemed that these funding mechanisms are adequate to provide funding for law enforcement agencies.

Response 152-128 E: The commenter states support for mitigation measure MM 4.13.3.1b. Because the commenter supports this mitigation measure, no further response is necessary.
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Response 152-129 E: The commenter suggests that a greater percentage of costs should be provided by project developers for Impacts 4.13.5.1, 4.13.6.1, and 4.13.7.1. The County appreciates the input regarding the General Plan process. The County will consider the comment when reviewing the General Plan policies prior to adoption of the document and certification of the EIR.

The Draft EIR is required to evaluate the impacts resulting from the production of quantities of solid waste that would exceed the capacity of the landfill(s) that will serve the project’s solid waste disposal needs or result in non-compliance with federal, state, and local statutes and regulations related to solid waste for Impact 4.13.5.1. The provision of cost for increased solid waste will be determined on a case-by-case basis for specific projects.

For Impact 4.13.6.1, the California Government Code Sections 65995(h) and 65996(b) provide full and complete school facilities mitigation. 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 impacts for the planning, use, development, or provision of adequate school facilities, and Section 65996(b) states that the provisions of the Government Code provide full and complete school facilities mitigation. In Napa County, project applicants proposing new building square footage are directed to the applicable school district to pay required fees prior to permit issuance.

The Draft EIR is required to evaluate the impacts resulting in substantial adverse physical impacts associated with the provision of new or physically altered facilities for Impact 4.13.7.1. The provision of costs for increased facilities will be determined on a case-by-case basis for specific projects.

Response 152-130 E: The commenter suggests that a greater percentage of costs should be provided by project developers for Impacts 4.13.8.1 and 4.13.9.1. The County appreciates the input regarding the General Plan process. The County will consider the comment when reviewing the General Plan policies prior to adoption of the document and certification of the EIR.

The Draft EIR is required to evaluate the impacts resulting in substantial adverse physical impacts associated with the provision of new or physically altered facilities, the construction of which could cause significant environmental impacts associated with Impacts 4.13.8.1 and 4.13.9.1. The provision of costs for increased facilities will be determined on a case-by-case basis for specific projects.

Response 152-131 E: The commenter states support for mitigation measure MM 4.13.9.1a. Because the commenter supports this mitigation measure, no further response is necessary.

Response 152-132 E: The commenter states support for mitigation measure MM 4.13.9.1b. Because the commenter supports this mitigation measure, no further response is necessary.
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Response 152-133 E: The commenter states support for mitigation measure MM 4.13.9.1e. Because the commenter supports this mitigation measure, no further response is necessary.

Response 152-134 E: The commenter suggests the insertion of "...and private multi-residential or commercial development" into mitigation measure MM 4.14.1a. All development activity (e.g., wineries, residences) are subject to the applicable provisions of the Viewshed Protection Ordinance that are intended to protect the visual landscape characteristics of ridgelines and views from designated scenic corridors. Therefore, the Napa County Viewshed Protection Program currently applies to all development activities including multi-family residential and commercial. No change to this mitigation measure is required.

Response 152-135 E: The commenter suggests that text should be inserted into mitigation measure MM 4.14.1b that states "...and most significantly along Viewshed Designated Scenic Routes." Mitigation measure MM 4.14.1b provides for the same level of retention of trees along all public roadways in Napa County, including roads along Viewshed Designated Scenic Routes. No change to this mitigation measure is required.

Response 152-136 E: The commenter states support for mitigation measure MM 4.14. The commenter also suggests that the General Plan and the Draft EIR should identify County-designated scenic roadways throughout the County. Comment noted. The Community Character Element in the Revised General Plan Update has been revised to include information on scenic roadways in the county.

Response 152-137 E: The commenter states support for mitigation measure MM 4.14.1d. Because the commenter supports this mitigation measure, no further response is necessary.

Response 152-138 E: The commenter states support for mitigation measure MM 4.14.1e. Because the commenter supports this mitigation measure, no further response is necessary.

Response 152-139 E: The commenter states support for mitigation measure MM 4.14.2a. Because the commenter supports this mitigation measure, no further response is necessary.

Response 152-140 E: The commenter states support for mitigation measure MM 4.14.2b. Because the commenter supports this mitigation measure, no further response is necessary.

Response 152-141 E: The commenter suggests that the General Plan and the Draft EIR should identify County-designated scenic roadways throughout the County. The commenter is referred to Response 152-136 for a discussion of identifying County-designated scenic roadways.

Response 152-142 E: The commenter states support for mitigation measure MM 4.14.2d. Because the commenter supports this mitigation measure, no further response is necessary.
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Response 152-143 P: The comment suggests inserting “...therefore development will be concentrated in the County’s existing cities and urbanized areas” into Policy Ag/LU-1. The County will consider the comment when reviewing the General Plan policies prior to adoption of the document and certification of the EIR.

Response 152-144 P: The commenter states Goal 2 from the current General Plan should be retained in the updated General Plan. The County appreciates the input regarding the General Plan process. The County will consider the comment when reviewing the General Plan policies prior to adoption of the document and certification of the EIR.

Response 152-145 P: The commenter states support for the use of active verbs in the General Plan. Because the commenter states support for the policy and actions, no further response is necessary.

Response 152-146 P: The commenter suggests that a Designated Public (Scenic) Roads Map should be made part of the General Plan. The Community Character Element of the Revised General Plan Update includes a map of the scenic roadways subject to viewshed protection.

Response 152-147 P: The commenter suggests insertion of “...support of agriculture” into Policy CON-30. Subsequent to the release of the Draft General Plan and Draft EIR, further modification has been made to the General Plan Conservation Element. These protective measures include language for the protection of watersheds for the support of agriculture.

Response 152-148 P: The commenter states support for ROS Goal 1 and Policy ROS-1. Because the commenter states support for the goal and policy, no further response is necessary.

Response 152-149 P: The commenter states support for Policy ROS-3. Because the commenter states support for the policy, no further response is necessary.

Response 152-150 P: The commenter states that portions of Goal 2.5 from the current General Plan are not retained in the updated General Plan. Policy ROS-23 contains measures for a system of scenic roads, bicycle routes, and hiking trails to connect existing cities with recreation and open space resources. Therefore, Policy ROS-23 in the updated General Plan retains the same measures as Goal 2.5 from the current General Plan.

Response 152-151 P: The commenter states support for Policy CiR-3.6. Because the commenter states support for the policy, no further response is necessary.

Response 152-152 P: The commenter states support for Policy Ag/LU-7. Because the commenter states support for the policy, no further response is necessary.

Response 152-153 P: The commenter states support for Policy Ag/LU-3. Because the commenter states support for the policy, no further response is necessary.

Response 152-154 P: The commenter states support for Policy Ag/LU-14 and the disclosure of the right to farm. The commenter also notes that the right-to-farm policy should be disclosed to buyers adjacent to planned subdivisions in rural areas. The requested information has been added to the Revised General Plan Update (now Policy Ag/LU-15).
3.0 Comments and Responses to Comments

Response 152-155 P: The commenter states support for the current General Plan Policy 3.14 Water Supply and stated that it should be retained in the General Plan update. Subsequent to the release of the Draft General Plan and Draft EIR, further modification has been made to the General Plan Conservation Element. These protective measures include language to perform surface and groundwater resources studies within the County.

Response 152-156 P: The commenter requests clarification as to the definition of sub-areas. The County will consider the comment when reviewing the General Plan policies prior to adoption of the document and certification of the EIR.

Response 152-157 P: The commenter states Policy Ag/LU-32 assumes that “bubbles” are appropriately designated; the commenter believes they are not appropriately designated. The County appreciates the input regarding the General Plan process. The County will consider the comment when reviewing the General Plan policies prior to adoption of the document and certification of the EIR.

Response 152-158 P: The commenter states support for Policy Ag/LU-55 and notes that the policy is mislabeled as Policy Ag/LU-53. The commenter suggests that Policy Ag/LU-55 include “and wells.” The commenter also concurs with the current General Plan policy 4.9 for the Angwin Urban Area. The County appreciates the input regarding the General Plan process. The County will consider the comment when reviewing the General Plan policies prior to adoption of the document and certification of the EIR.

The following text on page 14 of the Draft General Plan Policy Location Matrix will be changed as follows:

- Policy Ag/LU-535: The existing density of development in the Angwin Area...

Response 152-159 P: The commenter states that the text should be changed from Figure Ag/LU-1 to Figure 2. The commenter also notes support for Policy Ag/LU-125. The County appreciates the input regarding the General Plan process.

The following text in the General Plan Policy Location Matrix will be changed as follows:

- Policy Ag/LU-111: Figure Ag/LU-133 depicts the land use policy of the County of Napa.

Response 152-160 P: The commenter suggests further defining “already developed areas” in Policy Ag/LU-23. The commenter also suggests defining how many residences are required to extend urban services and what urban services consist of in Policy Ag/LU-24. The County feels that the “already developed areas” terminology contains the correct level of detail for a General Plan policy.

Response 152-161 P: The commenter suggests further defining “already developed areas” in Policy Ag/LU-20. See Response 152-160 above.
Response 152-162 P: The commenter states zoning for Hess Vineyards is inconsistent with Ag/LU goals. The County will consider the comment when reviewing the General Plan policies prior to adoption of the document and certification of the EIR.

Response 152-163 P: The commenter states zoning for Hess Vineyards is inconsistent with Ag/LU goals. The County will consider the comment when reviewing the General Plan policies prior to adoption of the document and certification of the EIR.

Response 152-164 P: The commenter states support for Policy Ag/LU-39. Because the commenter states support for the policy, no further response is necessary.

Response 152-165 P: The commenter states that Policy Ag/LU-121 and -123 have the same language and content.

The following text on page 86 of the General Plan will be changed as follows to reflect the correct policy numbering in the General Plan Update.

Policy Ag/LU-120: Work with the school districts serving students in the County to coordinate the provision of school facilities in conjunction with demographic changes and student populations. Also encourage incorporated areas to reserve school sites within their jurisdictions.

Response 152-166 P: The commenter states support for Policy Ag/LU-122. Because the commenter states support for the policy, no further response is necessary.

Response 152-167 P: The commenter states support for Policy Ag/LU-124. Because the commenter states support for the policy, no further response is necessary.

Response 152-168 P: The commenter states support for Circulation Goal 1. Because the commenter states support for the goal, no further response is necessary.

Response 152-169 P: The commenter suggests further defining “already developed areas” to “existing incorporated areas and urbanized areas” in Policy CIR-1.1. Subsequent to the release of the Draft General Plan and Draft EIR, further modification has been made to the General Plan Circulation Element. These protective measures include additional language to further describe already developed areas as existing cities, towns, and urbanized areas.

Response 152-170 P: The commenter suggests language be inserted in Action Item CIR-2.1.1: “…driveway spacing.” The commenter also suggests inserting “Proposed multi-residential developments shall address impacts to County connector roads prior to project approval for construction” into Action Item CIR-2.1.1.

In the text of this action item (Action Item CIR-11.1 in the Revised General Plan Update) “other design details” would encompass driveway spacing. Additionally, Action Item CIR-11.1 addresses road and street design standards and does not assess the impacts from traffic on nearby roadways.
3.0 Comments and Responses to Comments

Response 152-171 P: The commenter suggests further defining “already developed areas” to existing incorporated areas and urbanized areas in Policy CIR-1.1. The commenter also suggests that the term “should” be replaced with “shall.” Subsequent to the release of the Draft General Plan and Draft EIR, further modification has been made to the General Plan Circulation Element. These protective measures include additional language to further describe already developed areas as existing cities, towns, and urbanized areas. Additionally, the County deems that the term “should” is adequate for this policy (now Policy CIR-1).

Response 152-172 P: Commenter suggests including intersection improvements to SR 29 and Deer Park Road. The commenter suggests inserting “…separate left turn lanes when justified.” The commenter also questions whether there is an intersection at SR 29 and Rutherford Cross Road and if the Yountville Cross Road and SR 29 intersection is intended to reference Yountville Cross Road and Silverado Trail. The County has reviewed the Circulation Element and did not recommend including these recommendations at this time. However, Circulation Element Policy CIR-13 specifically notes the following:

“Intersection improvements to improve safety and traffic flow at the intersections of State Route 29 and Silverado Trail with Oakville Grade, Oakville Cross Road, Rutherford Cross Road, Yountville Cross Road, and Deer Park Road.”

Response 152-173 P: The commenter states that a portion of the current General Plan policy 2.e State Highway Routes and County Roads should be retained in the General Plan Update under Policy Ag/LU-105. The County will consider the comment when reviewing the General Plan policies prior to adoption of the document and certification of the EIR.

Response 152-174 P: The commenter states support for Circulation Goal 3. The commenter suggests that text be added: “The County shall encourage residents’ use of public transportation.” The Circulation Element includes several policies throughout the Element that encourage the use of regional and local public transportation, including several policies under Goal 3. Therefore, Circulation Goal 3 does not need to be modified.

Response 152-175 P: The commenter states support for Action Item CIR-2.7.1 and Policy CIR-3.7. Because the commenter supports the action and policy, no further response is necessary.

Response 152-176 P: The commenter states support for Policy CIR-3.11. Because the commenter supports the policy, no further response is necessary.

Response 152-177 P: The commenter suggests inserting “…and zoning” into Policy SAF-31. The commenter suggests that Angwin Airport should be specifically included in Policy SAF-31 policy. The County has made this suggested text change; the policy is now renumbered as SAF-33 in the revised Safety Element.

Response 152-178 P: The commenter states support for Circulation Goal 3. The commenter is referred to Response 152-174.
3.0 Comments and Responses to Comments

Response 152-179 P: The commenter states support for Policy CIR-3.9. The commenter also suggests inserting “…and are compatible with adjacent areas” and “Such alternate uses should be appropriately buffered.” Subsequent to the release of the Draft General Plan and Draft EIR, further modification has been made to the General Plan Circulation Element. These protective measures include additionally language to convert abandoned rail right-of-way to bicycle routes, provided they are compatible with adjacent uses.

Response 152-180 P: The commenter suggests further defining “Increase the attractiveness” in CIR-3.2. Subsequent to the release of the Draft General Plan and Draft EIR, further modification has been made to General Plan Policy CIR-3.2 Now CIR-26) that further defines increased attractiveness as achieved through a variety of means, including promoting transit-oriented development in appropriate locations and use of transit by visitors to Napa County.

Response 152-181 P: The commenter suggests including an increase percentage number into Policy ROS-12 and inserting the text “to meet both transportation and recreation needs.” The County will consider the comment when reviewing the General Plan policies prior to adoption of the document and certification of the EIR.

Response 152-182 P: The commenter suggests portions of the current General Plan policy 7g should be retained in the General Plan Update. The commenter states support for Policy CIR-3.5. The County appreciates the input regarding the General Plan process. The County will consider the comment when reviewing the General Plan policies prior to adoption of the document and certification of the EIR. The updated General Plan includes language under Goal 3 of the Circulation Element that would require that development proposals and public projects provide for bicycle access. These policies retain the intent of the current policy 7g.

Response 152-183 P: The commenter suggests that Policy CIR-3.8 should be changed to say “shall be required as a component” to replace “considered in the evaluation.” Subsequent to the release of the Draft General Plan and Draft EIR, further modification has been made to the policy (now Policy CIR-33) in the Revised General Plan Update Policy requiring that pedestrian and bicycle access be integrated into all parking lots where feasible and appropriate.

Response 152-184 P: The commenter suggests that the term “enhance the attractiveness” be further defined. The County will consider the comment when reviewing the General Plan policies prior to adoption of the document and certification of the EIR.

Response 152-185 P: The commenter states that Policy CC-12 [Policy CC-14 in the Revised General Plan Update] only addresses telecommunication facilities and transmission lines and suggests retaining language from the current General Plan Policy 3. The County will consider the comment when reviewing the General Plan policies prior to adoption of the document and certification of the EIR.
3.0 Comments and Responses to Comments

Response 152-186 P: The commenter suggests replacing “should” with “shall” in Policy CC-9. The County will consider the comment when reviewing the General Plan policies prior to adoption of the document and certification of the EIR.

Response 152-187 P: The commenter states support for Policy CON-8. Because the commenter supports the policy, no further response is necessary.

Response 152-188 P: The commenter states support for Policy CON-11. Because the commenter supports the policy, no further response is necessary.

Response 152-189 P: The commenter states support for Policy CON-6. Because the commenter supports the policy, no further response is necessary.

Response 152-190 P: The commenter states support for Policy CON-31. The commenter suggests that the current conservation regulations be listed and referenced. The conservation regulations to which Policy CON-31d is referring are those regulations that pertain to municipal water supply. The County will consider the comment when reviewing the General Plan policies prior to adoption of the document and certification of the EIR.

Response 152-191 P: The commenter states support for Policy CON-31g. Because the commenter supports the policy, no further response is necessary.

Response 152-192 P: The commenter suggests that the current General Plan policies d and e related to encouraging programs to protect wildlife species should be retained in the General Plan update. The General Plan update contains language in the current General Plan policies d and e under protection measures related to special-status species including but not limited to CON-9, -11, and -13. The County will consider the comment when reviewing the General Plan policies prior to adoption of the document and certification of the EIR.

Response 152-193 P: The commenter suggests that “Napa County” be inserted in Policy CON-14. The commenter also notes support for CON-14. Additionally, subsequent to the releases of the Draft General Plan and Draft EIR, further modification has been made to General Plan Policy CON-14 to include the term Napa County. Because the commenter supports the policy, no further response is necessary.

Response 152-194 P: The commenter states support for Policy CON-16. Because the commenter supports the policy, no further response is necessary.

Response 152-195 P: The commenter states support for Policy CON-17. Because the commenter supports the policy, no further response is necessary.

Response 152-196 P: The commenter does not support construction on levees discussed under Policy CON-21d. Subsequent to the releases of the Draft General Plan and Draft EIR, the Conservation Element of the Revised General Plan Update has been further modified to restrict construction on levees (see Policy CON-31d).

Response 152-197 P: The commenter suggests that Policy CON-22c should redefine “adaptive vegetation” to be conscious of exotic/invasive species. Subsequent to the release of the Draft General Plan and Draft EIR, further modification has
3.0 Comments and Responses to Comments

been made to the Conservation Element of the Revised General Plan Update to define replacement vegetation as native vegetation (see Policy CON-24c).

Response 152-198 P: The commenter states support for Policy CON-23. Because the commenter supports the policy, no further response is necessary.

Response 152-199 P: The commenter states support for Policy CON-25e. Because the commenter supports the policy, no further response is necessary.

Response 152-200 P: The commenter states support for Policy CON-27. The commenter also suggests inserting “…careful review for ecological impacts of proposed developments.” Subsequent to the release of the Draft General Plan and Draft EIR, further modification has been made to the Conservation Element in Policy CON-18, which includes additional language requirement for reviewing ecological impact from various developments.

Response 152-201 P: The commenter states that Policy CON-16 addresses wetlands and not forested lands.

The commenter is referred to the revisions to the update matrix released in December 2007.

Response 152-202 P: The commenter states that monitoring conversions of riparian lands is very important in Policy CON-24 and the text “Napa County” should be inserted into the policy. Subsequent to the release of the Draft General Plan and Draft EIR, further modification has been made to Revised General Plan Update Policy CON-28 (policy has been renumbered) to include the term “Napa County.”

Response 152-203 P: The commenter suggests that “adapted vegetation” be further defined in Policy CON-2c. Subsequent to the release of the Draft General Plan and Draft EIR, further modification has been made to the General Plan to further define adaptive vegetation as non-invasive vegetation in Policy CON-2c.

Response 152-204 P: The commenter states support for Policy CON-7. Because the commenter supports the policy, no further response is necessary.

Response 152-205 P: The commenter states support for Policy CON-34. Because the commenter supports the policy, no further response is necessary.

Response 152-206 P: The commenter requests that the term “resources” be further defined in Policy CON-68. The term resources is defined in Goal CON-6, and -7 as forests, woodlands, commercial timberlands, and mineral deposits.

Response 152-207 P: The commenter states support for Policy CON-72. Because the commenter supports the policy, no further response is necessary.

Response 152-208 P: The commenter states support for Policy CON-71. Because the commenter supports the policy, no further response is necessary.

Response 152-209 P: The commenter states support for Policy CON-73. Because the commenter supports the policy, no further response is necessary.
3.0 Comments and Responses to Comments

Response 152-210 P: The commenter states support for ROS Goal 1 and Goal 2. Because the commenter supports the goals, no further response is necessary.

Response 152-211 P: The commenter states support for Policy CC-17 and Action Item CC-17.1 and CC-17.2. Because the commenter supports the policy and action items, no further response is necessary.

Response 152-212 P: The commenter states support for Policy CC-3. Because the commenter supports the policy, no further response is necessary.

Response 152-213 P: The commenter states support for Policy SAF-8. Because the commenter supports the policy, no further response is necessary.

Response 152-214 P: The commenter states support for Policy SAF-23. Because the commenter supports the policy, no further response is necessary.

Response 152-215 P: The commenter states that language from the current General Plan policy Conservation Policy (a) should be retained in the General Plan update Action Item SAF-16.1 for safe ingress and egress. Safe ingress/egress is addressed in Policies SAF-13 and SAF-20 of the revised Safety Element.

Response 152-216 P: The commenter suggests text changes to Policy CON-38 to strengthen the policy. The County appreciates the input regarding the General Plan process. The County will consider the comment when reviewing the General Plan policies prior to adoption of the document and certification of the EIR. The County deems that the language in Policy CON-38 (now Policy CON-44) is adequate for maintaining reliable water supply. The County will consider the comment when reviewing the General Plan policies prior to adoption of the document and certification of the EIR.

Response 152-217 P: The commenter states support for Goal CON-12. Because the commenter supports the goal, no further response is necessary.

Response 152-218 P: The commenter states that the language in Conservation Policy (b) was forward thinking for the 1983 General Plan. Because the commenter does not provide a comment about the General Plan Update or proposed policies, no further response is necessary.

Response 152-219 P: The commenter states support for Safety Element Goal 2. Because the commenter supports the goal, no further response is necessary.

Response 152-220 P: The commenter states support for Safety Element Goals 3, 4, and 5. Because the commenter supports the goals, no further response is necessary.

Response 152-221 P: The commenter states support for Policy SAF-9. Because the commenter supports the policy, no further response is necessary.

Response 152-222 P: The commenter suggests changing the language of “should” to “shall be” in Policy SAF-13. The suggested change has been made to the revised Safety Element (see Action Item SAF-8.1).

Response 152-223 P: The commenter states support for Policy SAF-20. Because the commenter supports the policy, no further response is necessary.
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Response 152-224 P: The commenter states support for Policy SAF-16. The commenter suggests changing the language of “should” to “shall be” in Policy SAF-16. The commenter also suggests inserting “…and adequate ingress and egress for the population of the area” into Action Item SAF-16.1. The commenter also notes support for Action Item SAF-16.2. The requested change has been made to Policy SAF-16 in the Safety Element.

Response 152-225 P: The commenter states support for Policy SAF-17. Because the commenter supports the policy, no further response is necessary.

Response 152-226 P: The commenter suggests implementing with changes she noted under Policy SAF-16. The commenter is referred to Response 152-224.

Response 152-227 P: The commenter states support for Policy SAF-19. Because the commenter supports the policy, no further response is necessary.

Response 152-228 P: The commenter states support for Policy SAF-10. Because the commenter supports the policy, no further response is necessary.

Response 152-229 P: The commenter states support for Policy SAF-11. Because the commenter supports the policy, no further response is necessary.

Response 152-230 P: The commenter states support for Policy SAF-12. Because the commenter supports the policy, no further response is necessary.

Response 152-231 P: The commenter states support for Policy SAF-23. Because the commenter supports the policy, no further response is necessary.

Response 152-232 P: Commenter suggests changing the language of “should” to “shall be” in Policy SAF-24. Comment noted. The requested change has been made to the Safety Element of the Revised General Plan Update (see Policy SAF-25).

Response 152-233 P: The commenter suggests inserting the language “…and feasibility of development for the location proposed” into Policy SAF-25 and also suggests changing the word “should” to “shall be” in the policy. The County will consider the comment when reviewing the General Plan policies prior to adoption of the document and certification of the EIR.

Response 152-234 P: The commenter states support for Policy SAF-27. Because the commenter supports the policy, no further response is necessary.

Response 152-235 P: The commenter states support for Policy SAF-5. Because the commenter supports the policy, no further response is necessary.

Response 152-236 P: The commenter states support for Policy SAF-38. Because the commenter supports the policy, no further response is necessary.

Response 152-237 P: The commenter suggests inserting the language “…emergency broadcast systems” into Policy SAF-39. The requested change has been made and is now shown in revised Policy SAF-41 of the revised Safety Element.
3.0 COMMENTS AND RESPONSES TO COMMENTS

Response 152-238 P: The commenter states support for Policy SAF-42. Because the commenter supports the policy, no further response is necessary.