

## CEQA Environmental Checklist Form

### ENVIRONMENTAL FACTORS POTENTIALLY AFFECTED:

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

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

DETERMINATION: (To be completed by the Lead Agency)

On the basis of this initial evaluation:

- I find that the proposed project COULD NOT have a significant effect on the environment, and a NEGATIVE DECLARATION will be prepared.
- I find that although the proposed project could have a significant effect on the environment, there will not be a significant effect in this case because revisions in the project have been made by or agreed to by the project proponent. A MITIGATED NEGATIVE DECLARATION will be prepared.
- I find that the proposed project MAY have a significant effect on the environment, and an ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACT REPORT is required.
- I find that the proposed project MAY have a "potentially significant impact" or "potentially significant unless mitigated" impact on the environment, but at least one effect 1) has been adequately analyzed in an earlier document pursuant to applicable legal standards, and 2) has been addressed by mitigation measures based on the earlier analysis as described on attached sheets. An ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACT REPORT is required, but it must analyze only the effects that remain to be addressed.

I find that although the proposed project could have a significant effect on the environment, because all potentially significant effects (a) have been analyzed adequately in an earlier EIR or NEGATIVE DECLARATION pursuant to applicable standards, and (b) have been avoided or mitigated pursuant to that earlier EIR or NEGATIVE DECLARATION, including revisions or mitigation measures that are imposed upon the proposed project, nothing further is required.

---

Signature

Date

---

Printed name

For

Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporation	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
--------------------------------------	---	------------------------------------	--------------

**I. AESTHETICS** -- Would the project:

a) Have a substantial adverse effect on a scenic vista?

<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
--------------------------	--------------------------	-------------------------------------	--------------------------

Substantiation: The project vicinity does not include any areas that are recognized as scenic vistas. The Maxwell Bridge Replacement Project would contribute to the aesthetic and scenic enhancement of the Napa River by spanning over a restored floodplain.

b) Substantially damage scenic resources, including, but not limited to, trees, rock outcroppings, and Historic buildings within a state scenic highway?

<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
--------------------------	--------------------------	--------------------------	-------------------------------------

Substantiation: The revegetation plan would address riverbank vegetation disturbed by construction. The plan would include cutting and filling along the banks and levees to make them appear more natural, and tree replacement design to regain the characteristics of existing trees in a relatively short time.

b) Substantially degrade the existing visual character or quality of the site and its surroundings?

<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
--------------------------	--------------------------	-------------------------------------	--------------------------

Substantiation: The bridge would be visually comparable to other arcing bridges in the City of Napa (e.g. Butler Bridge) compared to the existing structure.

d) Create a new source of substantial light or glare which would adversely affect day or nighttime views in the area?

<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
--------------------------	--------------------------	-------------------------------------	--------------------------

Substantiation: As vehicles travel over the top of the proposed bridge, headlights have the potential to throw light and glare toward residential areas to the southwest. A glare study would be conducted during the design phase of the bridge; and, if the study indicates that headlight glare would be generated toward residential areas, a deflective barrier would be incorporated into the final bridge design.

	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporation	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
--	--------------------------------------	---	------------------------------------	--------------

**II. AGRICULTURE RESOURCES:** In determining whether impacts to agricultural resources are significant environmental effects, lead agencies may refer to the California Agricultural Land Evaluation and Site Assessment Model (1997) prepared by the California Dept. of Conservation as an optional model to use in assessing impacts on agriculture and farmland. Would the project:

a) Convert Prime Farmland, Unique Farmland, or Farmland of Statewide Importance Farmland), as shown on the maps prepared pursuant to the Farmland Mapping and Monitoring Program of the California Resources Agency, to non-agricultural use?

                                                                

b) Conflict with existing zoning for agricultural use, or a Williamson Act contract?

                                                                

c) Involve other changes in the existing environment which, due to their location or nature, could result in conversion of Farmland, to non-agricultural use?

                                                                

Substantiation for II a), b), and c): None of the land at or near the project site is zoned for agriculture.

**III. AIR QUALITY --** Where available, the Significance criteria established by the applicable air quality management or air pollution control district may be relied upon to make the following determinations. Would the project:

a) Conflict with or obstruct implementation of the applicable air quality plan?

                                                                

b) Violate any air quality standard or contribute substantially to an existing or projected air quality violation?

                                                                

c) Result in a cumulatively considerable net increase of any criteria pollutant for which the project region is non-attainment under an applicable federal or state ambient air quality standard (including releasing emissions which exceed quantitative thresholds for ozone precursors)?

Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporation	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
--------------------------------------	---	------------------------------------	--------------

d) Expose sensitive receptors to substantial pollutant concentrations?

                                                                

Substantiation for III a), b), c), & d): Currently, the Bay Area is in attainment for carbon monoxide (CO) emissions. The Bay Area Air Quality Management District, the regulating agency for the nine-county region, has approved the use of Caltrans' CO Protocol as a framework for analyzing impacts of proposed projects to regional CO emission levels. This protocol compares proposed projects to similar roadways currently in use in the region. Based upon the results of the air quality analysis conducted for the Maxwell Bridge Replacement Project, Caltrans has concluded that this project will not cause an increase in regional CO emissions.

e) Create objectionable odors affecting a substantial number of people?

                                                                

Substantiation: Construction activities would not generate objectionable odors.

**IV. BIOLOGICAL RESOURCES -- Would the project:**

a) Have a substantial adverse effect, either directly or through habitat modifications, on any species identified as a candidate, sensitive, or special status species in local or regional plans, policies, or regulations, or by the California Department of Fish and Game or U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service?

                                                                

b) Have a substantial adverse effect on any riparian habitat or other sensitive natural community identified in local or regional plans, policies, regulations or by the California Department of Fish and Game or U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service?

                                                                

Substantiation of IV a), & b): The project is not likely to jeopardize the continued existence of the Salt Marsh Harvest Mouse, Delta Smelt and Sacramento Splittail. Furthermore, the project is not likely to jeopardize the continued existence of the Central California Coast steelhead ESU (evolutionary significant unit).

The proposed project was developed as part of the Napa River/Napa Creek Flood Reduction Project and will adhere to any conditions prescribed by federal and state regulatory agencies to protect biological resources. In addition, the Napa River/Napa Creek Flood Reduction

Project FEIS/EIR proposed measures to minimize adverse impacts on biological resources from activities associated with the flood reduction project. The following biological resources have been considered and will be protected in accordance with the protective, monitoring, and mitigation measures prescribed by USFWS, NMFS, and DFG:

Central California Coast Steelhead. The Central California Coast Steelhead is proposed as endangered under the federal Endangered Species Act. Construction of the Maxwell Bridge will result in short-term habitat impacts, such as loss of riparian habitat and shaded riverine aquatic cover, and emergent marsh. However, the contiguous floodplain that the new bridge will allow will contribute to a net increase in habitat values for steelhead over the life of the flood reduction project.

Chinook Salmon. According to NMFS, juvenile chinook salmon runs and outmigration are expected to remain downstream of the project area. Therefore, it is not expected that the Maxwell Bridge Project will affect any listed or proposed chinook salmon runs.

Sacramento Splittail. The Sacramento Splittail is proposed as threatened under the federal Endangered Species list. The U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service does not expect long-term losses of habitat; however there may be some short-term impacts related to construction that may result in direct, indirect, and cumulative effects on splittail. For instance, splittail could be harassed or harmed during construction. In its biological opinion, the USFWS has concluded that the Napa River/Napa Creek Flood Reduction Project, which includes the Maxwell Bridge Replacement Project, meets the recovery objective to restore floodplain habitat that is stated in the Recovery Plan for Delta Fishes for spawning and rearing for splittail.

Delta Smelt. The U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service does not expect long-term losses of habitat; however there may be some short-term impacts related to construction that may result in direct, indirect, and cumulative effects on delta smelt. For instance, delta smelt could be harassed or harmed during construction. In its biological opinion, the USFWS has concluded that the Napa River/Napa Creek Flood Reduction Project, which includes the Maxwell Bridge Replacement Project, meets the recovery objective to restore floodplain habitat that is stated in the Recovery Plan for Delta Fishes for spawning and rearing for delta smelt.

Salt Marsh Harvest Mouse. Although no Salt March Harvest Mouse habitat exists within the project limits, Caltrans will adhere to the habitat restoration plan developed by the U.S. Army Corps of Engineers in consultation with U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service for implementation of the flood reduction project.

Delta Tule Pea. The Delta Tule Pea has been found within the proposed Maxwell Bridge Replacement project limits and is identified as a Species of Concern by the U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service. It is Caltrans' policy to mitigate for Species of Concern plants that are taken as a result of project work. It is anticipated that the Delta Tule Pea will be replaced at an approximately 10:1 ratio at a location within the project limits. A mitigation plan will be implemented after consultation with the U.S. Fish and Wildlife.

Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporation	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
--------------------------------------	---	------------------------------------	--------------

c) Have a substantial adverse effect on federally protected wetlands as defined by Section 404 of the Clean Water Act (including but not limited to, marsh, vernal pool, coastal, etc.) through direct removal, filling, hydrological interruption, or other means?

                
 
                 
 
                 

Substantiation: Two wetlands that have been identified within the project limits. One is located just outside of the proposed bridge alignment; however, it will be protected as an Environmentally Sensitive Area, and will not be impacted by the proposed project. The other area, which will be filled, constitutes less than 0.25 hectares of wetland. As stated earlier, a 404 Nationwide Permit will be sought from the US Army Corps of Engineers for this project.

d) Interfere substantially with the movement of any native resident or migratory fish or wildlife species or with established native resident or migratory wildlife corridors, or impede the use of native wildlife nursery sites?

                
 
                 
 
                 

Substantiation: Cliff swallows and barn swallows that use Maxwell Bridge for nesting are protected under the Migratory Bird Treaty Act. Caltrans will take protective measures to avoid impacts to nesting migratory birds.

e) Conflict with any local policies or ordinances protecting biological resources, such as a tree preservation policy or ordinance?

                
 
                 
 
                 

Substantiation: The City of Napa does not have a tree preservation policy per se. However, the City has policies regarding habitat preservation and restoration. It is likely that the proposed project would disturb a small amount of habitat, especially riparian habitat, during parts of construction. The project includes the restoration of the riverbanks and reestablishment of vegetation after construction is complete, thereby preventing any significant conflict with the City's habitat preservation policies. Also, the completion of the proposed project would reestablish the marshplain terrace habitat planned in the "Living River Strategy" proposed in the Napa River/Napa Creek Flood Reduction Project.

	Potentially Significant Impact	Less than Significant With Mitigation Incorporation	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
--	--------------------------------------	---	------------------------------------	--------------

f) Conflict with the provisions of an adopted Habitat Conservation Plan, Natural Community Conservation Plan, or other approved local, regional, or state habitat conservation plan?

                                                                

Substantiation: The proposed project will not interfere with the planned Napa River Wetlands Enhancement Plan and Napa Marsh Project identified in the FSEIS/R for the Napa River/Napa Creek Flood Reduction Project.

**V. CULTURAL RESOURCES -- Would the project:**

a) Cause a substantial adverse change in the significance of a historical resource as defined in Sec. 15064.5?

                                                                

Substantiation: There are no significant local, state, or federal historic properties, landmarks, etc., in the vicinity of the proposed project. The California State Historic Preservation Officer has concurred with the Corps of Engineers that the Maxwell Bridge is not eligible for listing on the National Register of Historic Places.

b) Cause a substantial adverse change in the significance of an archaeological resource pursuant to Sec. 15064.5?

                                                                

c) Directly or indirectly destroy a unique paleontological resource or site or unique geologic features?

                                                                

d) Disturb any human remains, including those interred outside of formal cemeteries?

                                                                

Substantiation for V b), c), and d). According to the Archaeological Survey Report for the proposed project, there are no recorded prehistoric resources in the project vicinity, and the available information suggests a minimum potential for either significant subsurface prehistoric or historic archaeological materials in the project vicinity. A site visit found no surface indicators of cultural resources. However, Caltrans requires a field survey after vegetation is cleared to confirm the absence of archaeological resources.

Furthermore, Caltrans policy requires that, in the event that archaeological elements are encountered during construction, work in the vicinity of the find must be halted until an archaeologist can be consulted and can assess the significance of the find. If the archaeological site cannot be avoided, work will proceed in the vicinity of the find only after appropriate archaeological studies have been undertaken.

	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporation	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
--	--------------------------------------	---	------------------------------------	--------------

**VI. GEOLOGY AND SOILS --** Would the project:

a) Expose people or structures to potential substantial adverse effects, including the risk of loss, injury, or death involving:

i) Rupture of a known earthquake fault, as delineated on the most recent Alquist-Priolo Earthquake Fault Zoning Map issued by the State Geologist for the area or based on other substantial evidence of a known fault? Refer to Division of Mines and Geology Special Publication 42.

                                                                

ii) Strong seismic ground shaking?

                                                                

iii) Seismic-related ground failure, including liquefaction?

                                                                

iv) Landslides?

                                                                

Substantiation: According to the Caltrans Highway Design Manual, "While it is not possible to completely assure earthquake proof facilities, every attempt should be made to limit potential damage and prevent collapse." The project area is located in a seismically active area, between the Soda Creek Fault to the east and the West Napa Fault to the west. This situation necessitates a great deal of geotechnical investigation and accommodation when designing the replacement bridge. The final bridge design would be reviewed and approved by Caltrans' Division of Structures and Office of Structural Foundations for seismic stability and structural integrity.

b) Result in substantial soil erosion or the loss of topsoil?

                                                                

Substantiation: Caltrans would require erosion control measures during construction of the new approaches and when removing the existing approaches.

c) Be located on a geologic unit or soil that is unstable, or that would become unstable as a result of the project, and potentially result in on- or off-site landslide, lateral spreading, subsidence, liquefaction or collapse?

                                                                

Substantiation: Before beginning any construction project, Caltrans conducts geotechnical investigations. Preliminary, planning-level investigations at Maxwell Bridge have indicated the presence of soils with the potential for liquefaction, lurching, laterally spreading into the river, and settlement. If the proposed project is approved, these characteristics would be further investigated and compensated for when designing the bridge.

Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporation	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
--------------------------------------	---	------------------------------------	--------------

- d) Be located on expansive soil, as defined in Table 18-1-B of the Uniform Building Code (1994), creating substantial risks to life or property?

<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
--------------------------	--------------------------	-------------------------------------	--------------------------

Substantiation: Preliminary geotechnical investigations have not revealed the presence of expansive soil. However, if expansive soil is encountered during project development or construction, the structural design will accommodate them.

- e) Have soils incapable of adequately supporting the use of septic tanks or alternative waste water disposal systems where sewers are not available for the disposal of waste water?

<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
--------------------------	--------------------------	--------------------------	-------------------------------------

Substantiation: The proposed project does not entail the construction or use of septic tanks. It does not include the generation of wastewater.

**VII. HAZARDS AND HAZARDOUS MATERIALS --** Would the project:

- a) Create a significant hazard to the public or the environment through the routine transport, use or disposal of hazardous materials?

<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
--------------------------	--------------------------	-------------------------------------	--------------------------

- b) Create a significant hazard to the public or the environment through reasonably foreseeable upset and accident conditions involving the release of hazardous materials into the environment?

<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
--------------------------	--------------------------	-------------------------------------	--------------------------

Substantiation of VII a) and b): The proposed replacement bridge would be designed and constructed for safety by meeting the standards of Caltrans' Highway Design Manual. Hazardous materials transport is allowed on state highways. Caltrans anticipates that hazardous materials transporters that currently use the existing bridge would also use the replacement bridge. Because the highway will meet safety standards, the hazard to the public or the environment is less than significant.

- c) Emit hazardous emissions or handle hazardous or acutely hazardous materials, substances, or waste within one-quarter mile of an existing or proposed school?

<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
--------------------------	--------------------------	-------------------------------------	--------------------------

Substantiation: At the eastern end of the eastern approach, the project site shares a boundary with the athletic fields of Napa Valley College. During removal of the existing bridge, there is the potential for emissions of lead-containing paint dust. However, the Caltrans contract would specify that the contractor must take all practical actions necessary to avoid the release of these emissions. Also, the contract would specify that the contractor will perform work area monitoring of the

ambient air and soil. The Caltrans resident engineer in charge of construction, as well as any other Caltrans field engineers, would have authority to order the contractor to stop work if any emission of lead-containing materials was detected.

- d) Be located on a site which is included on a list of hazardous materials sites compiled pursuant to Government Code Section 65962.5 and, as a result, would it create a significant hazard to the public or the environment?

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

Substantiation: None of the four properties that would be involved in the new bridge alignment is on any of the Government Code Section 65962.5 lists. An investigation was conducted for each parcel, including a review of government records and a visual site inspection. None of these Initial Site Assessments (ISAs) encountered evidence of hazardous materials sites. Still, Caltrans would continue to inspect the site for hazards as the design and construction of the proposed project progressed. If any hazardous materials were discovered, Caltrans would ensure that they were managed in accordance with applicable regulations in a way that fully protected public health and the environment.

- e) For a project located within an airport land use plan or, where such a plan has not been adopted, within two miles of a public airport or public use airport, would the project result in a safety hazard for people residing or working in the project area?

<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
--------------------------	--------------------------	--------------------------	-------------------------------------

Substantiation: Imola Avenue is outside the Planning Area Boundary of the Napa County Airport Land Use Compatibility Plan.

- f) For a project within the vicinity of a private airstrip, would the project result in a safety hazard for people residing or working in the project area?

<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
--------------------------	--------------------------	--------------------------	-------------------------------------

Substantiation: The project area is not within the vicinity of a private airstrip.

- g) Impair implementation of or physically interfere with an adopted emergency response plan or emergency execution plan?

<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
--------------------------	--------------------------	--------------------------	-------------------------------------

Substantiation: The proposed bridge replacement would enhance emergency response vehicle service. It may reduce travel time during peak hours. In addition, the existing

bridge would remain in use until the new bridge is completed; therefore, construction would also not delay emergency response vehicles.

Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporation	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
--------------------------------------	---	------------------------------------	--------------

- h) Expose people or structures to a significant risk of loss, injury or death involving wildland fires, including where wildlands are adjacent to urbanized areas or where residences are intermixed with wildlands?

                                                                

Substantiation: The proposed project would not tend to expose people to wildland fires because it would not have a discernable effect on wildland land use.

**VIII. HYDROLOGY AND WATER QUALITY –**Would the project:

- a) Violate any water quality standards or waste discharge requirements?

                                                                

Substantiation: The State Water Resources Control Board has issued Caltrans a statewide NPDES (National Pollutant Discharge Elimination System) permit, Order No. 99-06-DWQ, and a permit that applies to all general construction activities, Order No. 99-08-DWQ. All Caltrans activities must comply with these permits. According to the NPDES permit, a Storm Water Pollution Prevention Plan must be submitted to the Regional Board before project construction can be initiated. The NPDES permit also requires that Permanent Control Measures or drainage improvements for water quality benefit must be considered for the project. Adherence to the requirements of the NPDES permit would ensure that the proposed project would not have any significant environmental impacts to water quality.

- b) Substantially deplete groundwater supplies or interfere substantially with groundwater recharge such that there would be a net deficit in aquifer volume or a lowering of the local groundwater table level (e.g. the production rate of pre-existing nearby wells would drop to a level which would not support existing land uses or planned uses for which permits have been granted)?

                                                                

Substantiation: The construction of the bridge approaches might involve work within the water table. For instance, footings for the columns proposed to support the approaches might require excavation deeper than the level of the water table. However, there is only one abandoned well within the project limits that will become Caltrans property as part of acquired right of way. Furthermore, it is not anticipated that the well will be used in the future; therefore, the excavations are not expected to perceptibly affect the groundwater level in any well.

Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporation	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
--------------------------------------	---	------------------------------------	--------------

c) Substantially alter the existing drainage pattern of the site or area, including through the alteration of the course of a stream or river, in a manner which would result in substantial erosion or siltation on- or off-site?

<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
--------------------------	--------------------------	--------------------------	-------------------------------------

Substantiation. Erosion is not anticipated due to permanent control measures, such as slope terracing, which will be implemented by the USACE Flood Reduction Project. The slope terracing is expected to improve drainage and to reduce erosion, and will be implemented prior to the construction of the Maxwell Bridge. As a precaution, boundary fencing would be placed along the river to protect the riverbed from foreign materials that may alter the course of the river during construction.

d) Substantially alter the existing drainage pattern of the site or area, including through the alteration of the course of a stream or river, or substantially increase the rate or amount of surface runoff in a manner which would result in flooding on- or off-site?

<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
--------------------------	--------------------------	--------------------------	-------------------------------------

Substantiation: The proposed project does not include activities expected to alter drainage or surface runoff, such as an appreciable amount of paving.

e) Create or contribute runoff water which would exceed the capacity of existing or planned stormwater drainage systems or provide substantial additional sources of polluted runoff?

<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
--------------------------	--------------------------	-------------------------------------	--------------------------

f) Otherwise substantially degrade water quality?

<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
--------------------------	--------------------------	--------------------------	-------------------------------------

Substantiation for e) & f): Because there will be increased surface area on the bridge, there will be more runoff; however, water quality would not be degraded as all activities in the proposed project will comply with Caltrans' NPDES Permit Order No. 99-06-DWQ and Order No. 99-08-DWQ, issued by the State Water Resources Control Board.

Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporation	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
--------------------------------------	---	------------------------------------	--------------

g) Place housing within a 100-year flood hazard area as mapped on a federal Flood Hazard Boundary or Flood Insurance Rate Map or other flood hazard delineation map?

                                                                

Substantiation: The proposed project would not provide for housing on the floodplain.

h) Place within a 100-year flood hazard area structures which would impede or redirect flood flows?

                                                                

Substantiation: The proposed replacement bridge would be designed specifically to be compatible with the Corps of Engineers' and the County Flood Control District's flood reduction project.

i) Expose people or structures to a significant risk of loss, injury or death involving flooding, including flooding as a result of the failure of a levee or dam?

                                                                

Substantiation: The proposed replacement bridge would be designed specifically to be compatible with the Corps of Engineers; and the County Flood Control District's flood reduction project. The levees in the flood reduction project would not be anticipated to work in combination with the replacement bridge to expose people to flooding.

j) Inundation by seiche, tsunami, or mudflow?                                                                  

Substantiation: The project location is inland and mostly flat. The proposed project is not expected to affect or be affected by seiche, tsunami, or mudflow.

**IX. LAND USE AND PLANNING** - Would the project:

a) Physically divide an established community?

                                                                

Substantiation: The proposed bridge has essentially the same alignment as the existing bridge.

Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporation	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
--------------------------------------	---	------------------------------------	--------------

b) Conflict with any applicable land use plan, policy, or regulation of an agency with jurisdiction over the project (including, but not limited to the general plan, specific plan, local coastal program, or zoning ordinance) adopted for the purpose of avoiding or mitigating an environmental effect?

                                                                

Substantiation: The proposed project is consistent with the City of Napa General Plan. It is also specifically included in the Regional Transportation Plan.

c) Conflict with any applicable habitat conservation plan or natural community conservation plan?

                                                                

Substantiation: The proposed project is consistent with the conservation plans and aspects of the Napa River/Napa Creek Flood Reduction Project.

**X. MINERAL RESOURCES --** Would the project:

a) Result in the loss of availability of a known mineral resource that would be of value to the region and the residents of the state?

                                                                

Substantiation: There are no known mineral resources in the vicinity of the proposed project.

b) Result in the loss of availability of a locally-important mineral resource recovery site delineated on a local general plan, specific plan or other land use plan?

                                                                

Substantiation: Local plans do not delineate any mineral resource recovery site in the project vicinity.

**XI. NOISE --**Would the project result in:

a) Exposure of persons to or generation of noise levels in excess of standards established in the local general plan or noise ordinance, or applicable standards of other agencies?

                                                                

Substantiation: The City of Napa has adopted noise guidelines in its General Plan. For residential areas of the city, the upper limit of “normally-acceptable” on-site exterior noise should be a L<sub>dn</sub> of 60 dB. The acoustical study of the proposed project estimated

that long-term noise exposure at the Newport North Condominiums including the proposed replacement bridge would be about 60 dBA L<sub>dn</sub>. Therefore, the proposed project meets locally-accepted standards.

The noisiest construction activity that might be associated with the project would be pile driving, which would only take place if the final project design uses piles for structural support, rather than some alternative such as straight-drilled shafts. Pile driving would generate maximum noise levels between 80 and 90 dBA at the nearest noise-sensitive areas. However, the temporary nature of construction noise makes the impact less than significant. If built on piles, the bridge would require about 300 piles. The noisiest construction activities would take place on about 50 work days over the course of 1-2 years. It is expected to be an annoyance to nearby residences; however, this does not constitute a significant impact because of the short duration of the activity.

Caltrans will comply with the City of Napa's noise ordinance during construction and demolition activities. The City of Napa's noise ordinance applies to noise-generating activities including start-ups, deliveries, equipment maintenance, and cleaning. The ordinance also specifies times of day and weekday and weekend schedules.

Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporation	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
--------------------------------------	---	------------------------------------	--------------

b) Exposure of persons to or generation of excessive groundborne vibration or groundborne noise levels?

<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
--------------------------	--------------------------	-------------------------------------	--------------------------

Substantiation: Groundborne vibration tends to subside quickly with distance. No receptors are expected to be close enough to the project to experience any detectable groundborne disturbance.

c) A substantial permanent increase in ambient noise levels in the project vicinity above levels existing without the project?

<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
--------------------------	--------------------------	-------------------------------------	--------------------------

Substantiation: Please refer to Appendix G, Section 5, "Noise Impacts" (pgs. 45-56). According to the Illington and Rodkin, Inc., study cited in Appendix G, the replacement bridge would be expected to increase the noise level at one of the nearby locations investigated by about 3 dBA. Caltrans considers an increase of 12 dBA to be substantial. Therefore, the project would not cause a significant impact due to traffic noise.

d) A substantial temporary or periodic increase in ambient noise levels in the project vicinity above levels existing without the project?

	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporation	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
--	--------------------------------------	---	------------------------------------	--------------

<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
--------------------------	--------------------------	-------------------------------------	--------------------------

Substantiation: The project would cause a substantial temporary increase in noise levels, but it will not constitute a significant impact. The duration of construction noise would be short. As described in Substantiation XI (a), the noisiest construction activities would take place on about 50 work days over the course of 1-2 years. Consequently, this does not constitute a significant impact.

- e) For a project located within an airport land use plan or, where such a plan has not been adopted, within two miles of a public airport or public use airport would the project expose people residing or working in the project area to excessive noise levels?

<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
--------------------------	--------------------------	--------------------------	-------------------------------------

Substantiation: The project is not on an airport land use plan and is farther than two miles from any airport.

- f) For a project within the vicinity of a private airstrip, would the project expose people residing or working in the project area to excessive noise levels?

<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
--------------------------	--------------------------	--------------------------	-------------------------------------

Substantiation: The project is not in the vicinity of any private airstrip.

**XII. POPULATION AND HOUSING --** Would the project:

- a) Induce substantial population growth in an area, either directly (for example, by proposing new homes and businesses) or indirectly (for example, through extension of roads or other infrastructure)?

<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
--------------------------	--------------------------	-------------------------------------	--------------------------

Substantiation: The proposed project does not include any changes in zoning or land use designations which would increase the potential for growth. The proposed bridge replacement project is not a road extension project, and; therefore, would not create new access to undeveloped areas. Also, the proposed bridge would be just inside the Napa City Limit line, and the City and County are cooperatively preventing urban development beyond this line. The areas near the proposed bridge are built out, with a few vacant lots available for infill development. The areas on the east side of the river are also subject to flooding, which make them unsuitable for development.

	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporation	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
--	--------------------------------	---	------------------------------	-----------

b) Displace substantial numbers of existing housing, necessitating the construction of replacement housing elsewhere?

<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
--------------------------	--------------------------	--------------------------	-------------------------------------

c) Displace substantial numbers of people, necessitating the construction of replacement housing elsewhere?

<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
--------------------------	--------------------------	--------------------------	-------------------------------------

Substantiation for XII b) and c): The proposal does not involve displacing any residences. The anticipated loss of buildings on APN 46-450-32 and 46-450-33 are related to the Napa River Flood Reduction Project and not due to the Maxwell Bridge Replacement.

**XIII. PUBLIC SERVICES**

a) Would the project result in substantial adverse physical impacts associated with the provision of new or physically altered governmental facilities, need for new or physically altered governmental facilities, the construction of which could cause significant environmental impacts, in order to maintain acceptable service ratios, response times or other performance objectives for any of the public services:

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

Substantiation: The proposed project would not affect the density or distribution of people or facilities that would affect the provision of public services. Furthermore, the four-lane replacement bridge would be expected to decrease emergency response times by relieving congestion, if any, generated from the existing two-lane Maxwell Bridge.

**XIV. RECREATION --**

a) Would the project increase the use of existing neighborhood and regional parks or other recreational facilities such that substantial physical deterioration of the facility would occur or be accelerated?

<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
--------------------------	--------------------------	--------------------------	-------------------------------------

Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporation	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
--------------------------------------	---	------------------------------------	--------------

b) Does the project include recreational facilities or require the construction or expansion of recreational facilities which might have an adverse physical effect on the environment?

                        
 
                         
 
                         

Substantiation for XIV a) and b): The proposed project would not limit or expand existing recreation in the project vicinity, therefore the project would not increase the use of nearby recreational facilities or cause an adverse physical affect the environment.

**XV. TRANSPORTATION/TRAFFIC --** Would the project:

a) Cause an increase in traffic which is substantial in relation to the existing traffic load and capacity of the street system (i.e., result in a substantial increase in either the number of vehicle trips, the volume to capacity ratio on roads, or congestion at intersections)?

                        
 
                         
 
                         

Substantiation: The existing bridge is a traffic problem. Its failure to operate at the same standard as the surrounding sections of Imola Avenue causes drivers to choose alternative facilities that are operating properly. Replacement with a four-lane facility is expected to lead to more traffic on Imola Avenue by diversion from the alternative facilities. This is indicative of proper operation of Imola Avenue, rather than a net increase in traffic.

b) Exceed, either individually or cumulatively, a level of service standard established by the county congestion management agency for designated roads or highways?

                        
 
                         
 
                         

Substantiation: The City of Napa’s adopted Level of Service Standard is contained in the *Envision Napa 2020 Napa General Plan*. This standard calls for operation to be maintained at mid-LOS D or better at intersections. According to a traffic study, the intersections most affected by the flow of traffic on Imola Avenue would be expected to perform at LOS C or better if four lanes were provided across the Napa River. The traffic model predicted that the delay at the intersection of Soscol Avenue and Imola Avenue would increase slightly, reflecting the diversion of traffic from other areas as congestion eases on Imola, but the LOS C would still reflect performance within the City’s accepted standards.

Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporation	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
--------------------------------------	---	------------------------------------	--------------

c) Result in a change in air traffic patterns, including either an increase in traffic levels or a change in location that results in substantial safety risks?

<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
--------------------------	--------------------------	--------------------------	-------------------------------------

Substantiation: Caltrans has not identified any features of the proposed project with the potential to influence any decisions or designs having to do with air traffic. Imola Avenue is not known to be related to any air traffic pattern; for instance, it is not aligned with any airport runways in the vicinity.

d) Substantially increase hazards due to a design feature (e.g., sharp curves or dangerous intersections) or incompatible uses (e.g., farm equipment)?

<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
--------------------------	--------------------------	--------------------------	-------------------------------------

Substantiation: The proposed project would not decrease safety due to design features and is not expected to attract incompatible road users such as farm equipment.

e) Result in inadequate emergency access?

<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
--------------------------	--------------------------	--------------------------	-------------------------------------

Substantiation: The proposed project is intended to improve congestion on Imola Avenue, which would facilitate emergency response.

f) Result in inadequate parking capacity?

<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
--------------------------	--------------------------	--------------------------	-------------------------------------

Substantiation: It is not anticipated that the proposed project would influence land uses; and, therefore, it will not change parking demand.

g) Conflict with adopted policies, plans, or programs supporting alternative transportation (e.g., bus turnouts, bicycle racks)?

<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
--------------------------	--------------------------	--------------------------	-------------------------------------

Substantiation: The proposed project does not conflict with any alternative transportation plans, for instance with the public transit policies in the City of Napa 1998 General Plan.

Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporation	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
--------------------------------------	---	------------------------------------	--------------

**XVI. UTILITIES AND SERVICE SYSTEMS -- Would the project:**

- a) Exceed wastewater treatment requirements of the applicable Regional Water Quality Control Board?

                                                                

Substantiation: The proposed project is not anticipated to generate any wastewater.

- b) Require or result in the construction of new water or wastewater treatment facilities or expansion of existing facilities, the construction of which could cause significant environmental effects?

                                                                

Substantiation: The proposed project is not expected to consume water or generate wastewater.

- c) Require or result in the construction of new storm water drainage facilities or expansion of existing facilities, the construction of which could cause significant environmental effects?

                                                                

Substantiation: The project does not include the construction of new storm water drainage facilities or expansion of facilities.

- d) Have sufficient water supplies available to serve the project from existing entitlements and resources, or are new or expanded entitlements needed?

                                                                

Substantiation: The proposed improved highway would not require any water supply. Water supplies required during construction are adequately served by existing sources.

- e) Result in a determination by the wastewater treatment provider which serves or may serve the project that it has adequate capacity to serve the project's projected demand in addition to the provider's existing commitments?

                                                                

Substantiation: The proposed project would not generate wastewater.

Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporation	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
--------------------------------------	---	------------------------------------	--------------

f) Be served by a landfill with sufficient permitted capacity to accommodate the project's solid waste disposal needs?

                                                                

Substantiation: The proposed improved highway would not be expected to generate solid waste. Removal of the existing Maxwell Bridge would generate many tons of material. Caltrans standard contract terms require contractors to manage waste in compliance with all applicable laws. Every effort will be made to salvage materials. The structural steel of the bridge is a likely candidate for salvage.

g) Comply with federal, state, and local statutes and regulations related to solid waste?

                                                                

Substantiation: Caltrans specifies in the terms of its contracts that contractors are responsible for complying with all solid waste laws.

**XVII. MANDATORY FINDINGS OF SIGNIFICANCE --**

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

                                                                

Substantiation: The project proposal includes features that will prevent impacts that might degrade the quality of the environment.

b) Does the project have impacts that are individually limited, but cumulatively considerable? ("Cumulatively considerable" means that the incremental effects of a project are considerable when viewed in connection with the effects of past projects, the effects of other current projects, and the effects of probable future projects)?

Substantiation: the CEQA Guidelines (Section 15064 (i)(3)) state, " A lead agency may determine that a project's incremental contribution to a cumulative effect is not cumulatively considerable if the project will comply with the requirements in a previously approved plan or mitigation program which provides specific requirements that will avoid or significantly lessen the cumulative Problem . . . "

The City of Napa general plan, *Envision Napa 2020*, takes into account planned transportation projects and has determined that the Maxwell Bridge Project would not significantly contribute to cumulative effects of past, current, and future planned transportation projects. *Envision Napa 2020* does specify policies and measures to ensure that certain impacts will be less than significant; and Caltrans has adhered to these policies and measures by incorporating them into the proposed project design. These policies and measures include:

In consideration of degradation of Transportation: Policy T-1.A of *Envision Napa 2020* lists transportation improvements needed to maintain the established level of service standards. Element (a) of this list is: "Widen Imola Avenue between Soscol Avenue and Coombs Street to four lanes, including widening of the bridge over the Napa River." This widening is a requirement for preventing impacts to traffic or circulation. The proposed bridge replacement would make the specified improvement.

In consideration of Cultural Resources: Policy HR-6.2 requires investigation during the planning process for all proposed developments in archaeologically sensitive areas in order to determine whether prehistoric resources may be affected. Caltrans has conducted an Archaeological Survey of the project area for both historic and prehistoric resources. The City of Napa's Policy Resolution No. 27 requires construction personnel, upon discovery of remains during construction of a project, to cease all activity until qualified professional archaeological examination and reburial in an appropriate manner is accomplished. Standard Caltrans policy states that, in the event that archaeological elements are encountered during construction, work in the vicinity of the find must be halted until an archaeologist can be consulted and can assess the significance of the find. If the archaeological site cannot be avoided, work will proceed in the vicinity of the find only after appropriate archaeological studies have been undertaken.

In consideration of Air Quality: Policy T-1.1 "Establish 1.5 meter sidewalks on both sides of all streets at the collector level and above." The proposed replacement bridge would have 2.4 meter shoulders on both sides of the street.

In an effort to be comprehensive, the Maxwell Bridge initial study has updated the list of projects in the vicinity and considered transportation as well as a broad range of environmental impacts in the context of cumulative, direct and indirect impacts from the Maxwell Bridge Replacement Project. This discussion was adapted from the discussion of cumulative impacts in the *Napa River/Napa Creek Flood Reduction Project Final Environmental Impact Statement/Environmental Impact Report* and can be found on pages 44-45 of this document.

	<b>Potentially Significant Impact</b>	<b>Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporation</b>	<b>Less Than Significant Impact</b>	<b>No Impact</b>
--	---	--	---	----------------------

c) Does the project have environmental effects which will cause substantial adverse effects on human beings, either directly or indirectly?

                
 
                 
 
                 

Substantiation: Based upon the information presented in this checklist, the proposed project will not have environmental effects that will cause substantial adverse effects on human beings, whether directly or indirectly.