

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

**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 type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" 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 type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
c) Emit hazardous emissions or handle hazardous or acutely hazardous materials, substances, or waste within one-quarter mile of an existing or proposed school?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
d) Be located on a site which is included on a list of hazardous materials sites compiled pursuant to Government Code Section 65962.5 and, as a result, would it create a significant hazard to the public or the environment?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
e) For a project located within an airport land use plan or, where such a plan has not been adopted, within two miles of a public airport or public use airport, would the project result in a safety hazard for people residing or working in the project area?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
f) For a project within the vicinity of a private airstrip, would the project result in a safety hazard for people residing or working in the project area?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
g) Impair implementation of or physically interfere with an adopted emergency response plan or emergency evacuation plan?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
h) Expose people or structures to a significant risk of loss, injury or death involving wildland fires, including where wildlands are adjacent to urbanized areas or where residences are intermixed with wildlands?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>

*Question A*

Except during construction, when certain types of equipment may be used that require various types of fuel, the revised Master Plan does not include any feature that involves the use, generation or transport of any hazardous substances. Construction-period hazards would be addressed through standard construction safety practices.

*Question B*

The revised Master Plan will not expose people to significant health hazards or hazardous materials.

*Question C*

The project site is located within one-quarter of a mile from an existing or proposed school, however, the uses contemplated in the revised Master Plan will not emit hazardous emissions or handle hazardous or acutely hazardous materials, substances, or waste that would harm or endanger the public.

*Question D*

In April, 1998, an Underground Storage Tank that had contained gasoline was removed from the northwest portion of the site. Subsequent analysis of soil samples demonstrated that the tank had not contaminated the surrounding soils and it was concluded that the site required no further work.

*Question E*

The project site is located less than one mile from the former Calistoga Gliderport, a private airport that is no longer in operation. Although no longer in operation, recreational use of the site as envisioned by the revised Master Plan would not have conflicted with Gliderport operations because the project site lies in an area that was designated by the Napa County Airport Land Use Compatibility Plan as "largely unrestricted." Therefore the contemplated uses would not result in an airport-related safety hazard for people visiting or working at the site.

*Question F*

The project site is not located near or within a private airport or private use airport, and would not result in safety hazards to people residing or working in the project area. No new health hazards would be created.

*Question G*

The revised Master Plan would not involve substantial alterations or reconfiguration of existing roadways in the area and therefore would not create any direct interference with an emergency evacuation plan.

*Question H*

This site is not within an area considered to be susceptible to wildland fires.

**Mitigation Measures:**

*None*

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

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

a) Violate any water quality standards or waste discharge requirements?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
b) Substantially deplete groundwater supplies or interfere substantially with groundwater recharge such that there would be a net deficit in aquifer volume or a lowering of the local groundwater table level (e.g., the production rate of pre-existing nearby wells would drop to a level which would not support existing land uses or planned uses for which permits have been granted)?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
c) Substantially alter the existing drainage pattern of the site or area, including through the alteration of the course of a stream or river, in a manner which would result in substantial erosion or siltation on- or off-site?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
d) Substantially alter the existing drainage pattern of the site or area, including through the alteration of the course of a stream or river, or substantially increase the rate or amount of surface runoff in a manner which would result in flooding on- or off-site?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
e) Create or contribute runoff water which would exceed the capacity of existing or planned stormwater drainage systems or provide substantial additional sources of polluted runoff?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
f) Otherwise substantially degrade water quality?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
g) Place housing within a 100-year flood hazard area as mapped on a federal Flood Hazard Boundary or Flood Insurance Rate Map or other flood hazard delineation map?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
h) Place within a 100-year flood hazard area structures which would impede or redirect flood flows?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
i) Expose people or structures to a significant risk of loss, injury or death involving flooding, including flooding as a result of the failure of a levee or dam?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
j) Inundation by seiche, tsunami, or mudflow?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>

*Question A*

Section 303 of the federal Clean Water Act requires states to develop water quality standards to protect the beneficial uses of receiving waters. In accordance with California's Porter/Cologne Act, the Regional Water

Quality Control Boards (RWQCBs) of the State Water Resources Control Board (SWRCB) are required to develop water quality objectives that ensure their region meets the requirements of Section 303 of the Clean Water Act.

Calistoga is within the jurisdiction of the San Francisco Bay RWQCB. The San Francisco Bay RWQCB adopted water quality objectives in its Stormwater Quality Management Plan (SQMP). This SQMP is designed to ensure stormwater achieves compliance with receiving water limitations. Thus, stormwater generated by a development that complies with the SQMP does not exceed the limitations of receiving waters, and thus does not exceed water quality standards.

Compliance with the SQMP is ensured by Section 402 of the Clean Water Act, which is known as the National Pollution Discharge Elimination System (NPDES). Under this section, municipalities are required to obtain permits for the water pollution generated by stormwater in their jurisdiction. The City of Calistoga has adopted a Stormwater Runoff Pollution Control ordinance to ensure new developments comply with SQMP. This ordinance requires the submittal of a plan demonstrating how the project will comply with the City's Stormwater Runoff Pollution Control ordinance. Mitigation Measure WQ-1 requires preparation of a stormwater drainage plan in conformity with the National Pollution Discharge Elimination System and including Best Management Practices (BMP) as described in the California Stormwater BMP Handbook. Incorporation of appropriate stormwater control, management and discharge measures would reduce potentially adverse impacts to water quality to a level that is less than significant.

*Question B*

The project will be required to connect to public water system. No impacts to groundwater supply are anticipated.

*Questions C and D*

Significant alterations to existing drainage patterns on the site and in the area are not anticipated because the project site is flat and the contemplated amount of development is relatively small. While some proposed improvements will create additional impervious surfaces on the site – potentially increasing peak storm water runoff rates for the project site – the increase in runoff from these areas would not be substantial enough and would not significantly increase soil erosion or create a risk of flooding on or off-site due to the project's relatively small scale. Further, the large quantity of open space being planned would be sufficient to capture additional runoff generated by the contemplated improvements and allow it to percolate into the ground, rather than flow directly into the Napa River or the City's storm drain system. No alterations to the course or channel of the Napa River are being proposed.

Prior to the issuance of a grading permit for subsequent construction of the contemplated improvements, a grading and drainage plan will be required to be prepared (Mitigation Measure WQ-2). The grading and drainage plan shall be designed by a civil engineer and in accordance with the Napa County Design Criteria and any applicable adopted City standards. Incorporation of this mitigation measure into the project will ensure that the potential for increased soil erosion or flooding remains at a level that is less than significant.

*Question E*

Surface water runoff generated by impervious surfaces would either sheet flow off the impervious surface area and naturally percolate into the ground or be collected, conveyed and discharged into the City's storm drain system. Mitigation Measure WQ-3 requires that appropriate measures for management of surface water runoff from all vehicle parking areas, where there is a potential for surface water runoff to become polluted, be evaluated and identified prior to approval of any project phase that includes construction of a parking area. Mitigation Measure WQ-4 prohibits discharge of hazardous materials into ground or surface waters. Incorporation of these measures will reduce the potential for polluted storm water runoff entering the City's storm drain system or the Napa River to a level that is less than significant.

*Question F*

The proposed development will not be a point-source generator of water pollutants with the exception of those associated with landscaping. The only long-term water pollutants expected to be generated onsite are typical urban

stormwater pollutants.

**Question G**

The project would not result in the construction of residential housing units within the 100-year floodplain identified by the Federal Emergency Management Agency (FEMA).

*Question H*

According to the Digital Flood Insurance Rate Map (DFIRM) published by FEMA (Panel FM06055C0229E), the far western edge of the project site is located within the designated floodway of the Napa River. However, all structural development contemplated by the revised Master Plan would be located a minimum of 45-feet from the top of bank of the Napa River and outside of the designated floodway. The remainder of the site is not located within the floodway or the 100-year flood hazard area. Given these conditions, the potential for planned improvements to significantly obstruct or redirect flood flows is less than significant.

*Question I*

The project site is located downstream from Kimball Dam. According to the Office of Emergency Services, the southeaster corner of the project site lies within Kimball Dam's Flood Inundation zone and would experience flooding if Kimball Dam failed. However, this would not constitute a significant impact because the uses planned in this portion of the site (playing field and bocce ball court) are active outdoor uses that could easily be evacuated if the dam were to fail. It is estimated that it would take about one hour for flood waters to reach the project site after dam failure, which would provide time for complete evacuation of the area.

*Question J*

The City of Calistoga is not located near enough to any inland bodies of water or the Pacific Ocean to be inundated by either a seiche or tsunami. For mudflow see responses in the Geology and Soils section of this initial study regarding seismic hazards such as liquefaction and landslides.

**Mitigation Measures:**

WQ-1 (Stormwater Quality): *Prior to issuance of a grading or building permit, a stormwater drainage plan shall be prepared and implemented for each phase of construction in conformance with the National Pollution Discharge Elimination System and including Best Management Practices (BMP) as described in the California Stormwater BMP Handbook or equivalent.*

WQ-2 (Drainage): *Prior to grading permit issuance, the Public Works, Planning and Building Departments shall have reviewed and approved all drainage improvements. Said improvement plans shall be designed by a civil engineer and in accordance with the Napa County Design Criteria and any applicable adopted City standards. The capacity and condition of existing drainage facilities downstream of the development shall be analyzed and off-site drainage improvements shall be constructed as necessary. Site grading and drainage improvements shall be shown on the improvement plans.*

WQ-3 (Pollution): *Prior to approval of any project phase that includes construction of a parking area, the Public Works Department will evaluate alternatives for managing pollutants in surface water runoff from the proposed parking area (including those contained in the California Stormwater Best Management Practices Handbook) and identify appropriate management measures for implementation as part of the project.*

WQ-4 (Pollution): *No discharge of hazardous materials shall be allowed in ground or surface waters or on the land. All hazardous materials shall be stored and managed.*

WQ-5 (Pollution): *All drainage inlets shall be permanently marked "No Dumping-Flows to River".*

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

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

- |                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                             |                          |                          |                          |                                     |
|-------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|--------------------------|--------------------------|--------------------------|-------------------------------------|
| a) Physically divide an established community?                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                              | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> |
| b) Conflict with any applicable land use plan, policy, or regulation of an agency with jurisdiction over the project (including, but not limited to the general plan, specific plan, local coastal program, or zoning ordinance) adopted for the purpose of avoiding or mitigating an environmental effect? | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> |
| c) Conflict with any applicable habitat conservation plan or natural community conservation plan?                                                                                                                                                                                                           | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> |

*Question A*

The project site is directly adjacent to the Napa River which forms a natural boundary between neighborhoods in Calistoga. Because the site is at the edge of an established community and not in the middle, its development would not result in a physical division of the community.

*Question B*

The uses contemplated by the revised Master Plan are consistent with the City of Calistoga’s 2003 General Plan Update and Zoning Ordinance. The General Plan Land Use Diagram designates the project site as Public / Quasi-Public. As identified in the Land Use Element of the General Plan, uses allowed under the Public / Quasi-Public land use designation generally include existing and planned park facilities. Figure OSC-3 in the Open Space and Conservation Element of the General Plan designates the project site as a City park.

The project site is zoned “P”, Public / Quasi-Public. The P Zoning District allows public parks and uses similar in nature upon Conditional Use Permit approval. The project is and will be designed to meet General Plan policies and Zoning District standards and, therefore, will not conflict with any applicable land use plan, policy, or regulation adopted for the purpose of avoiding or mitigating an environmental effect.

*Question C*

There are no Habitat or Natural Community Conservation Plans adopted by the City that apply to the project site, therefore no adverse environmental impacts are anticipated.

**Mitigation Measures:**

*None Required*

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

**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?                                | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> |
| b) Result in the loss of availability of a locally-important mineral resource recovery site delineated on a local general plan, specific plan or other land use plan? | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> |

*Questions A and B*

There are no known important mineral resources located on the site and the General Plan does not delineate any important mineral resources within the City. Mineral resources such as sand and gravel that may be associated with construction of this project are expected to be imported from locations in and beyond the Napa Valley. These resources are in plentiful supply in both the Napa Valley and the Bay Area Region and there is no indication that such resources are nearing a depletion point. As such, no adverse impacts to mineral resources are anticipated to result from subsequent construction of the improvements envisioned in the revised Master Plan.

**Mitigation Measures:**

*None Required*

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

**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?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
b) Exposure of persons to or generation of excessive groundborne vibration or groundborne noise levels?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
c) A substantial permanent increase in ambient noise levels in the project vicinity above levels existing without the project?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
d) A substantial temporary or periodic increase in ambient noise levels in the project vicinity above levels existing without the project?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
e) For a project located within an airport land use plan or, where such a plan has not been adopted, within two miles of a public airport or public use airport, would the project expose people residing or working in the project area to excessive noise levels?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
f) For a project within the vicinity of a private airstrip, would the project expose people residing or working in the project area to excessive noise levels?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>

*Question A*

A project is normally considered to cause a significant impact upon sensitive receivers in the area if noise levels conflict with adopted environmental standards or plans, or if noise generated by the project would substantially increase noise levels above existing levels at sensitive receivers in the area. The City has not adopted quantitative absolute noise level limits, nor has it quantified what constitutes a substantial increase in policies set forth in the Noise Element of the General Plan or in a quantitative noise ordinance. The Noise Element does include "land use compatibility guidelines for noise exposure". These guidelines are used to judge the suitability of the site for the intended use. A noise level of up to 65 dBA Ldn is considered normally acceptable for a park. A "substantial" permanent noise increase would occur if the project would cause noise levels to increase by 5 dBA Ldn or more at noise sensitive receptors, resulting either from vehicular traffic on onsite activities. A substantial temporary noise level increase would occur where noise levels from construction activities would exceed 60 dBA Ldn(h) and the ambient noise environment by at least 5 dBA Leq at noise sensitive uses in the project vicinity, and this temporary noise level increase would occur for more than one year.

A noise study has been prepared to assess potential noise impacts that would result during construction and operation of the uses contemplated in the revised Master Plan (Illingworth & Rodkin; December, 2008). The study included the determination of existing baseline acoustical conditions in the study area at nearby residences that could be affected by noise resulting from the project, a review of planned uses and their potential to cause noise, and an evaluation of the need for and determination of measures to mitigate any significant impacts identified. The noise study identified three potential impacts: construction noise; noise generated by park activities; and noise generated by park-related vehicle traffic.



### Construction Noise

Construction activities generate noise. Construction-related noise levels are normally highest during foundation, and framing. These phases of construction sometimes require heavy equipment that normally generates the highest noise levels. Typically hourly average construction-generated noise levels are about 81 to 88 dBA Leq(h) measured at a distance of 50 feet from the center of the construction site during busy construction periods. Construction-related noise levels are normally less during building finishing, and landscaping phases.

There would be variations in construction noise levels on a day-to-day basis depending on the actual activities occurring at the site. Construction-generated noise levels drop off at a rate of about 6 dBA per doubling of distance between the source and receptor. Noise impacts resulting from construction depend on the noise generated by various pieces of construction equipment, the timing and duration of noise-generating activities, and the distance between the construction noise sources and noise sensitive receptors. Construction noise impacts primarily occur during noise sensitive times of the day (early morning, evening, or nighttime hours), the construction occurs in areas immediately adjoining noise-sensitive land uses, or when construction durations last over extended periods of time.

Significant noise impacts do not normally occur when standard construction noise control measures are enforced at the project site and when the duration of the noise-generating construction period at a particular receiver or group of receivers is limited to one construction season (typically one year) or less. Mitigation Measures N-1 through N-6 regulate the hours of construction, as well as the arrival and operation of heavy equipment and the delivery of construction material. Incorporation of these measures as part of project construction would reduce the generation of / level of exposure to noise levels in excess of standards established in the City's General Plan to a level that is less than significant.

### Park Activities

Figure 2 shows the Logvy Park Master Plan. The swim center was previously approved (and is now open) so it is not re-analyzed in this assessment. The primary changes at the park that would affect community noise levels include the eventual relocation of the softball field off-site that would be expected to result in lower noise levels at sensitive receivers, particularly to the north, the new bocce courts proposed to be located in the southeast corner of the park, the sports court that would be located in a building near the park center, and the teen center. In the long term, a pool party room is also planned to the north of the swim center. At the bocce courts, the sound results primarily from voices in conversational tones. While it is possible that voices may be occasionally audible at residences to the south across the Napa River, the noise would not have a significant effect on overall noise levels in the neighborhood.

Activities in the large playfields generally in the eastern area of the site would be no different than existing noise levels. Once the softball field has been relocated, noise levels resulting from activities in these areas would be lower than noise levels that have resulted from the historical use of these fields. The sports court would be within an enclosed building. The building would be air conditioned and would not rely upon open windows for ventilation. Maximum noise levels emanating from the building would not exceed 60 dBA Lmax at a distance of 15 feet from the building. Intermittent maximum noise levels would be less than 40 dBA at the nearest residences to the south. Activities inside the sport court would not make a measurable or noticeable contribution to community noise levels nearby residential areas. The Teen Center could also be a potential source of community noise as a result of the sound of voices and possibly amplified music being played indoors. The Teen Center would be a fully-enclosed air conditioned building. Similar noise levels are expected.

Mitigation Measures N-7 and N-8 require that the design of future buildings be reviewed by a qualified acoustical consultant to confirm that all potentially significant sound transmission paths from the inside to the outside have been appropriately controlled, including windows, doors, and ventilation systems.

### Park-Related Vehicle Traffic

The traffic impacts that would result from the project were assessed in a Traffic Impact Study prepared for the project by W-Trans (December, 2008). The project generated traffic would be distributed about equally between Washington Street and North Oak Street. The project is anticipated to generate 387 daily weekday trips and 701 daily weekend trips under maximum usage. Using data provided in the traffic study, the project would cause traffic noise levels along Washington Street to increase about 1 dBA Ldn on weekends and less than 1 dBA Ldn on weekdays. Traffic noise levels along North Oak Street are calculated to increase about 1.5 dBA Ldn on weekends and less than 1 dBA Ldn on weekdays. Because traffic noise levels are calculated to increase less than 5 dBA, the impact is considered to be less than significant.

*Question B*

Residences are located within the vicinity of the project site. Construction of the facilities contemplated in the revised Master Plan would result in ground disturbing activities such as trenching, excavation and grading. The heavy loading of earthmoving machines may generate some groundborne vibration and groundborne noise. Some facilities are proposed to be located within 100 feet of a sensitive noise receptor. Incorporation of Mitigation Measures N-1 through N-6 during project construction will reduce the exposure of noise sensitive receptors to excessive groundborne vibration or groundborne noise levels to a level that is less than significant.

*Question C*

The 2003 General Plan Update indicates that projected noise levels from operation of the uses contemplated in the revised Master Plan would not exceed established noise levels standards for that land use type. Hence, this impact is considered less than significant.

*Question D*

Construction-related noise impacts would be limited in duration and would not result in a substantial permanent increase in ambient noise levels.

*Question E*

The proposed project is not located within an airport land use plan. No impacts are identified.

*Question F*

There are no private airstrips in the City of Calistoga. The project would not expose people to excessive noise levels. No impacts are identified

**Mitigation Measures:**

N-1 (Construction Noise): *Construction shall be limited to the hours of 7:00 a.m. to 7:00 p.m. on weekdays, and from 9:00 a.m. to 5:00 p.m. on Saturdays. No noise generating construction activities shall be permitted on Sundays or on holidays.*

N-2 (Construction Noise): *All internal combustion engine-driven equipment shall be equipped with mufflers which are in good condition and appropriate for the equipment.*

N-3 (Construction Noise): *"Quiet" models of air compressors and other stationary noise sources shall be used where the technology exists.*

N-4 (Construction Noise): *Stationary noise-generating equipment shall be located as far as possible from sensitive receptors when sensitive receptors adjoin are near a construction project area.*

N-5 (Construction Noise): *Unnecessary idling of internal combustion engine-driven equipment shall be prohibited.*

N-6 (Construction Noise): *A "noise disturbance coordinator" responsible for responding to local complaints about construction noise shall be designated. The disturbance coordinator would determine the cause of the noise complaints (e.g., starting too early, bad muffler, etc.) and institute reasonable measures necessary to correct the problem. The telephone number for the disturbance coordinator shall be conspicuously posted at the construction site.*

N-7 (Operational Noise): *As development occurs and as determined to be necessary, noise studies will be completed to assess the degree of noise impact on surrounding uses. Recommendations of the study will be implemented to lower noise impacts to acceptable levels. Such measures may include the relocation of project facilities, fences or berms on-site, or retro-fitting the adjacent buildings with double-glazed windows.*

N-8 (Operational Noise): *The design of future buildings shall be reviewed by a qualified acoustical consultant to confirm that all potentially significant sound transmission paths from the inside to the outside have been appropriately controlled, including windows, doors and ventilation systems.*

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

**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 type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
b) Displace substantial numbers of existing housing, necessitating the construction of replacement housing elsewhere?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
c) Displace substantial numbers of people, necessitating the construction of replacement housing elsewhere?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>

*Question A*

The proposed revision to the Logvy Park Master Plan would not stimulate population growth as it does not include residential or commercial components and will not result in the extension of infrastructure that would indirectly accommodate growth in other areas of the City.

*Questions B and C*

At the time the initial study was prepared for the original Master Plan in 1999, the project required changing the site's 1990 General Plan land use designation from high density residential to public. The initial study concluded that the proposed change would have no impact on then-existing housing. Since this time, the City's General Plan has been updated (2003) and the project site's General Plan land use designation has been changed to Public / Quasi-Public. The proposed revisions to the Master Plan would not result in the need to change the current General Plan nor would it displace planned housing development.

Two vacant homes had previously existed on the project site and were demolished in Fall of 2008. Demolition of these homes, which were uninhabitable, did not result in the displacement of habitable housing units or substantial numbers of people and was considered to have a less than significant impact on the areas population and housing.

**Mitigation Measures:**

*None*

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

**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 checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Schools?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
Parks?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
Other public facilities?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>

*Question A*

The project would not interfere with fire response routes and is not anticipated to result in an inordinate increase in calls for service.

The Calistoga Police Department has anticipated that the proposed project will result in an increase in calls for service to the project site. The increase in calls for service could potentially impact department resources. Mitigation Measure PUB-1 requires that calls for service to the community park be monitored as individual components of the project are constructed and requires the City to respond as appropriate should it be concluded that increased calls for service related to the community park are straining the City's police resources. Incorporation of this mitigation measure will reduce potential impacts to police services to a level that is less than significant.

The proposed project would not contribute to any increase in population and therefore is not anticipated to have any impact on schools.

The project furthers the General Plan goal of building a community park on the project site and will not negatively impact other City parks or planned open space systems.

No other public facilities are anticipated to be impacted by the proposed revision to the Logvy Park Master Plan (see additional discussion under Utilities and Service Systems).

**Mitigation Measures:**

PSF-1 (Police Services): *As the individual components of the project are constructed and come into use, the City will monitor the number of requests for police assistance or protection that are attributable to the project. The City will respond to any increase in the demand for police services by adding appropriate resources as necessary.*

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

**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"/> |
| b) Does the project include recreational facilities or require the construction or expansion of recreational facilities which might have an adverse physical effect on the environment?                        | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> |

*Questions A and B*

The proposed project would provide more recreation space and opportunities for the residents of Calistoga. The use of new facilities would not result in the physical deterioration of existing parks and recreation facilities.

**Mitigation Measures:**

*None Required*

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

**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)?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
b) Exceed, either individually or cumulatively, a level of service standard established by the county congestion management agency for designated roads or highways?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
c) Result in a change in air traffic patterns, including either an increase in traffic levels or a change in location that result in substantial safety risks?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
d) Substantially increase hazards due to a design feature (e.g., sharp curves or dangerous intersections) or incompatible uses (e.g., farm equipment)?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
e) Result in inadequate emergency access?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
f) Result in inadequate parking capacity?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
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"/>

*Questions A and B*

A Traffic Impact Study analyzing the potential traffic impacts that would be associated with the proposed revision to the Master Plan has been prepared by the consulting firm of Whitlock & Weinberger (W-Trans). The traffic study concluded that the proposed project would result in an increase in the number of vehicle trips on area roadways. At completion of the project the proposed uses would result in an increase of approximately 387 new daily vehicle trips, including 34 during the weekday evening peak and 63 during the weekend midday peak. It is assumed that 50% of these trips would occur on N. Oak Street and 50% would occur on Washington Street.

The number of projected vehicle trips generated at build out of the proposed project is not anticipated to have a significant impact on the "Level of Service" (LOS) at the intersection of N. Oak Street and Washington Street. Currently, this intersection operates at LOS A (experiencing traffic congestion delays of less than 10 seconds). The intersection is expected to continue to operate at LOS after completion of the project. Given this, the projected increase in traffic levels and impact on LOS is considered to be less than significant.

The previous Traffic Impact Study prepared for the project (Crane Transportation Group, 1999) concluded that the Master Plan would exacerbate the LOS at the intersection of Lincoln Avenue (SR 29) and Foothill Boulevard (SR 128/28/Kortum Canyon Road), which currently operates at LOS E. A mitigation measure requiring signalization, creation of a traffic circle, or implementation of other appropriate improvements at this intersection to improve circulation conditions was included in the Initial Study for the original Master Plan. Although not studied in the Traffic Impact Study prepared by W-Trans, it is presumed that the intersection of Lincoln Avenue and Foothill Boulevard continues to operate at LOS E. Given this, the subject mitigation measure is being included in this

#### Initial Study as Mitigation Measure CIR-1.

At the time the Initial Study was prepared for the original Master Plan in 1999, the project required changing the Circulation Element in the 1990 General Plan to eliminate the extension of Oak Street across the Napa River. The initial study concluded that the existing streets would be capable of meeting traffic demand without the extension of Oak Street, including traffic anticipated to be generated by the proposed project. Therefore, potential traffic circulation impacts resulting from the elimination of the proposed Oak Street extension were considered to be less than significant.

The City's current General Plan (adopted in 2003) does not anticipate the future extension of Oak Street over the Napa River. However, the current General Plan (Figure CIR-3) does anticipate a planned Class I bicycle connection between S. Oak Street and the project site. This connection, which is not a part of the proposed project, would provide direct park access to the neighborhoods south of the park on the south side of the Napa River and would reduce the number of park-related vehicle trips.

#### *Question C*

The project does not include any changes to air traffic patterns; therefore, no impacts are anticipated.

#### *Question D*

Primary access to the project site would be from an existing driveway that currently serves the site and makes up the "third leg" of the Washington Street / N. Oak Street intersection. The driveway apron is approximately 35 feet wide, which is sufficient to accommodate turning movements in and out of the site. Secondary access to the project site would be provided via a new driveway connection to N. Oak Street that will serve a small parking area adjacent to the planned Teen / Art Center and Recreational Office buildings. Adequate sight distance exists from both access points.

The alignment of the intersection of N. Oak Street and Washington Street is considered a non-standard alignment and may create vehicle-vehicle and vehicle-pedestrian conflicts with the addition of project-generated trips. Mitigation Measure CIR-2 requires that the intersection of N. Oak Street and Washington Street be reconfigured to provide a standard tee intersection alignment in order to reduce potential conflicts as park users enter and exit the project driveway.

Pedestrian access to the site is currently provided via continuous sidewalks on the north side of Washington Street and the east side of N. Oak Street. Sidewalks would be constructed along the frontage of the project site on the west side of N. Oak Street. A bike and pedestrian path is also planned north of the playing fields parallel to Washington Street. Mitigation Measure CIR-3 requires that marked crosswalks be installed at the intersection of N. Oak Street and Washington Street to accommodate safe pedestrian crossing of vehicle driveways.

With the mitigation measures above, the potential for increased hazards due to the project's design will be reduced to a level that is less than significant.

#### *Question E*

The revised Master Plan would not involve substantial alterations or reconfiguration of existing roadways in the area and therefore would not create any direct interference with an emergency vehicle access or circulation. Planned access points, vehicle accessways and parking would be designed to meet the standards of the City's Building, Fire and Public Works departments.

#### *Question F*

Parking demand for the entire Logvy Community Park project was estimated as part of the Traffic Impact Study prepared by W-Trans. The analysis focused on peak conditions utilizing use projections and facility area calculations. A peak occupancy of 335 patrons is estimated to occur on a weekend day in July or August when the pool is near capacity and a soccer tournament is taking place.

Using a vehicle occupancy ratio of three persons per vehicle for pool and soccer patrons and 2.5 persons per vehicle for other uses, and with no deductions for patrons travelling by foot or bicycle, the maximum parking



demand of the project is estimated to be 119 spaces. A total of 119 parking spaces is being proposed in the revised Master Plan, which is expected to be adequate to serve peak parking demands. Therefore, parking impacts to surrounding uses are expected to be less than significant.

*Question G*

The proposed revisions to the Master Plan would not impact the City or County's plans for public transportation. Bicycle and pedestrian access to the site is expected to occur from established routes along N. Oak Street and Washington Street. Future access from the south is planned via a bicycle and pedestrian bridge extending over the Napa River from S. Oak Street. The proposed revisions to the Master Plan would accommodate pedestrian and bicycle travel through the provision of internal pathways systems that would link existing and planned routes to the park's major facilities. Bicycle racks for parking and securing bicycles would be provided at locations convenient to the park's buildings and attractions.

**Mitigation Measures:**

*CIR-1 (Level of Service): The City will study feasible alternatives for improving circulation conditions including signalization, intersection realignment, a roundabout and other alternatives as warranted at the impacted intersection of Lincoln Avenue and Foothill Boulevard.*

*CIR-2 (Intersection Design): The intersection of N. Oak Street and Washington Street shall be reconfigured to provide a standard tee intersection alignment, including removing the centerline striping through the intersection and installing stop signs to convert the intersection to all-way stop controls in order to reduce potential conflicts as park users enter and exit the project driveway.*

*CIR-3 (Pedestrian Crosswalks): Crosswalk markings shall be provided at the intersection of N. Oak Street and Washington Street.*

	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?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
b) Require or result in the construction of new water or wastewater treatment facilities or expansion of existing facilities, the construction of which could cause significant environmental effects?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
c) Require or result in the construction of new storm water drainage facilities or expansion of existing facilities, the construction of which could cause significant environmental effects?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
d) Have sufficient water supplies available to serve the project from existing entitlements and resources, or are new or expanded entitlements needed?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
e) Result in a determination by the wastewater treatment provider which serves or may serve the project that it has adequate capacity to serve the project's projected demand in addition to the provider's existing commitments?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
f) Be served by a landfill with sufficient permitted capacity to accommodate the project's solid waste disposal needs?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
g) Comply with federal, state, and local statutes and regulations related to solid waste?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>

*Question A*

The proposed project would be served by the City's existing wastewater treatment plant and would have no effect on the wastewater treatment requirements of the Bay Area Regional Water Quality Control Board.

*Question B*

The proposed project does not include, nor would it require the construction of new water or wastewater treatment facilities.

*Question C*

Please see Section VIII "Hydrology" for a discussion of site hydrology and storm drainage. Management of drainage from the parking areas on the site will be evaluated and identified prior to approval of any project phase that includes construction of a parking area (Mitigation Measure WQ-3). All other runoff will be absorbed by the ground. Mitigation Measure WQ-4 prohibits discharge of hazardous materials into ground or surface waters. Incorporation of these measures will reduce the potential for polluted storm water runoff entering the City's storm drain system or the Napa River to a level that is less than significant.

*Questions D and E*

The proposed project will be served by the City's existing facilities. The project's demand would not trigger the need for new water and/or wastewater treatment facilities. Infrastructure would be extended to the site from existing lines.

*Question F*

The proposed project would not significantly impact local or regional landfills. The proposed project would not involve the substantial generation of solid waste.

*Question G*

The proposed project would comply with all federal, state, and local statutes and regulations related to solid waste therefore, no impact would result from the proposed project.

**Mitigation Measures:**

*None.*

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

**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?

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

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

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

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

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

*Question A*

The proposed project is consistent with the General Plan and would not significantly degrade the quality of the environment. As discussed in previous sections, the proposed project would have a number of potentially significant impacts. Potential impacts to Aesthetic, Biological, Cultural, Geologic and Hydrologic resources as well as impacts resulting in some effect on Air Quality, Hydrology (storm water), Noise levels, Public Services, Traffic conditions and Utilities have been assessed and appropriate mitigation measures are required. With incorporation of the identified mitigation measures, all potentially significant environmental impacts will be mitigated to a less than significant level.

*Question B*

The cumulative impacts of the project would not be considerable because there are no similar community resource projects or projects that would result in similar cumulative impacts planned for the vicinity.

*Question C*

The project would not cause substantial adverse effects on human beings. The impacts of the project are not severe and could successfully be mitigated to cause less than significant impacts on humans and their surrounding environment.

DETERMINATION:

On the basis of this initial evaluation:

I find that the proposed project COULD NOT have a significant effect on the environment, and a NEGATIVE DECLARATION will be prepared.

X

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.

---

Kenneth G. MacNab, Senior Planner, City of Calistoga

---

Date

---

Dan Takasugi, Director of Public Works, City of Calistoga (applicant)

---

Date

