

SUMMARY OF IMPACTS AND MITIGATION MEASURES

IMPACT AND MITIGATION SUMMARY

The following table identifies, by environmental topic as identified in the Environmental Impact Report (EIR), the significant project impacts, proposed mitigation measures, and post-mitigation significance. Additional information about the impacts and mitigation measures can be found in Chapter 4 of the Draft EIR, as referenced for each topic. The numbering of the impacts corresponds to the numbering within each section in Chapter 4 of the Draft EIR.

IMPACT AND MITIGATION SUMMARY TABLE

Impact	Project Significance	Mitigation Measure	Post-mitigation Significance
4.1 Aesthetics			
4.1-1: The project would not have a substantial adverse effect on a scenic vista.	Less-than-significant	None	
4.1-2: The project would not substantially damage scenic resources, including natural rock outcroppings, recreational use areas, or historic buildings, within a state scenic highway.	Less-than-significant	None	
4.1-3: The project would not substantially degrade the existing visual character or quality of the site and its surroundings.	Less-than-significant	None	
4.1-4: The project would not create a new source of substantial light or glare.	Less-than-significant	None	
4.2 Agriculture and Forest Resources			
4.2-1: The project would not convert Prime Farmland, Unique Farmland, or Farmland of Statewide Importance.	No impact	None	
4.2-2: The project would not conflict with existing zoning for agricultural use or a Williamson Act contract.	No impact	None	
4.2-3: The project would not conflict with zoning for timberland or forest land or cause the rezoning thereof.	No impact	None	
4.2-4: The project would result in the loss of forest land and conversion of forest land to non-forest use.	Less-than-significant	None	

IMPACT AND MITIGATION SUMMARY TABLE

Impact	Project Significance	Mitigation Measure	Post-mitigation Significance
4.2-5: The project would not involve changes in the existing environment that would result in conversion of farmland to non-agricultural use.	No impact	None	
4.3 Air Quality			
4.3-1: Construction or operation of the project would not conflict with implementation of the Bay Area 2010 Clean Air Plan.	No impact	None	
4.3-2: Construction or operation of the project could violate air quality standards or contribute substantially to an existing or projected air quality violation.	Potentially significant impact	Mitigation Measure 4.3-2A: Reduce NOx. Mitigation Measure 4.3-2B: Reduce Fugitive Dust	Less-than-significant
4.3-3: The project would expose sensitive receptors to levels of toxic air contaminants above the threshold.	Significant impact	Mitigation Measure 4.3-3: Reduce Health Risk	Less-than-significant
4.3-4: The project would not cause objectionable odors affecting a substantial number of people.	Less-than-significant	None	
4.3-5: Operation of the project could violate air quality standards or contribute to an existing or project air quality violation, but these levels would not be considered substantial in the cumulative scenario.	Less-than-significant	None	
4.3-6: The project would not expose sensitive receptors to levels of toxic air contaminants above the threshold for the cumulative scenario.	Less-than-significant	None	
4.4 Biology			
4.4-1: The proposed project would have the potential to directly and indirectly impact populations of holly-leaved ceanothus, a CNPS List 1B plant species within the project site.	Potentially significant impact	Mitigation Measure 4.4-1	Less-than-significant
4.4-2: The proposed project would have the potential to affect American badger, a CDFW Species of Special Concern.	Potentially significant impact	Mitigation Measure 4.4-2	Less-than-significant
4.4-3: The proposed project would have the potential to impact special-status and/or migratory bird species.	Potentially significant impact	Mitigation Measure 4.4-3	Less-than-significant

IMPACT AND MITIGATION SUMMARY TABLE

Impact	Project Significance	Mitigation Measure	Post-mitigation Significance
4.4-4: The proposed project would have less-than-significant impacts to special-status amphibian and reptile species.	Less-than-significant	None	
4.4-5: The proposed project would have the potential to impact special-status bat species.	Potentially significant impact	Mitigation Measure 4.4-5	Less-than-significant
4.4-6: Construction of the relocated Skyline Trail may affect unknown biological resources in trail relocation areas not previously surveyed.	Potentially significant impact	Mitigation Measure 4.4-6	Less-than-significant
4.4-7: The proposed project would have the potential to result in net reduction of sensitive habitats including protected wetland habitat as defined in Section 404 of the Clean Water Act, riparian vegetation, and state jurisdictional waters/wetlands.	Potentially significant impact	Mitigation Measure 4.4-7	Less-than-significant
4.4-8: The proposed project could result in indirect impacts to perennial native grassland (purple needlegrass).	Potentially significant impact	Mitigation Measure 4.4-8	Less-than-significant
4.4-9: The proposed project would result in direct and indirect impacts to native oak woodlands.	Potentially significant impact	Mitigation Measure 4.4-9	Less-than-significant
4.4-10: The proposed project would have the potential to cause indirect hydrology impacts affecting biological resources and functions within the Arroyo Creek watershed.	Potentially significant impact	Mitigation Measure 4.4-10	Less-than-significant
4.4-11: The proposed project would have less-than-significant impacts to existing established native resident or migratory wildlife movement corridors or to movement of wildlife species.	Less-than-significant	None	
4.5 Cultural Resources			
4.5-1: The project has the potential to impact known historical or archaeological resources on the project site.	Less-than-significant	None	
4.5-2: Blasting associated with the proposed quarry expansion has the potential to cause damage to stone fence P-28-00068 as a result of strong ground vibrations.	Less-than-significant	None	

IMPACT AND MITIGATION SUMMARY TABLE

Impact	Project Significance	Mitigation Measure	Post-mitigation Significance
4.5-3: Trail Relocation has the potential to impact historical or archaeological resources within Skyline Wilderness Park.	Potentially significant impact	Mitigation Measure 4.5-3: Conduct Field Surveys for Historic and Archaeological Resources and Avoid Impacts from Trail Relocation	Less-than-significant
4.5-4: The project has the potential to impact unknown historical or archaeological resources on the project site.	Potentially significant impact	Mitigation Measure 4.5-4: Avoid or Minimize Impacts to Unknown Historical or Archaeological Resources	Less-than-significant
4.5-5: Ground-disturbing activities could disturb unknown human remains present within the project impact areas.	Potentially significant impact	Mitigation Measure 4.5-5: Avoid or Minimize Impacts to Unknown Human Remains	Less-than-significant
4.5-6: Currently unknown significant paleontological resources within the Pleistocene alluvial deposits at the western edge of the site may be disturbed by project activities.	Potentially significant impact	Mitigation Measure 4.5-6: Evaluation and Treatment of Paleontological Resources	Less-than-significant
4.6 Geology and Soils			
4.6-1: The project could be subject to 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 active fault.	Less-than-significant	None	
4.6-2: The project could expose people or structures to substantial adverse effects (failure of newly constructed dams, berms, detention/sedimentation basins and related structures for stormwater improvements) from strong seismic ground shaking.	Potentially significant impact	Mitigation Measure 4.6-2a: Supplemental Geotechnical Design Criteria. Mitigation Measure 4.6-2b: Slope Stability Criteria	Less-than-significant
4.6-2b: The project could expose people or structures to substantial adverse effects from landslides.	Potentially significant impact	Mitigation Measure 4.6-2b: Slope Stability Criteria	Less-than-significant
4.6-3: The project could 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.	Less-than-significant	None	

IMPACT AND MITIGATION SUMMARY TABLE

Impact	Project Significance	Mitigation Measure	Post-mitigation Significance
4.6-4: The project could be located on expansive soil, as defined in Table 18-1 of the Uniform Building Code (1994), in a manner that would create substantial risk to life or property.	Less-than-significant	None	
4.7 Hazardous Materials			
4.7-1: The project could create a significant hazard to the public or the environment through the routine transport, use, or disposal of hazardous materials.	Less-than-significant	None	
4.7-2: The project has the potential to create a significant hazard to the public or the environment through the release of hazardous materials into the environment.	Potentially significant impact	Mitigation Measure 4.7-2: Standard operating procedures shall be used during the handling of hazardous materials for the operation and maintenance of vehicles and equipment; and an approved Hazardous Material Business Plan shall be maintained for the project site	Less-than-significant
4.7-3: The project would not be located on a site which is included on a list of hazardous materials sites compiled pursuant to Government Code Section 65692.5.	No impact	None	
4.7-4: The project would be located within an airport land use plan area, but would not result in a safety hazard for people residing or working in the project area.	No impact	None	
4.7-5: The project would not expose people or structures to a significant risk involving wildland fires.	Less-than-significant	None	
4.7-6: The project could expose the workers to safety hazards associated with operation of heavy machinery, vehicles, or equipment; creation of accessible excavations; or handling of hazardous materials.	Less-than-significant	None	
4.8 Hydrology and Water Quality			

IMPACT AND MITIGATION SUMMARY TABLE

Impact	Project Significance	Mitigation Measure	Post-mitigation Significance
4.8-1: The project could violate water quality standards or waste discharge requirements.	Potentially significant impact	Mitigation Measure 4.8-1: Update Industrial Storm Water Pollution Prevention Plan to address new land disturbance and operations changes	Less-than-significant
4.8-2: The project could substantially deplete groundwater supplies or interfere substantially with groundwater recharge in the vicinity of Arroyo Creek such that there would be a net deficit in aquifer volume or lowering of the local (MST) 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).	Potentially significant impact	Mitigation Measure 4.8-2: Avoid depleting groundwater supplies or interfering with groundwater recharge mechanisms including maintaining a 10-foot vertical separation between final grade and regional groundwater potentiometric elevation	Less-than-significant
4.8-3: The project could substantially deplete groundwater supplies or interfere substantially with groundwater recharge in the vicinity of State Blue and State Grey pits such that there would be a net deficit in aquifer volume or lowering of the local (MST) 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).	Potentially significant impact	Mitigation Measure 4.8-3: Avoid reducing the groundwater potentiometric elevation and increasing consumptive use of surface water or surface occurrence of regional groundwater as a result of quarry activities	Less-than-significant
4.8-4: The project could substantially deplete groundwater supplies or interfere substantially with groundwater recharge in the vicinity of the Quarry Well and Sand Plant such that there would be a net deficit in aquifer volume or lowering of the local (MST) groundwater table level.	Potentially significant impact	Mitigation Measure 4.8-4: Avoid depleting groundwater supplies by water reuse and obtaining new supplies of additional water for operations	Less-than-significant
4.8-5: The project could 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.	Potentially significant impact	Mitigation Measure 4.8-5: Reduce Potential for Offsite Runoff	Less-than-significant

IMPACT AND MITIGATION SUMMARY TABLE

Impact	Project Significance	Mitigation Measure	Post-mitigation Significance
4.8-6: The project could create or contribute runoff water which would provide substantial additional sources of polluted runoff, or otherwise substantially degrade water quality.	Potentially significant impact	Mitigation Measure 4.8-6: Update Industrial Storm Water Pollution Prevention Plan to address hazardous materials spill response actions	Less-than-significant
4.8-7: The project would not 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, place within a 100-year flood hazard area structures which would impede or redirect flood flows, or 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.	No impact	None	
4.8-8: The proposed project could result in substantial adverse effects to the surface and groundwater hydrology of Skyline Wilderness Park.	Potentially significant impact	Mitigation Measures 4.8-2, 4.8-3 and 4.8-4	Less-than-significant
4.8-9: The project could contribute to violation of water quality standards or waste discharge requirements in the cumulative scenario.	Potentially significant impact	Mitigation Measure 4.8-1	Less-than-significant
4.8-10: The project could contribute to depletion of groundwater supplies or interfere substantially with groundwater recharge in the vicinity of Arroyo Creek in the cumulative scenario.	Potentially significant impact	Mitigation Measure 4.8-2	Less-than-significant
4.8-11: The project could contribute to depletion of groundwater supplies or interfere substantially with groundwater recharge in the vicinity of State Blue and State Grey pits in the cumulative scenario.	Potentially significant impact	Mitigation Measures 4.8-2 and 4.8-3	Less-than-significant
4.8-12: The project could contribute to depletion of groundwater supplies or interfere substantially with groundwater recharge in the vicinity of the Quarry Well and Sand Plant in the cumulative scenario.	Potentially significant impact	Mitigation Measure 4.8-4	Less-than-significant

IMPACT AND MITIGATION SUMMARY TABLE

Impact	Project Significance	Mitigation Measure	Post-mitigation Significance
4.8-13: The project could contribute to substantial alteration of the existing drainage pattern of the site or area, including through the alteration of the course of a stream or river, or to a substantial increase in the rate or amount of surface runoff in a manner that would result in flooding on- or off-site in the cumulative scenario.	Potentially significant impact	Mitigation Measure 4.8-5	Less-than-significant
4.8-14: The project could create or contribute to sources of polluted runoff or otherwise substantially degrade water quality in the cumulative scenario.	Potentially significant impact	Mitigation Measures 4.8-1 and 4.8-6	Less-than-significant
4.9 Land Use			
4.9-1: The project would not substantially conflict with or impede implementation of any applicable land use plan, policy, or regulation of an agency with jurisdiction over the project adopted for the purpose of avoiding or mitigating an environmental effect.	Less-than-significant	None	
4.9-2: The project would not conflict with any applicable habitat conservation plan or natural community conservation plan.	No impact	None	
4.9-3: The proposed project would not contribute to cumulative impacts associated with land use conflicts.	Less-than-significant	None	
4.10 Mineral Resources			
4.10-1: The project would not result in a substantial loss of availability of a known mineral resource of state, regional, or local importance.	No impact	None	
4.10-2: The project would not result in the use of energy or non-renewable resources in a wasteful or inefficient manner.	Less-than-significant	None	
4.11 Noise			

IMPACT AND MITIGATION SUMMARY TABLE

Impact	Project Significance	Mitigation Measure	Post-mitigation Significance
4.11-1: Noise generated by mining activities on the ridgelines in the expansion areas would exceed allowable noise levels as established in the Napa County General Plan and Napa County Noise Ordinance.	Potentially significant impact	Mitigation Measure 4.11-1: Noise Restrictions in Expansion Area North and East of the State Blue Pit and Snake Pit (Pasini Parcel)	Less-than-significant
4.11-2: Vibration levels generated by blasting may result in excessive vibration at sensitive receptors north and south of the quarry and sensitive structures north and west of the quarry.	Potentially significant impact	Mitigation Measure 4.11-2: Blasting Vibration Reduction Measures	Less-than-significant
4.11-3: Noise from changes in quarry processing activities would not result in a substantial permanent noise increase at sensitive land uses in the project vicinity.	Less-than-significant	None	
4.11-4: Traffic noise level increases attributable to the project, and noise level increases resulting from additional project-generated barge and railroad trips, would not result in a substantial permanent noise increase at sensitive land uses in the project vicinity.	Less-than-significant	None	
4.11-5: Temporary or periodic noise level increases attributable to the project as a result of blasting, would not result in substantial temporary noise increases at sensitive land uses in the project vicinity.	Less-than-significant	None	
4.11-6: Traffic noise level increases attributable to the project will not result in a “cumulatively considerable” noise level increase at sensitive land uses in the project vicinity.	Less-than-significant	None	
4.12 Population Housing			
4.12-1: Additional workers required to operate the expanded mining operation could cause population growth in the Napa area.	Less-than-significant	None	
4.12-2: The project would not displace existing housing or necessitate the construction of replacement housing.	No impact	None	
4.12-3: The project would not displace people or necessitate the construction of replacement housing elsewhere.	No impact	None	

IMPACT AND MITIGATION SUMMARY TABLE

Impact	Project Significance	Mitigation Measure	Post-mitigation Significance
4.13 Public Services			
4.13-1: The project would increase the demand for police, emergency medical, and fire protection services.	Less-than-significant	None	
4.14 Recreation			
4.14-1: The proposed project would not increase the use of existing neighborhood and regional parks or other recreational facilities such that substantial physical deterioration of the facility would occur.	No impact	None	
4.14-2: Trail Abandonment, Fence Construction, and Relocation of Segments of Skyline, Buckeye, Lower Skyline and Access Road Trails would require construction or expansion of recreational facilities that might have an adverse physical effect on the environment.	Potentially significant impact	Mitigation Measures 4.4-6 and 4.5-3	Less-than-significant
4.15 Transportation			
4.15-1: The proposed project would increase traffic volumes on roadways and at intersections in the area.	Potentially significant impact	Mitigation Measure 4.15-1: Transportation Demand Management Program	Less-than-significant
4.15-2: The proposed project would increase traffic volumes on roadways and at intersections in the area under cumulative conditions.	Potentially significant impact	Mitigation Measure 4.15-1: Transportation Demand Management Program	Less-than-significant
4.16 Utilities			
4.16-1: Implementation of the proposed project would result in the construction of new stormwater drainage facilities and/or expansion of existing facilities.	Potentially significant impact	Mitigation Measure 4.8-6	Less-than-significant
4.16-2: The project would have sufficient water supplies available from existing entitlements and resources and no new or expanded entitlements would be needed.	Potentially significant impact	Mitigation Measures 4.8-2 and 4.8-3	Less-than-significant
4.17 Greenhouse Gases			
4.17-1: The proposed project would conflict with Napa County General Plan policies adopted for the purpose of reducing GHG emissions.	Potentially significant impact	Mitigation Measure 4.4-8. Mitigation Measure 4.17-2	Less-than-significant

IMPACT AND MITIGATION SUMMARY TABLE

Impact	Project Significance	Mitigation Measure	Post-mitigation Significance
4.17-2: The proposed project would generate GHG emissions greater than identified significance criteria.	Potentially significant impact	Mitigation Measure 4.17-2: Greenhouse Gas Reduction Plan	Significant and unavoidable