

**NAPA COUNTY AMENDMENT No. 1
AGREEMENT NO. 250315B**

PROFESSIONAL SERVICES AGREEMENT

THIS AGREEMENT is made and entered into in Napa County, California, this 14th day of April, 2026, (“Effective Date”) by and between Napa County, a political subdivision of the State of California, hereinafter referred to as “County,” and Environmental Science Associates, an S Corporation whose address is 2600 Capitol Avenue, Suite #200, Sacramento, California, 95816, hereinafter referred to as “Consultant.”

RECITALS

WHEREAS, County and Consultant entered into Napa County Agreement No 250315B (the “Agreement”) on February 4, 2025, to provide professional services required to execute the update to the County’s Baseline Data Report; and

WHEREAS, County and Consultant now wish to amend the Agreement to alter the scope, term, and compensation to include services for the County’s General Plan Update.

TERMS

NOW, THEREFORE, the Agreement is amended as follows:

AGREEMENT

ARTICLE I – SCOPE OF SERVICES

1. Scope of Services, is hereby amended to read in full as follows:

1.1 Scope of Services. Consultant shall provide professional services to County as described in Exhibit A and Exhibit A-1 to this Agreement, and in accordance with the Contract Documents. The Contract Documents consist of this Agreement and its Exhibits, the Request for Proposals or Qualifications issued by County (if any), and Consultant’s proposal or statement of qualifications.

2. Schedule, is hereby amended to read in full as follows:

1.2 Schedule. Consultant shall perform and complete the scope of services in accordance with the schedule set forth in Exhibit A and Exhibit A-1. Consultant shall further perform the scope of services in compliance with any interim milestones or deadlines, as may be set forth in both Exhibit A and Exhibit A-1. Time is of the essence in the performance of the scope of services. In no event shall Consultant be liable for any costs or delays resulting in whole or in part from causes beyond the reasonable control of

Consultant, including, without limitation actions or inaction of County or County's other consultants and contractors.

ARTICLE II – DURATION OF AGREEMENT

3. Term of the Agreement, is hereby amended to read in full as follows:
 - 2.1 **Term of the Agreement.** The term of this Agreement shall begin on the Effective Date entered on page 1 of this Agreement. This Agreement shall expire on June 30, 2030, or upon completion of the services, whichever occurs first, unless terminated earlier in accordance with this Article.

ARTICLE III – COMPENSATION

4. Amount of Compensation, is hereby amended to read in full as follows:
 - 3.1 **Amount of Compensation.** County shall pay Consultant for satisfactory performance of the scope of services, as follows:
 - 3.1.1 **Rates.** County shall pay Consultant according to the compensation and fee schedule set forth in Exhibit B and Exhibit B-1.
 - 3.1.2 **Expenses.** Travel or other expenses will only be reimbursed by County if such expenses are specifically identified in Exhibit B and Exhibit B-1. Any travel expenses must comply with the Napa County Travel Policy found in the Napa County Policy Manual, Part I, Section 43, regardless of anything to the contrary in Exhibit B.
 - 3.1.3 **Maximum Amount.** Notwithstanding paragraphs 3.1.1 and 3.1.2, the maximum payments under this Agreement shall not exceed a total of Four Million Eight Hundred Thousand One Hundred Ten Dollars (\$4,800,110.); provided, however, that such amounts shall not be construed as guaranteed sums, and compensation shall be based upon services actually provided and reimbursable expenses actually incurred.
5. Except as provided above, the terms and provisions of the Agreement shall remain in full force and effect.

/// Remainder of Page Intentionally Left Blank ///

IN WITNESS WHEREOF, this Agreement is executed by County, acting by and through the Chair of the Board of Supervisors, and by Consultant through its duly authorized officer(s).

Environmental Science Associates

By _____
Dan Dameron, Vice President

By _____
Maury Ballif, Chief Financial Officer

NAPA COUNTY, a political subdivision of the State of California

By _____
AMBER MANFREE, Chair of the Board of Supervisors

<p>APPROVED AS TO FORM Office of County Counsel</p> <p>By: <u>Laura J. Anderson (e-sign)</u> Lead Deputy County Counsel</p> <p>Date: <u>April 3, 2026</u></p>	<p>APPROVED BY THE NAPA COUNTY BOARD OF SUPERVISORS</p> <p>Date: _____</p> <p>Processed By: _____</p> <p>_____ Deputy Clerk of the Board</p>	<p>ATTEST: NEHA HOSKINS Clerk of the Board of Supervisors</p> <p>By: _____</p>
---	--	--

EXHIBIT A-1
SCOPE OF SERVICES

I. Description of Goods and/or Services

Consultant shall provide a comprehensive update to the County's General Plan Update in accordance with the Scope of Services dated April 6, 2026, which is hereby incorporated into this Exhibit by reference.

II. Schedule

Consultant shall perform the Scope of Services in accordance with the schedule set forth in Consultant's Scope of Services which is hereby incorporated into this Exhibit by reference.

**EXHIBIT B-1
COMPENSATION AND FEE SCHEDULE**

County shall pay Consultant in accordance with the fee schedule set forth in Consultant's Fee Schedule dated April 6, 2026, which is hereby incorporated into this Exhibit by reference.

Scope of Work

The following Scope of Work outlines the comprehensive tasks necessary to successfully complete Napa County's (County) **General Plan Update (GPU) and associated program environmental impact report (EIR)**.

The GPU will modernize the County's 2008 General Plan to reflect new state laws, regional trends, and Board of Supervisors (BOS) strategic priorities, while reaffirming Napa's long-standing commitment to agricultural preservation, environmental stewardship, and community well-being.

The GPU will also address a variety of cross-cutting themes that influence the quality of life and natural environment in Napa County. These themes include public health, equity, resilience, and long-term economic vitality. Accordingly, the update will apply a **Health in All Policies** framework as a cross-cutting lens throughout the General Plan, ensuring that considerations, such as economic development, housing affordability, mobility, climate impacts, environmental quality, and access to resources, are intentionally integrated into policy decisions rather than addressed in isolation.

The GPU will also be informed by realistic assumptions about future conditions, including climate variability, wildfire risk, water security, and economic transition. Climate change projections, water supply resilience, and hazard exposure will be treated as baseline planning considerations, and the GPU will be aligned with relevant County and regional initiatives, including the Regional Climate Action and Adaptation Plan (RCAAP), Groundwater Sustainability Plan and related efforts and adjacent habitat conservation and shoreline planning initiatives.

The EIR will also provide the legally required environmental analysis of the GPU, ensuring the policy framework is both visionary and defensible under the California Environmental Quality Act (CEQA), while supporting informed decision-making by clearly disclosing potential impacts and mitigation strategies.

This scope is designed to ensure that the GPU and EIR processes are:

- **Collaborative** – Engaging the BOS, Planning Commission, staff, topic-specific and community workshops, and the broader community through structured, well-facilitated engagement focused on decision-relevant input.
- **Comprehensive** – Addressing all State-mandated elements of the General Plan, integrating cross-cutting topics, such as climate adaptation, resilience, equity, fiscal sustainability, and public health, and ensuring compliance with CEQA.
- **Flexible and Forward-Looking** – Providing a policy framework that preserves Napa County's legacy while anticipating emerging challenges, such as climate change, wildfire risk, water security, and economic transition.
- **Consistent and Integrated** – Ensuring that all elements are internally consistent, that the General Plan aligns with other County and regional plans and initiatives, and that cross-references among topics strengthen policy integration rather than duplicating efforts.
- **Accessible and Transparent** – Delivering products that are clear, visual and publicly accessible, including maps, graphics, and scenario-based tools that illustrate alternative futures, trade-offs, and consequences to support community understanding and informed decision-making.

The result will be a **modernized, State-compliant, and community-driven General Plan**, supported by a Programmatic EIR, that together will guide Napa County's land use, environmental, social, and economic policies through 2050 and beyond.

The Scope of Work is outlined as follows:

- **Phase 1: New Data Collection and Policy Audit**
 - Task 1.1 Kickoff and Tour of Key Sites
 - Task 1.2 Additional Existing Conditions Analysis
 - Task 1.3 Policy Audit and Retention Review

- **Phase 2: Community Engagement and Facilitation**
 - Task 2.1 Community Engagement Plan
 - Task 2.2 Branding and Templates
 - Task 2.3 Outreach Activities, Social Media, and Newsletters
 - Task 2.4 Website
 - Task 2.5 Initial Outreach and Engagement
 - Task 2.6 Topic-Specific Workshops
 - Task 2.7 Countywide Workshops
 - Task 2.8 Online Surveys/Feedback Forms
 - Task 2.9 Public Agency Working Group (PAWG)
 - Task 2.10 Ongoing Stakeholder Meetings
 - Task 2.11 Board and Commission Study Sessions
 - Task 2.12 Comment Tracking and Response to Comments
- **Phase 3: Land Use Alternatives**
 - Task 3.1 Community Vision Plan Document
 - Task 3.2 Conceptual Alternatives and Concepts
 - Task 3.3 Land Use and Policy Alternatives Report
 - Task 3.4 Land Use Alternatives Analysis
 - Task 3.5 Growth Projections
 - Task 3.6 Preferred Land Use Plan Development
 - Task 3.7 Land Use, Health, and Environmental Justice Policy Framework
 - Task 3.8 Fiscal, Economic, and Agricultural Sustainability Analysis
 - Task 3.9 Transportation Analysis
- **Phase 4: General Plan Development**
 - Task 4.1 Outline and Format
 - Task 4.2 Administrative Draft
 - Task 4.3 Draft
 - Task 4.4 Public Review Draft
 - Task 4.5 Final GPU
- **Phase 5: Environmental Clearance (EIR)**
 - Task 5.1 Project Description and Alternatives Development
 - Task 5.2 Notice of Preparation and Scoping
 - Task 5.3 Prepare Administrative Draft EIR
 - Task 5.4 Prepare Public Draft EIR
 - Task 5.5 Prepare Responses to Comments
 - Task 5.6 Prepare Final EIR
- **Phase 6: Meetings, Hearings, Project, and Data Management**
 - Task 6.1 Public Hearings
 - Task 6.2 Staff Coordination Meetings
 - Task 6.3 Project Administration
 - Task 6.4 Data Management
 - Task 6.5 GIS Specifications

Scope of Work Assumptions

The following are assumptions for the Scope of Work:

- The level of effort for each task is limited to the general number of hours for each task listed in the budget spreadsheet. Environmental Science Associates (ESA) team members may reallocate hours between tasks if individual tasks are completed in less time than anticipated. Any reallocation of hours between tasks must be first presented, discussed, and approved by the County.
- All studies that the ESA team will prepare are identified in the scope of work. Any studies, tasks, deliverables or reports not specifically identified are assumed to **not** be included.
- All County comments to deliverables will be provided as a single set of non-conflicting and actionable comments. Unless agreed upon by ESA, all comments will be provided one time for each deliverable. To the extent feasible, County staff will modify documents prepared by the ESA team using “track changes” in Microsoft Word.
- The number of rounds of review of each document is identified in the scope of work. Additional rounds of review and edits may result in a budget amendment.
- All deliverables will receive internal quality assurance/quality control (QA/QC) review before being submitted to the County and will be substantially complete (which shall mean at least 95% complete) and ready for substantive review.
- Draft deliverables submitted for County review are assumed to be “reviewable drafts.” Drafts that contain significant errors, missing sections, omissions, internal inconsistencies, or formatting issues that substantially impede review may be returned for correction and resubmittal and will not count as a formal round of review.

Phase 1: New Data Collection and Policy Audit

The first phase of the Napa County GPU will be built upon the Baseline Data Report (BDR) to ensure that all datasets, maps, and policy foundations reflect the most current conditions, regulatory requirements, and County priorities. This phase also establishes a clear roadmap for coordination, decision-making, and integration of new priorities, such as climate resilience, wildfire protection, and water security.

Task 1.1: Kickoff and Tour of Key Sites

The project will begin with an in-person kickoff meeting with County staff, followed by a driving tour of key sites and planning areas. The kickoff will confirm the project scope, schedule, and deliverables, and provide an opportunity to discuss County goals and expectations for the GPU.

Subtask activities include the following:

- Review and confirm work plan, schedule, and communication protocols.
- Discuss County priorities, including community visioning, climate, housing, agriculture, natural resources, and economic development.
- Discuss the community engagement approach including the flow of engagement activities.
- Conduct a field tour with County staff to discuss opportunities, challenges, and emerging themes (e.g., agricultural preservation, watershed health, wildfire risk, infrastructure, mobility).

Task 1.1 Deliverables

- Meeting agenda, summary notes, and action items.
- Refined project schedule and Scope of Work, if necessary (draft and final).
- Photo log and key findings from field tour.

- Detailed workflow for immediate upcoming tasks (e.g., additional existing conditions analysis, Engagement Plan, branding, website).

Task 1.1 Assumptions

- Kickoff will be one full-day session in Napa County.
- ESA will prepare agenda and materials in consultation with County staff.
- County will coordinate participant invitations and meeting logistics.
- Up to four ESA staff (one in-person/three virtual), four Alta staff (two in-person/two virtual), two BAE staff (one in-person/one virtual), and one Fehrs & Peers staff (one in-person) will attend the kickoff meeting, including General Plan Element leads and management team.
- The ESA team and County staff will have reviewed the scope of work, schedule, and budget as well as the existing General Plan Elements and state requirements prior to attendance at the meeting.

Task 1.2: Additional Existing Conditions Analysis

This task provides flexibility to collaborate with County geographic information system (GIS) and other County subject matter experts to conduct additional existing conditions analysis, as needed, to meet State requirements for the GPU. The need for new analysis may arise if new state legislation, state guidance, or regulatory changes emerge after the BDR is finalized and during the preparation of the GPU. This task is not intended to maintain the currency of data in the BDR. The additional existing conditions analysis can also be used to conduct multi-layered analysis using existing data to address any new questions that arise during the process. Any new geospatial data collected as part of this task will be integrated into the Napa County Baseline Data Explorer web application for use across tasks.

Task 1.2 Deliverables

- Supplemental technical analysis, geospatial datasets, and findings to support the GPU and EIR.
- Updates to GIS data as needed (see GIS-related assumption below).
- Updates to Napa County BDR Explorer web application.

Task 1.2 Assumptions

- The extent of updates is unknown at this time, so while the budget reflects the need for some existing conditions analysis and updates across topics, ESA may need additional contingency funding depending on the level of new analysis and geospatial mapping required.
- Planning, Building & Environmental Services (PBES) GIS staff will be responsible for maintaining currency of data sources for which they are the owners, including data previously supplied to County by ESA. ESA will be available to support the County by providing guidance on updates available from previously used sources. New or significantly modified data resulting from the GPU process will be provided to the County in complete form, including compliant metadata.

Task 1.3: Policy Audit and Retention Review

Before drafting new policies, the ESA team will conduct a systematic review of the existing General Plan (2008) and other County policies and ordinances to identify which policies remain current in accordance with State requirements or are anticipated to require revision to be consistent with and build upon planning efforts that have been completed since 2008 or are in process. This review will also evaluate consistency and coordination with policies and plans of incorporated jurisdictions within the County and relevant regional agencies to minimize conflicts and support alignment on shared issues. In addition to providing a preliminary identification of goals and policies, the audit will ensure continuity while modernizing the policy framework to reflect new State mandates and County priorities. This policy audit will also help inform the vision and BOS priorities and ultimately determine the magnitude of the GPU. The deliverable

will be a document, organized by topic or General Plan Element, which will include all goals, policies, and actions from the existing General Plan and other policies and plans that are still relevant today and should be included in the updated General Plan.

Subtask activities include:

- Develop a policy audit matrix comparing existing policies with:
 - Relevant State legislation including, but not limited to, Senate Bill (SB) 1000, SB 379, SB 743, SB 932, SB 375, and Assembly Bill (AB) 98. (Note that there are nearly 300 planning-related laws that have passed in the last 5 to 10 years. This effort will focus on the most relevant for the County but will not include a full survey of all legislation.)
 - Office of Planning and Research General Plan Guidelines (2017) and any “in-process” version of the revised General Plan Guidelines that is publicly available.
 - County strategic priorities (e.g., ag preservation, climate, mobility, housing, equity).
- Flag policies for Retain / Revise / Retire / Replace.
- Review and assess consistency with the incorporated areas within the County’s general plans, specific plans, and regional agency plans (e.g., transportation, housing, climate) to identify areas of alignment, potential conflict, and opportunities for coordination.
- Cross-reference with Housing Element (2023), Safety Element (2023), Circulation Element (2019), Airport Land Use Compatibility Plan (2024), RCAAP and related initiatives, Shoreline Adaptation Plan, and Hazard Mitigation Plans as well as relevant plans from incorporated areas within the County and regional agencies to avoid duplication, ensure consistency, and identify opportunities for alignments.
- Include policy direction from other topic-specific plans, ordinances, and regulations adopted since the previous General Plan (2008).
- Identify gaps in addressing issues identified in the BDR key findings.
- Share preliminary findings with County staff, Topic-Specific Workshops (TSWs) and Public Agency Working Groups (PAWGs) for feedback.

Task 1.3 Deliverables

- Policy Audit Matrix for each chapter. (Excel and/or word + summary memo [draft and final.])
- Presentation of findings for staff, TSWs), and PAWG discussion.

Task 1.3 Assumptions

- Audit will focus on substantive policy content rather than formatting.
- County staff will provide existing General Plan policies in editable format.
- This task follows the first Topic-Specific Workshops and first round of community workshops and survey to ensure that policies are reviewed against the agreed upon issues and opportunities.

Phase 2: Community Engagement and Facilitation

Task 2.1: Community Engagement Plan

Alta will prepare a Community Engagement Plan to guide the GPU. This strategy will take a Health in All Policies approach and will include details about each of the engagement events in the scope (including any changes or alterations emerging from the kickoff meeting, or changes that may occur if determined to be necessary to better engage with the public). The Community Engagement Plan will include the following:

- Provide a summary overview of the project engagement strategy by phase and task, clearly outlining the engagement focus and objectives at each stage and aligning the engagement schedule with key dates.

- Outline outreach, communications, and engagement roles and responsibilities.
- Outline the communication strategies, cadence, and format (e.g., email, social media) for each engagement type (e.g., Topic-Specific Workshops, Community Workshops, surveys, Planning Commission meetings and BOS meetings).

In addition to the above, Alta will prepare a matrix of engagement tasks with a timeline for each major phase of engagement. This will include details regarding the timing and schedule of all community engagement events and activities, including dates, times, location, timing of notifications to be sent and by whom, and more. Unlike the Engagement Plan (which is a static document prepared at the beginning of the project), the matrix of engagement tasks will be updated up to five times during the project and will include significantly more detail on the tasks, responsibilities, and dates for each engagement task.

Task 2.1 Deliverables

- Community Engagement Plan (draft and final).
- Event planning grid/timeline template, populated for each activity at time of planning.
- The matrix of engagement tasks will be updated up to five times during the project

Task 2.1 Assumptions

- The Engagement Plan will not be updated on a regular basis. It will be prepared at the beginning of the project and referenced throughout.

Task 2.2: Branding and Templates

Alta will prepare unique branding materials for the project and templates to be used by the entire ESA team, drawing on ESA templates from the BDR, updating to align with new logos or other relevant components from Alta. This will include a color palette, project logo, and document templates for a variety of deliverables. All public materials related to this project will be produced using these branded templates and must align with Napa County’s Brand Guidelines to ensure consistency across all communications.

Task 2.2 Deliverables

- Branding sheet including a color palette and logo (draft and final).
- Document templates for PowerPoint presentations, Word documents, meeting agendas, meeting notes, workshop boards, and meeting announcements. Templates will comply with WCAG AA accessibility standards.

Task 2.2 Assumptions

- Alta will build off the County branding guide. questionnaire.
- County staff will complete Alta’s branding

Task 2.3: Outreach Activities, Social Media, and Newsletters

During this task, Alta will work with Countywide Communications to reach out to the community about the GPU and opportunities for engagement. The work in this task will build off the outreach efforts that occurred during the BDR process.

Task activities include the following:

- Eight newsletters (1–2 pages each), distributed quarterly at key milestones in the process. The first newsletter will be a project “fact sheet” that describes the GPU process and how community members can get involved.
- Flyers for each workshop (three total) for distribution around the county (by County staff). Flyers will be provided in English and Spanish.

- Create and maintain an email database through Social Pinpoint to distribute newsletters and announce workshops, hearings, and surveys.

Task 2.3 Deliverables

- 1–2-page project newsletters (8x) – Draft and final.
- Flyers announcing each workshop (3x) – Draft and final.

Task 2.3 Assumptions

- County staff will be responsible for distributing flyers throughout the county, managing all social media, and coordinating with other departments to promote General Plan engagement activities. This includes sharing information through County newsletters and BOS communications.
- Alta will use the County’s Social Pinpoint account for public engagement, email database management, and surveys.
- Alta will prepare draft social media content. County Communications will review, finalize, and post the content on official County platforms including department or BOS newsletters.
- County staff will be responsible for coordinating with the media, including news releases and advertising and maintaining the email database.
- All materials developed for this project that are public facing will comply with applicable WCAG AA accessibility standards

Task 2.4: Website

Alta will use the County’s Social Pinpoint account to create and maintain an interactive project website for two-way communication. The Social Pinpoint website will include project information, background resources, frequently asked questions (FAQs), and other information. The Social Pinpoint website will also include an interactive component, such as sign-up for more information, a comment feature, links to questionnaires, and links to online workshops. The website will be regularly updated through plan development.

In addition, Alta will develop content for a GPU landing page on the County’s website. This will include basic information on the project, notices about upcoming engagement activities, and a link to the Social Pinpoint project website. County staff will be responsible for the actual updates to the County website using content provided by Alta.

Subtask activities include the following:

- Developing an outline and wireframe for the website.
- Preparing preliminary website content.
- Preparing regular and timely content updates for the project website.
- Preparing content for a landing page for the GPU on the County website (draft, final, and regular updates throughout the project).

Task 2.4 Deliverables

- Website Outline – Draft and final.
- Preliminary Social Pinpoint website – Draft and final.
- Quarterly updates to Social Pinpoint project website.
- Initial content for the GPU landing page on the County website (draft and final).
- Quarterly updates to the GPU landing page throughout the project.

Task 2.4 Assumptions

- Alta will develop a project website using the County’s Social Pinpoint account. County staff will provide Alta staff with access to the Social Pinpoint account.

- County staff will develop a GPU landing page on the County website. Alta will provide content, and the County will be responsible for updating the content using information provided by Alta.
- The website will have translation using Social Pinpoint’s built-in features.
- The website will be prepared using WCAG AA standards.

Task 2.5: Initial Outreach and Engagement

This task will occur at the beginning of the project. The purpose is to meet with as many residents, businesses, trade groups, and other stakeholders as possible to inform them about the GPU and to discuss their issues, opportunities, and vision for the County. A key focus of this phase of engagement is to reach residents and stakeholders who are not typically engaged in the planning process. The intent is to get people interested in and engaged in the update process as early as possible and to build a comprehensive database of potential participants in the process. Additionally, the conversations will be a direct input to the Community Vision Plan Document (Task 3.1).

Based on past experience, this initial phase of work is the best time to engage the widest variety of stakeholders. Activities during this phase may include the following:

- Town Hall meetings in each of the BOS Districts.
- Individual meetings with stakeholder groups.
- Attendance at community events.
- Phone calls to stakeholder groups.

During these conversations, the ESA team will do the following:

- 1) Inform participants about the purpose and value of a GPU.
- 2) Ask participants the best ways to engage with County stakeholders.
- 3) Ask three broad questions that will help to create the Community Vision Plan Document (Task 3.1):
 - a. What do you love and cherish about the County that you want to maintain?
 - b. What are the issues and challenges in the County?
 - c. What is your vision for the future?

The result of this task will be a summary report of the results of engagement.

Task 2.5 Deliverables

- Summary Report (draft and final).
- PowerPoint presentation for Town Halls (draft and final).
- Summary notes from Town Halls (draft and final).
- Other deliverables as needed to achieve the outcomes of the task.

Task 2.5 Assumptions

- Since the specific activities of the ESA team will be determined in discussions with County staff, the ESA team has budgeted a maximum number of hours for the activities.
- County Staff will be active partners in the activities.
- BOS’s Offices will organize town hall meetings, which the ESA team will attend. The ESA team will assist with meeting logistics and facilitation.

Task 2.6: Topic-Specific Workshops (TSWs)

To support inclusive and technically informed input on the GPU, the ESA team, in collaboration with County staff, will convene a series of TSWs throughout the project. These workshops will provide a focused forum for community members and subject matter experts to help shape the vision, policy direction, and implementation framework of the GPU.

Five topic areas will be established. Each topic will convene on five occasions at key project milestones, for a total of approximately 25 meetings (5 topics × 5 milestones). All meetings will be publicly noticed through Social Pinpoint and will be open to the public. The format is intended to support consistent participation by individuals with specific expertise or interest in a topic area.

Each workshop series will build on prior discussions and advance from existing conditions and policy review through visioning, alternatives development, preferred plan direction, and review of the Draft GPU and EIR.

For efficiency, meetings will be scheduled over two to three consecutive days, with staggered times to allow participation across topics. Two meetings per topic will be held in person and three will be virtual.

Each Topic-Specific Workshop will be led by the designated topic lead (identified below) with support from County staff. Alta will provide facilitation for all meetings to ensure consistent meeting management and productive discussion.

The proposed Topic-Specific Workshops and the subtopics covered are listed below:

1. **Land Use and Community Character TSW (Alta lead)** – Proposed land uses, growth management, community design, Measure J/P, new employment uses, noise, and historic and cultural resources.
2. **Agriculture and Working Lands TSW (ESA lead; BAE support)** – Agricultural preservation, Measure J/P, potential conflicts between agriculture and other land uses, and economic development.
3. **Resource Management, Climate, and Water TSW (ESA lead)** – Conservation and open space, habitat and biodiversity, water quality and watershed protection, climate resilience (SB 379), habitat connectivity and wildlife corridors (AB 1889), equitable park access (SB 1425), carbon sequestration, and scenic resources.
4. **Mobility and Infrastructure TSW (Fehr & Peers lead; ESA support)** – Multimodal transportation (roadways, transit, active transportation), goods movement and truck routes (AB 98), vehicle-miles traveled (VMT) reduction and SB 743 compliance, safe systems policies (SB 932), broadband and digital equity, renewable energy and utilities infrastructure, and green infrastructure for stormwater.
5. **Environmental Justice, Health and Equity (Alta lead)** – Disadvantaged Community identification, pollution burden, health outcomes, social equity, access to healthy foods, and equitable access to parks and open spaces.

Each Topic-Specific Workshop will convene at **five major milestones**:

- Introduction, Roles/Responsibilities, and Review of Existing Policy (Phase 1).
- Vision and Guiding Principles (Phase 2).
- Policy and Physical Alternatives (Phase 3).
- Preferred Plan Direction (Phase 4).
- Draft GPU and EIR (Phases 5 and 6).

This results in approximately **25 Topic-Specific Workshops (5 groups × 5 milestones)** over the course of the project.

Task 2.6 Deliverables

For each meeting, the ESA team will provide the following:

- Meeting approach and agenda (including messaging bullets for each event).
- PowerPoint presentation (if needed).
- Summary notes and action items, if any.
- Interpretation at each TSW.

Task 2.6 Assumptions

- All meetings will be publicly noticed and open to the public. The County is responsible for public noticing.

- Meetings are designed for participants with familiarity with the topic. Broader public participation will occur through countywide workshops, surveys, and other engagement activities.
- Materials will be distributed in advance, and participants will be expected to review them prior to each meeting.
- The ESA team will provide meeting materials, summaries, and comment tracking.
- A senior Alta staff member will facilitate all meetings.
- County staff will attend meetings and assist with logistics, technical input, and other supportive roles as needed.
- Two meetings per topic will be in person and three will be virtual.
- Meetings may be held on two to three consecutive days to reduce travel costs and improve coordination.
- Alta will track attendees for TSWs.

Task 2.7: Countywide Workshops

The ESA team, led by Alta, will prepare for three rounds of countywide workshops on the GPU process. Each round of workshops will include one in-person meeting and two virtual meetings (for a total of three meetings per round). The workshops are intended for members of the public who are not experts in any specific topic and will likely not participate in the Topic-Specific Workshops described in Task 2.6. The following are the expected topics of the community workshops:

1. **Vision, Goals and Outcomes** – This meeting will focus on reviewing a broad vision statement and topic-specific goals and outcomes. This workshop will occur after initial outreach (such as meetings with stakeholder groups) have occurred.
2. **Plan Framework** – These workshops will focus on presenting and receiving feedback on the proposed direction for all topics of the General Plan. The workshop will be held as an open-house-style workshop with a presentation followed by stations.
3. **Draft General Plan and EIR** – This open house workshop will allow participants to review and provide structured feedback on the Draft General Plan and Draft EIR.

Task 2.7 Deliverables

- The following will be prepared for each meeting:
 - Meeting flyer (in email, printed and social media templates);
 - Agenda;
 - Presentation;
 - Up to six unique boards or interactive activities;
 - Summary notes;
 - Spreadsheet of individual comments by participants; and
 - Recordings (for virtual meetings only).
- Attendance of up to four ESA team members at each workshop.

Task 2.7 Assumptions

- Alta staff will facilitate each meeting.
- County staff will assist with meeting logistics, including securing facilities, and pay food, childcare, meeting facility costs, and other expenses (other than printing) associated with the workshop based on what is deemed applicable.
- Alta will prepare and print up to six boards for each meeting. Additional design of materials and printing can occur at an added cost.
- Materials will be prepared to WCAG AA standards.
- ESA will use a third-party interpreter to provide live interpretation.

- The agenda, boards, and handouts will be translated into Spanish. The PowerPoint presentation will not be translated into Spanish.

Task 2.8: Online Surveys/Feedback Forms

The ESA team will prepare content for online surveys and/or feedback forms at three points during the process. Each will be available online using the County’s Social Pinpoint application. The current expectation is that the three surveys will occur at the following phases of work:

1. Vision and Goals – This survey will allow participants to review and provide feedback on the vision statement, project goals, and outcomes.
2. Alternatives – This survey will allow participants to provide feedback on land use and policy alternatives and will be supported by the Alternatives Briefing Book.
3. Policy Direction – The ESA team will prepare a single survey or a series of topic-specific surveys to obtain feedback on proposed direction of the General Plan.

Task 2.8 Deliverables (for each survey)

- Draft surveys in Microsoft Word.
- Screencheck final surveys in Social Pinpoint.
- Summary report for each survey that includes a 3–5-page summary of key takeaways and topline results and detailed responses.

Task 2.8 Assumptions

- The surveys will not be statistically valid.
- All surveys will be online and in English (Social Pinpoint will allow for translation into other languages).
- Paper versions, including preparation and entering data, can be included for an additional cost.
- Survey results will present basic information and will not include any cross-tabulations of data.

Task 2.9: Public Agency Working Group (PAWG)

ESA will convene a Public Agency Working Group that consists of County staff and other public agencies to provide feedback on the project on those matters within that public agency’s jurisdiction or area of expertise at key points during the process. Other ESA team members will attend meetings if needed to address specific topics. The PAWG will meet up to five times at points during the process. In some instances, a meeting may consist of a series of topic-specific serial meetings to allow for more focused conversations.

Task 2.9 Deliverables

- Agenda, PowerPoint presentation, and summary notes for each meeting (up to five meetings).

Task 2.9 Assumptions

- Meetings will be held virtually.
- County staff will coordinate with PAWG members between meetings.
- Attendees will be limited to government staff operating in their official capacity.
- Up to 14 ESA team staff will attend these meetings to cover all Elements of the GPU (seven Elements, two staff each).

Task 2.10: Ongoing Stakeholder Meetings

The ESA team will meet informally with external or internal stakeholders throughout the process on an as-needed basis to coordinate data needs and/or policy guidance related to the GPU and EIR. The number of meetings will vary based on the complexity, number of participants, preparation of materials, and whether the meeting is in-person or virtual. The

ESA team will maintain the list of stakeholders and may consult with County staff as to appropriate stakeholders to meet with depending on the topic and need. A budget allowance is included for this task.

Task 2.10 Deliverables

- Meeting notes from each meeting.

Task 2.10 Assumptions

- The number of meetings for this task is flexible and will be used on an as-need basis.

Task 2.11: Board of Supervisors and Planning Commission Study Sessions

The ESA team will plan and facilitate up to three Planning Commission (PC) and up to four BOS meetings during the project to provide updates and receive direction on the GPU. ESA's assumption is that the meetings will focus on the following topics:

1. **Project overview and Engagement Plan review** – This meeting will allow the BOS to share their initial thoughts about the goals of the project and the approach to engagement. This meeting will be a project kickoff meeting in advance of the initial community outreach and engagement in advance of the visioning stage.
2. **Vision, goals, and outcomes** – At this meeting, the ESA team will present the vision, goals, and outcomes developed through extensive community engagement. The PC will review these materials first to provide detailed feedback and help refine the framework. The ESA team will next present the BOS with the refined materials and request feedback and direction.
3. **Preferred plan direction** – At this meeting, the ESA team will present to the BOS the preferred land use approach and other key policy directions developed through the engagement process. This step will occur prior to the ESA team preparing the Draft GPU.
4. **Draft General Plan and EIR** – After the release of the Draft General Plan and EIR, the ESA team will hold a study session with the PC and BOS. This meeting will include an overview of the documents and allow PC and BOS members to provide initial feedback. The meetings will also provide the public with an additional opportunity to provide public comments on the document.

Task 2.11 Deliverables

- A PowerPoint presentation for each round.
- Preparation of draft staff reports for each round.
- Attendance at each meeting.
- Summary notes from each meeting.

Task 2.11 Assumptions

- A single presentation will be created for each round; modifications may be made between the Planning Commission and the BOS meetings if there are additional slides that need to be added to reflect Planning Commission recommendations to the BOS.
- Up to two ESA team staff members will attend and present at each meeting in person.
- County staff will review and finalize the staff report for each round.

Task 2.12: Comment Tracking and Response to Comments

Throughout the process, the ESA team will develop a comment tracking spreadsheet to document individual comments from engagement activities. This spreadsheet will be updated throughout the process and published at major phases. Working with County staff, the ESA team will develop a menu of four to six standard responses (e.g., “incorporate,” “not

relevant for the GP”) and apply a basic response for each comment. This comment tracking spreadsheet will be in addition to summary notes from each individual engagement event or series of events. *(Please note that the total number of comments and level of detail of each comment is highly variable during a General Plan process. Given the number of engagement activities, the County should expect thousands of individual comments each requiring a response. This will take a significant amount of County and ESA team resources.)*

Task 2.12 Deliverables

- Draft comment tracking template with standard responses (two versions).
- Updated spreadsheet at six points during the process and following each round of engagement activities.

Task 2.12 Assumptions

- County staff will assist with adding comments to the spreadsheet, reviewing individual comments, and providing responses.
- Each subject matter expert on the ESA team will be responsible for providing direction on comments for their chapter/topic.
- Detailed responses to comments are not included in the scope and budget.
- Except for workshops, all comments will be received in typewritten form either through surveys, “whiteboard” activities during virtual workshops, or comment forms through the Social Pinpoint website. The ESA team will not be responsible for transcribing comments or letters emailed to the County.
- Due to the volume and level of detail of the anticipated comments, the ESA team has identified a maximum number of hours for providing responses to individual comments. Any level of effort beyond this number of hours will require a budget amendment.

The following information summarizes the ESA team’s assumptions on meeting attendance for Tasks 2.6, 2.7, 2.9, and 2.10. An “L” indicates that the firm is leading or co-leading the content for the meeting. An “S” means that the firm is attending and providing support and/or expertise. An “F” means the firm is the lead facilitator for the meeting. A number indicates the number of meetings of that type that the firm is attending.

TASK	ESA	ALTA	BAE	F&P	NOTES/COMMENTS
2.10 Ongoing Stakeholder Meetings <i>(number of meetings is based on total hours)</i>	L	L	S	S	Firms will participate up to the hours in the project budget.
2.6 Topic-Specific Workshops (5x)	5	5	5	5	
Land Use and Community Character		L, F			
Agriculture and Working Lands	L	F	S		Assumes that BAE will attend three of the meeting.
Resource Management, Climate, and Water	L	F			
Mobility and Infrastructure	L	F		L	Roles will be split between ESA and F&P.
Environmental Justice and Equity		L, F			
2.7 Countywide Workshops <i>(three rounds with each round held at one in-person location and two virtual for three total meetings per round)</i>	3	3	2	2	Alta will lead all workshops with technical support from ESA team members as needed; ESA will provide up to two staff members at each workshop.
Vision, Goals, and Outcomes	S	L			
Plan Framework	S	L	S	S	F&P and BAE will each attend one in person and two virtual meetings.
Draft General Plan and EIR	S	L	S	S	F&P and BAE will each attend one in-person and two virtual meetings.
2.9 Public Agency Working Group <i>(5x)</i>	L, 5x	S, 5x	S, 2x	S, 2x	The topics of the working groups will be decided during the project.
2.11 Board of Supervisors and Planning Commission Study Sessions					Each round has two meetings: one PC meeting and one BOS meeting.
Project Overview and Engagement Plan (2)	S	L			
Vision, Goals, and Outcomes (2)	S	L			
Preferred Plan Direction (2)	S	L	S	S	
Draft General Plan and EIR (2)	S	L		S	

Phase 3: Land Use Alternatives

Task 3.1: Community Vision Plan Document

Alta will prepare a new or updated vision statement guiding principles and project goals by topic that identifies the community values (i.e., key community characteristics to preserve) and core components of the community’s vision for the County of Napa in the future. The Community Vision Plan document will include identified cross-cutting themes that could include topics, such as agricultural preservation, preservation of natural resources and watershed protection, “health in all policies,” sustainability, equity, and economic development.

The first draft of the vision statement, guiding principles, and goals will be based on the results from the initial community engagement, including Town Hall meetings, stakeholder meetings, and the TSWs. After County staff review the document, the ESA team will present the information to the BOS for comment and review. The vision statement, guiding principles, and goals will be the foundation for the GPU process.

Task 3.1 Deliverables

- Community Vision Plan (Draft, Second Draft, and Final).

Task 3.1 Assumptions

- None.

Task 3.2: Conceptual Alternatives and Concepts

The ESA team will develop a series of conceptual alternatives and concepts for how the Vision and Guiding Principles can be implemented over time. This task will start with a ESA team/County staff working meeting to explore what ideas and topics should be part of the alternatives. The topics will include both physical changes (such as land use designation modifications) or policy changes that affect the character and quality of life in the County. Conceptual alternatives will be developed within Napa County’s established growth management and agricultural protection framework, including Measure J and Measure P, and will be designed to test decision-relevant trade-offs and consider health impacts rather than propose rezoning of protected agricultural lands.

Potential topics include the following:

- Climate reality assumptions – Use of climate projections and variability to inform alternative concepts, including implications for future vineyard development, ecosystem health, and community vulnerability.
- Agriculture and working lands. Differentiated concepts addressing vineyards, wineries, and visitation/marketing activities to reflect on-the-ground realities and distinct resource implications (e.g., traffic, water demand, groundwater recharge, and water quality).
- Water security and watershed resilience – Portfolio-based strategies that consider groundwater sustainability, surface water, recycled water, conservation, storage, and interagency coordination, including planning considerations both within and outside the groundwater basin.
- Mobility and infrastructure shifts – e.g., VMT reduction, multimodal improvements, truck routes per AB 98, Safe Systems policies per SB 932.

Concepts will be paired with clear, visual storytelling to illustrate ‘what could change’ and ‘what could remain’ under different policy pathways. This information will be reviewed by County staff, the TSWs, and the PAWG. Review materials will be prepared to clearly communicate assumptions, constraints, and the key questions each concept is intended to answer. Following feedback from these groups, the alternatives and concepts will be included in Task 3.3: Land Use and Policy Alternatives Report.

Task 3.2 Deliverables

- Agenda for working meeting.
- Virtual working meeting.
- PowerPoint presentation with conceptual alternatives and concepts.
- Refined PowerPoint presentation with conceptual alternatives and concepts.

Task 3.2 Assumptions

Agenda for working meeting

Task 3.3: Land Use and Policy Alternatives Report

The ESA team, led by Alta, will prepare a Land Use and Policy Alternatives Report. This report will document and expand upon the conceptual alternatives prepared in Task 3.2 and will incorporate the summary of the alternatives analysis from Task 3.4. The report will be used during the community engagement process to seek input from the public on the land use and policy direction for Napa County. The report will emphasize clear, visual communication of choices and trade-offs, including scenario-based storytelling that illustrates how the County’s landscape and communities could evolve—or remain largely unchanged—under different policy directions.

Task 3.3 Deliverables

- Visual and descriptive representation of alternatives for identified areas (Draft and Final), including scenario-based graphics and narrative that clearly communicate key assumptions, constraints (including Measures J and P), and trade-offs.
- Land use designations table (Draft and Final).
- Memo summarizing analysis of opportunity sites/corridors (Draft and Final).
- Summary presentation of the land use alternatives.
- GIS data from the UrbanFootprint platform identifying proposed changes to land use designations for each alternative (See Task 3.4 below for description of tool).

Task 3.3 Assumptions

- The conceptual alternatives prepared in Task 3.2 will be used as the base for analysis.

Task 3.4: Land Use Alternatives Analysis

Concurrent with the above task, the ESA team will prepare a “matrix-level” analysis of the land use alternatives to enable the community to understand the distinctions and trade-offs among the alternatives. The matrix will be designed to support transparent decision-making by clearly documenting assumptions and highlighting trade-offs across priority lenses, including Health in All Policies, climate resilience, and long-term water security. The Alta team will use UrbanFootprint, a data-driven geospatial decision-support tool (<https://urbanfootprint.com/>), to model the alternatives and to compare and contrast the alternatives across land use, transportation, and environmental impacts metrics. Specific topics that may be addressed include the following:

- Land use mix, including land use by type and intensity (e.g., winery production capacity in gallons, number of tours and tasting visitors, and marketing events).
- Acreage of agricultural development and corresponding changes in land cover types.
- Development in critical environmental and hazard-prone areas.
- Transportation impacts including VMT per capita.
- Greenhouse gas (GHG) impacts including total GHG emissions and GHG per capita.
- Water security indicators or screening metrics, as feasible at a programmatic level (e.g., comparative implications for water demand drivers, watershed health, and alignment with the County’s water portfolio and groundwater sustainability efforts).
- Energy use per household and per capita.
- Access to destinations, including parks and community centers.

The UrbanFootprint software uses a wide variety of data and tools for analysis. Prior to beginning the work, the ESA team will review the data sources and methodologies with County staff. This will include updating the UrbanFootprint base canvas (i.e., existing land uses) to ensure that the “on-the-ground” data is correct. The methodology review memo will prioritize transparency by summarizing key data sources, limitations, and how the tool reflects local “on-the-ground” conditions and County-provided datasets.

Task 3.4 Deliverables

- Memo analyzing and documenting the review of UrbanFootprint, detailing its data source and methodologies.
- Updating the UrbanFootprint base canvas, ensuring the “on-the-ground” data is correct and accurately quantifies land use changes under each alternative.
- Presentation summarizing the UrbanFootprint analysis of the land use alternatives.
- GIS data outputs resulting from alternative analyses in UrbanFootprint, including GIS maps and supporting data.

Task 3.4 Assumptions

- The outputs from UrbanFootprint allow for a quantitative comparison between the alternatives and are based on available datasets.
- The ESA team will review the datasets and assumptions with County staff prior to running the analysis.
- County staff will review the base canvas to ensure the existing land uses in UrbanFootprint match the on-the-ground conditions. Alta will be responsible for making the changes in UrbanFootprint based on updated GIS data provided by County staff. Alta will provide base canvas data in a GIS format suitable for review in County GIS systems.

Task 3.5: Growth Projections

Alta will prepare residential and non-residential (e.g., winery, tourism, and vineyard) growth projections for the General Plan and EIR. This process will evaluate growth identified from Association of Bay Area Governments, the Housing Element, the State Department of Finance, and California Department of Transportation, among others. Using these as parameters, Alta will create a unique growth projection that meets the vision identified through this process. These growth projections will be used to evaluate impacts in the EIR. Growth projections will be developed with consideration of climate variability and resource constraints, including water security assumptions consistent with the County’s portfolio-based planning and groundwater sustainability efforts.

In addition to general residential and employment projections, the growth analysis will include potential future agricultural development that is specifically focused on trends in winery expansion and vineyard development, including representative ranges of production scale (e.g., wine production in gallons), visitor activity, and employment based on available land capacity, General Plan land use policy options, recent County permit data, and market trends.

These agricultural projections will inform impact assessments related to water supply and quality, biological resources, traffic, community character, health access, and other relevant topic areas. These projections will also help determine whether additional General Plan policies or mitigation measures are warranted to offset such impacts.

Assumptions for winery and vineyard growth will be developed in consultation with County staff, stakeholder interviews, and data provided by the County and other sources including County winery use-permit data, agricultural production reports, and recent development trends. These assumptions will be refined and validated through consultation with industry experts and/or knowledgeable specialists to ensure they reflect realistic market and operational conditions. All projections will be generalized to a programmatic level suitable for countywide policy and CEQA analysis, rather than parcel-specific siting.

Task 3.5 Deliverables

- Draft and Final Growth Projection Memo and corresponding GIS analyses to quantify and illustrate modeled projections from a spatial perspective (including housing units by type, and generalized winery production volumes, visitor activity, and vineyard acreage trends, which will feed into the traffic and environmental analyses).
- Matrix of growth projections by Travel Analysis Zones (TAZs) (assumes three rounds of review by County staff).

Task 3.5 Assumptions

- Assumptions for winery and vineyard growth will be developed in consultation with County staff, stakeholder interviews, and data provided by the County and other sources including County winery use-permit data, agricultural production reports, and recent development trends. These assumptions will be refined and validated through consultation with industry experts and/or knowledgeable specialists to ensure they reflect realistic market and operational conditions.
- All projections will be generalized to a programmatic level suitable for countywide policy and CEQA analysis, rather than parcel-specific siting.

Task 3.6: Preferred Land Use Plan Development

Through input from public workshops, County staff, and the Planning Commission, as well as BOS direction, the alternatives for the identified areas will be vetted, discussed, and evaluated. With clear direction from the BOS, the preferred land use alternative for each of the identified areas will be prepared and summarized in a presentation format. This presentation will include a land use map, summary of land use designations, and development intensity. The preferred plan direction will be accompanied by a concise summary of how the selected approach advances the Vision and Guiding Principles and reflects key BOS priorities, including agricultural preservation, Health in All Policies, resilience, and long-term water security.

Once the preferred land use alternative for each of the identified areas is identified, the Alta team will conduct a final analysis in UrbanFootprint using the same metrics as in Task 3.4.

Task 3.6 Deliverables

- Presentation summarizing the preferred land use alternative.
- Updated land use designations table (Draft and Final).
- GIS data identifying preferred changes to land use designations, including development intensity.

Task 3.6 Assumptions

- The outputs from UrbanFootprint allow for a comparison between the alternatives and are based on available datasets.
- The preferred land use alternative will be vetted with TSWs, PAWG, as well as PC and BOS.

Task 3.7: Land Use, Health, and Environmental Justice Policy Framework (Alta)

Based on the input received in this phase from the community, TSW, PAWG, PC, and BOS, Alta will then prepare policy framework for land use and for health and environmental justice. The policy framework will summarize policy drivers (e.g., key findings from the BDR analysis, State requirements, community priorities) and include draft goals and policies as well as initial ideas for implementation actions. This policy framework will use a Health in All Policies lens to ensure that decisions made in the future consider the potential impacts on the health and welfare of the residents of Napa County.

The policy framework will follow the format approved in Task 4.1.

Task 3.7 Deliverables

- Land Use and Health and Environmental Justice Policy Frameworks (goals, policies, and implementation actions) – Draft and Final.

Task 3.7 Assumptions

- The land use policy and health and environmental justice frameworks will be incorporated in the Administrative Draft of the General Plan (see Phase 4).

Task 3.8: Fiscal, Economic, and Agricultural Sustainability Analysis

Even if the GPU does not introduce major new growth areas, it is important to confirm the fiscal, economic, and agricultural implications of continuing existing land use patterns with only modest adjustments. This task will provide a concise assessment of how the County's current and anticipated development trajectory affects its long-term fiscal health, economic vitality, and agricultural sustainability. The analysis will help validate whether existing policies are sufficient or whether refinements are needed to ensure resilience through 2050. The analysis will also help inform the future direction of the county's economy and its interconnected industries.

Subtask 3.8.1: Fiscal Health Check (BAE)

BAE will prepare a fiscal impact analysis for the preferred land use alternative, based on estimates of the net new development, by land use type, which the land use plan would accommodate. Alta will provide the land use assumptions, including new residential units by type (e.g., single-family, multifamily residential units, retail, lodging, industrial/winery square feet, producing acres). BAE will develop a fiscal impact model based on the current County of Napa budget for general purpose revenues and expenditures. The analysis will primarily rely on the use of average cost and revenue multipliers, derived by dividing existing expenditures and revenues by the applicable existing service populations and using these multipliers to project increased costs and revenues associated with the anticipated new development in the unincorporated area. However, in consultation with County staff, BAE will use case study approaches to project costs and revenues for key services and/or revenues for which changes are not expected to be linear (e.g., property taxes). The fiscal model will project the net impact to the County's General Fund from the anticipated new development. BAE will prepare the fiscal impact model to allow testing the sensitivity of the fiscal impact model results by adjusting key variables. BAE will prepare a fiscal impact analysis report to document the modeling exercise, including key assumptions, cost and revenue projections, and net fiscal balance. BAE's analysis will discuss key modeling sensitivities and identify potential fiscal risks, such as over-reliance of key revenue sources.

Subtask 3.8.2: Economic Sustainability Snapshot (BAE)

BAE will draw upon the findings from the BDR, additional information received from the BDR's public engagement process, and information collected in the key stakeholder interviews completed in Task 2.10 (Ongoing Stakeholder Meetings) as well as other community engagement to be completed as part of the GPU project to provide an assessment of the County's overall economic health, considering trends and projections for growth of key sectors (e.g., agriculture, wineries, hospitality). The snapshot will also identify economic risks or vulnerabilities (e.g., over-concentration in certain sectors) as well as opportunities for strengthening the local economy (e.g., diversification) and implications for the GPU.

Subtask 3.8.3: Agricultural Viability Assessment (ESA with BAE support)

ESA will assess the long-term viability of agriculture in Napa County under existing land use policies and anticipated growth patterns. The assessment will identify and examine risks to long-term agricultural viability and sustainability, including water availability, climate change impacts (e.g., wildfire, drought, smoke), the loss of agricultural land to non-agricultural land uses, increases in impervious surface, and workforce challenges. The analysis will also evaluate land use compatibility issues, such as winery and marketing policies, interface with rural communities, safe mobility, and potential conflicts between agricultural and non-agricultural uses. In addition, ESA will highlight opportunities to support agricultural resilience and diversification, including regenerative practices, carbon sequestration, value-added production, and workforce housing solutions where there may be gaps in existing policy.

To ensure that the analysis reflects current economic realities, ESA and BAE will incorporate targeted interviews with key agricultural and wine industry experts as part of the stakeholder outreach conducted under Task 2.10 (Ongoing Stakeholder Meetings). These interviews will include independent experts such as Dr. Robert Eyer (Sonoma State University) as well as representatives from local and statewide organizations in the agricultural and wine industry (e.g., the UC Davis Department of Agricultural and Resource Economics, the State’s Office of Agricultural Resilience and Sustainability, and the California Department of Food and Agriculture). These conversations will provide a balanced, data-driven understanding of evolving market dynamics, including changes in grape and wine demand, oversupply concerns, production costs, and the implications of national and global wine market trends.

BAE will assist ESA with this assessment by contributing input on agriculture-related economic conditions, trends, opportunities and challenges, based on relevant information collected during the BDR preparation as well as from input collected in the key stakeholder interviews and other community engagement completed as part of the GPU process (e.g., input provided by the Agriculture and Working Lands Topic-Specific Workshops).

Subtask 3.8.4: Synthesis and Briefing

ESA and BAE will integrate the findings from the Fiscal Health Check, Economic Sustainability Snapshot, and Agricultural Viability Assessment into a concise, accessible briefing document. The briefing will summarize trade-offs, risks, and opportunities under the County’s existing land use framework, identifying areas of strength and vulnerability in fiscal, economic, and agricultural systems. The synthesis will also highlight cross-cutting themes, such as how agricultural preservation contributes to fiscal stability and climate resilience, or how economic diversification can support workforce needs.

The briefing will conclude with targeted recommendations for refinements to the GPU’s Land Use, Agriculture, and Economic Development policies, ensuring that the preferred land use alternative is aligned with Napa County’s goals for fiscal health, economic vitality, and agricultural sustainability. The briefing will be structured to support policy discussions with the BOS and Planning Commission, and will serve as a foundation for drafting related policies in Phase 4.

Task 3.8 Deliverables

- Fiscal, Economic, and Agricultural Sustainability Briefing (summary report or presentation, focused on key findings and recommendations).

Task 3.8 Assumptions

- Analysis will be program-level and comparative (not parcel-specific).
- Builds on updated BDR data and County financial baselines.
- Agricultural assessment focuses on viability and sustainability, not on detailed parcel-level market studies.

Task 3.9: Transportation Analysis

Subtask 3.9.1: Traffic Count Coordination and Processing

Fehr & Peers will review and process the count data collected by others as part of the Solano Napa Activity Based model (SNABM) Base Year Update effort led by the Solano Transportation Authority (STA). The processing step will include summarization of daily and peak hour count data and matching the count locations with roadway functional classifications (for Level of Service [LOS] calculation purposes). Fehr & Peers’ understanding is the SNABM Base Year Update will collect new counts throughout the two counties in the first half of 2026, and those traffic counts will be used for transportation analysis in this scope. No additional traffic count collections are included in this scope of work. Fehr & Peers’ understanding is that the County of Napa, through its participation as a member agency of Napa Valley Transportation Authority (NVTA), will have an opportunity to comment upon the SNABM data collection plan.

Subtask 3.9.2: Modeling, Vehicle-Miles of Travel, and Operations Evaluation

Fehr & Peers will use the version of the SNABM prepared by the STA consultant team to evaluate VMT and provide support in the analysis of LOS. Fehr & Peers will use the model as received and will not make updates to the base year model land use or transportation system inputs as the STA consultant team must provide a fully calibrated and validated model as part of STA's scope of work. For cumulative year analyses, Fehr & Peers will use the updated 2050 SNABM land use as part of the NVTCTP effort. This update revised SNABM's 2050 land use forecasts within Napa County to better reflect the location and type of housing growth projected by local jurisdictions in the 2023–2031 Housing Element cycle, while remaining in alignment with the countywide housing growth outlined in Plan Bay Area 2050, Metropolitan Transportation Commission (MTC)'s latest adopted Regional Transportation Plan. It is noted that these future year land use forecasts may not include major ongoing regional land use projects like Mare Island and California Forever as they are going through environmental review. Fehr & Peers can make refinements to SNABM, if required, as part of a scope and budget amendment.

Fehr & Peers will use the updated SNABM received from STA through the SNABM Base Year Update effort. To evaluate proposed alternatives (modified General Plan policies, transportation projects, and land use program changes), Fehr & Peers will provide an analysis of VMT for up to three alternatives plus the preferred alternative. The County and other members of the ESA team will be relied upon to specify what changes are needed to reflect the effects of the proposed initial alternatives and the preferred alternative. In addition, for travel behavior and trip characteristics regarding visitors generated by winery, vineyards, and other recreational uses, VMT metrics will include total VMT by speed bin, home-based VMT per resident, and home-based work trip VMT per employee for the County. The final model results will contain the final land use and circulation system improvements, and the transportation network identified to support the final preferred alternative will be represented in the Circulation Diagram in the General Plan based on the home-based and employment-based VMT information.

To evaluate the preferred General Plan policies, transportation projects and the land use program, Fehr & Peers will use the SNABM to develop General Plan horizon year traffic volume forecasts for roadway segments where traffic volume data is available from the SNABM Base Year Update counts. This scope includes traffic volume forecasts and LOS for up to 40 single-direction roadway segments. Fehr & Peers will compare LOS to the County's proposed LOS policy. If deficiencies are projected to occur, improvements will be suggested to alleviate the deficiency. It is noted that LOS will not be included in the EIR for the GPU as the EIR would be governed by the provisions of the new CEQA Guidelines that implement Senate Bill 743.

Task 3.9 Deliverables

- VMT information for up to three alternatives plus preferred alternative in tabular format.
- Traffic volume forecasts and LOS for 40 single-direction roadway segments in tabular format for the preferred alternative.

Task 3.9 Assumptions

- The SNABM will be used to develop General Plan horizon year traffic volume forecasts for roadway segments where traffic volume data is available from the SNABM Base Year Update counts.
- This scope includes traffic volume forecasts and LOS for up to 40 single-direction roadway segments.

Phase 4: General Plan Development

This phase involves preparation of the Administrative Draft, Public Review Draft, and Final GPU. The updated GPU will reorganize and modernize the 2008 General Plan to reflect new State requirements, County priorities, and community values. The proposed element names and organization described in this Phase represent a preliminary recommended

approach to support clarity, usability, and internal consistency. However, the element framework (including naming, bundling, and whether certain topics are stand-alone or woven across multiple elements) will remain flexible and will be refined in consultation with County staff and through Board/Commission study sessions.

The GPU will be organized around a clear and consistent framework that ties all elements back to the County’s Vision and Guiding Principles. Each element will be explicitly linked to the Vision through aligned goals, policy intent statements, and cross-references, ensuring that the General Plan functions as a cohesive, values-driven document rather than a collection of stand-alone chapters. This approach mirrors best practices and supports transparency by clearly demonstrating how individual policy areas advance shared community priorities.

Consistent with County direction, the 2023 Housing Element and Safety Element will be incorporated by reference and will not be reopened through this GPU, except for an internal consistency review to confirm there are no conflicts with other elements. In addition, the GPU will apply a Health in All Policies lens across all elements to ensure health, equity, and social determinants are intentionally integrated rather than siloed.

Task 4.1: Outline and Format

The ESA team will prepare a proposed outline and formatting standards for the GPU to guide consistent drafting across all elements. The outline will clarify element organization (e.g., whether Agricultural Preservation and Working Lands is a stand-alone or combined with another element). The draft outline will include one or more element-organization options (as feasible) and identify decision points for County staff/BOS input on naming and structure. The outline will also show how the General Plan will address cross-cutting themes, such as Health in All Policies, throughout each element.

ESA will also provide a policy writing style guide to ensure clarity, accessibility, ADA Compliance, and consistency in goals, policies, and actions.

Task 4.1 Deliverables

- Draft and Final GPU outline.
- Policy writing style guide.

Task 4.2: Administrative Draft

The Administrative Draft GPU will be prepared in collaboration with subconsultants, reflecting updated data, community input, and alternatives analysis. Each section below identifies the scope and subtopics to be addressed. As described in Task 1.2, ESA will work with County GIS staff to deliver new and updated spatial data as needed to maintain the currency of web services in the Napa County BDR Explorer Web App. Although each element will contain distinct policies, the GPU will include explicit cross-references to related policies in other elements to ensure consistency and usability. ESA will also conduct an internal consistency review with the adopted 2023 Safety and Housing elements to confirm there are no conflicts with other elements. The Implementation Plan will further unify all policies and actions in a single matrix.

Subtask 4.2.1: Introduction (ESA)

The Introduction will be updated to describe the purpose, authority, and organization of the GPU. Subtopics will include the following:

- **Planning History** – Brief narrative of Napa’s planning legacy (e.g., 1969 General Plan, 1983 update, 2008 comprehensive update, 2023 Safety Element, 2023 Housing Element, 2025 BDR, 2025 Strategic Plan).
- **Purpose of the General Plan** – Legal authority (Government Code Sections 65300–65303), role in guiding land use, and CEQA linkages.
- **Relationship to Other Plans** – Climate Action initiatives, Hazard Mitigation Plan, WAA, and regional and State frameworks.

- **Organization of the GPU** – Overview of elements, including new topics (e.g., Environmental Justice, Community Facilities, Fiscal Sustainability).
- **Community Involvement** – Role of public engagement, stakeholders, Planning Commission, and BOS in shaping the GPU.

Subtask 4.2.2: Summary and Vision (ESA/Alta)

This section will articulate Napa County’s vision for its future, grounded in values of agricultural preservation, equity, resilience, and fiscal stability. This section will draw from the Vision Plan document developed in Task 3.1 ensuring that community-driven priorities are carried through into the GPU. Subtopics will include the following:

- **Vision Statement** – Updated to reflect BOS strategic priorities and community engagement.
- **Guiding Principles** – Core values such as agricultural stewardship, climate adaptation, economic vitality, equity, and transparency.
- **Summary of Land Use Framework** – High-level overview of urban-centered growth, agricultural preservation, and resource conservation.
- **Graphic/Diagrammatic Vision** – Visual summary of the GPU’s major themes and priorities.

Subtask 4.2.3: Land Use and Community Character Element (Alta)

Alta will prepare the Land Use and Community Character Element of the updated General Plan. This important element will address all the topics required by state law plus topics that are of critical importance to Napa County such as farmworker and workforce housing, tourism, working lands, and agriculture and open space protection.

- **Land Use Map** – Land use map, text narrative, and related diagrams and tables to illustrate the updated land use map of designations.
- **Land Use Designations and Development Standards** – Descriptions of the land use designations that will shape future development, including allowed uses and development standards (e.g., density, FAR), to guide future zoning updates.
- **Growth Projections** – Estimated development using metrics such as winery facility production capacity and visitation, acres of new agricultural development, changes in land cover types, density and Floor Area Ratio to estimate growth in industrial areas, visitors/tourism, the number of potential housing units, and non-residential area resulting from the land use changes. The projections will be summarized in narrative and tabular format and provided to Fehr & Peers and ESA by TAZs for the Traffic Impact Analysis (TIA) and EIR.
- **Goals, Policies, and Programs** – Goals, policies, and implementation actions to support development consistent with the Land Use Map. Topics that may be covered include the following:
 - Growth pattern, including the desired location and type of development.
 - Community design, including how to preserve the unique character, rural nature, and scenic corridors in Napa County.
 - Focused policy direction for unincorporated communities within Napa County.
 - Relationship to the Open Space Element and requirements under SB 1425.
 - Jobs and employment uses (tied to the Economic Development Element) focusing on land for employment-related uses.
 - Airport-adjacent uses.
 - Other topics as needed.

Subtask 4.2.4: Natural Resource Conservation Element (ESA)

The Natural Resources Conservation Element will update and integrate Napa’s Conservation and Open Space policies, consistent with State mandates and local priorities. This element will also encompass recreation and parks planning,

ensuring compliance with Government Code Section 65560 and aligning with Napa’s strong tradition of open space preservation. Subtopics include the following:

- **Natural Resources** – Soils, timber, minerals, special-status species and habitats, land cover types, and biodiversity.
- **Water Resources** – Watershed protection, SGMA alignment, and water quality.
- **Parks, Recreation, and Trails (SB 1425)** – Equitable access analysis, parkland-to-population standards, ADA compliance, and programming diversity.
- **Air Quality and GHG Reduction** – RCAAP alignment.
- **Climate Resilience (SB 379)** – Role of open space and conservation in wildfire buffers, drought resilience, carbon sequestration, urban cooling, and flood protection.
- **Habitat Connectivity (AB 1889)** – Wildlife movement areas and corridors, ecological linkages, riparian protection, and restoration.
- **Rewilding (AB 1889)** – Opportunities for native vegetation restoration, reduced turf, pollinator-friendly landscapes, and multi-benefit projects.

Subtask 4.2.5: Agricultural Preservation and Working Lands Element (ESA)

Agriculture is Napa County’s defining land use, cultural identity, and economic driver. Since adoption of Measure J (1990) and Measure P (2008), the County has been recognized statewide and nationally as a leader in agricultural preservation. Building on this legacy, the GPU will modernize agricultural policies to address new State requirements, emerging challenges, and evolving community priorities.

This task will prepare a comprehensive Agricultural Preservation and Working Lands Element that can stand alone or be integrated with another element, depending on County preference. Three organizational options will be considered:

- **Stand-alone Element (recommended starting point)** – Elevates agriculture as Napa’s core identity and allows expansion to cover “working lands” (e.g., rangelands, forests, multi-benefit agriculture).
- **Integration with Land Use and Community Character** – Simplifies the GPU by consolidating all land use policies but risks diluting agriculture’s distinct role.
- **Integration with Natural Resource Conservation (Conservation and Open Space)** – Strengthens ties to natural resource and climate policies but may obscure agriculture as a land use framework.

ESA recommends preparing a stand-alone Administrative Draft Element so that agricultural policies are fully developed. Final organization can then be confirmed with County staff. . Subtopics to be explored include the following:

- **Preservation Framework** – Update policies implementing Measure J and Measure P, maintaining urban growth limits and agricultural land protections.
- **Agricultural Land Use Compatibility** – Refine policies for wineries, tasting rooms, marketing events, and buffering strategies to reduce land use conflicts.
- **Farmland Conversion Tools** – Evaluate Williamson Act contracts, conservation easements, and land trust partnerships.
- **Working Lands Expansion** – Refine policies for rangelands, forests, and other multi-benefit landscapes in alignment with State interest in sustainable working lands.
- **Economic Viability** – Support agriculture’s long-term sustainability through policies on farmworker housing, water security, value-added products, and balanced agritourism.
- **Climate and Resilience** – Position agriculture as a partner in climate solutions, including carbon sequestration, regenerative farming, groundwater recharge, and biodiversity corridors.

Subtask 4.2.6: Environmental Justice and Public Health Element (Alta)

Alta will lead the preparation for the Environmental Justice and Public Health Element. This element will satisfy SB 1000 requirements and serve as the primary location for public health policy content in the GPU, while supporting a Health in All Policies approach applied across all elements through cross-references and coordinated policy development. Topics may include the following:

- **Equitable access** (including access to public services and facilities).
- **Physical activity** (including access to parks, open spaces, and active transportation).
- **Pollution exposure** (including reducing impacts from agriculture and agriculture-related activities).
- **Food access** (including access to healthy food and produce).
- **Anti-displacement** (including protecting lower-income residents from displacement).
- **Healthy built environment** (including expanding safe and sanitary housing and development patterns that encourage walkability).
- **Increased engagement** (including expanding engagement opportunities to increase the level of involvement for underrepresented populations (i.e., populations that do not typically participate in County planning process)).
- **Health outcomes** (improving health outcomes including life expectancy, respiratory health, cardiovascular disease, diabetes, and others).
- **Social determinants of health and community conditions** (including housing affordability and quality, economic stability, access to healthcare, behavioral health, and healthy connected communities), organized to clarify how these factors are addressed across the GPU.
- **Health in All Policies coordination framework** (including guiding questions or an organizing structure) to support consistent integration of health and equity considerations into Land Use, Mobility, Natural Resources, Agriculture, and Economic Development policies without duplicating content.

Subtask 4.2.7: Mobility and Infrastructure Element (Fehr & Peers + ESA)

SUBTASK 4.2.7.1: SAFE SYSTEMS APPROACH COMPLIANCE (SB 932)

SB 932, which was signed into law in the early 2020s after the Circulation Element was last previously updated in the late 2010s, requires general plans to incorporate principles of the Federal Highway Administration (FHWA) Safe Systems approach into the planning process. It should incorporate bicycle plans, pedestrian plans, as well as traffic calming plans, among other items, with a proactive (rather than reactive) safety lens. Portions of the NVTVA Vision Zero Plan will be incorporated into SB 932 compliance. In addition, the legislation requires setting a goal to complete all identified implementation actions within 25 years of the date of adoption of the Circulation Element.

Under this task, Fehr & Peers will review existing deficiencies as well as conduct a proactive risk assessment to capture exposure and likelihood. Collision analysis will be conducted to identify high-injury streets and intersections based on the work that has already been done in the BDR. In addition, Fehr & Peers will conduct near-miss analysis to identify high-risk locations and inform targeted safety improvements before collisions occur. Fehr & Peers will develop policies and actions that address demand, speed, conflict management, and redundancy (such as technology, post-crash care, and vehicle safety).

Subtask 4.2.7.1 Deliverables

- Maps and supporting GIS data of High-Injury Network and existing Safe Systems deficiency areas.
- Draft policies and actions related to Safe Systems.

SUBTASK 4.2.7.2: TRUCK ROUTE IDENTIFICATION COMPLIANCE (AB 98)

AB 98, which was signed into law in the early 2020s after the Circulation Element was last previously updated in the late 2010s, requires the General Plan Mobility Element to incorporate designated truck routes that comply with AB 98

standards and identify specific truck routes that bypass residential areas and other sensitive receptors. Fehr & Peers will assist the County with addressing AB 98 Mobility Element update requirements by reviewing existing sensitive receptors, developing options for AB 98 compliance, and drafting Mobility Element content to address AB 98. This AB 98 analysis task has been scoped with consideration for the major truck generators in Napa County but also considers typical travel patterns and the location of possible sensitive receptors along County roadways that facilitate local and regional goods movement.

The BDR includes a discussion of existing truck routes and functional roadway classifications, including freeways, arterials, collectors, and local roads. The Environmental Justice section will identify and map “environmental justice (EJ) communities” and discuss the impacts of truck traffic on air quality and related health impacts in environmental justice communities.

Fehr & Peers will review existing truck traffic operating on County roadways using available data, including truck operations on existing truck routes or other roadways identified as priority routes under AB 98. Fehr & Peers will use vehicle counts with classification data (if available) to provide a summary/characterization of where trucks are currently operating relative to existing truck routes, existing or planned logistics uses or other similar uses where trucks serve such uses, and existing or planned land uses that could include sensitive receptors.

Based on the findings and the County’s comments and direction following review of the technical information, Fehr & Peers will develop additional goals, policies, and actions, and a designated truck routes diagram that address AB 98 requirements.

Subtask 4.2.7.2 Deliverables

- Maps and supporting GIS data of existing and proposed truck routes.
- Draft policies and actions related to AB 98 truck routing compliance.

SUBTASK 4.2.7.3: MOBILITY AND INFRASTRUCTURE ELEMENT POLICY DEVELOPMENT

Fehr & Peers and ESA will prepare an Administrative Draft for the Mobility and Infrastructure Element. Fehr & Peers will focus on updates to circulation policies, with particular emphasis on incorporating Complete Streets and Safe Systems policies, reflecting new General Plan guidelines, incorporating new policies related to VMT, proactive systemic safety, and truck routes, and considerations about emerging transportation technologies. The policies will combine local context with best practices and policies prepared for similar contexts in the San Francisco Bay Area (Bay Area).

ESA will focus on addressing Napa County’s infrastructure and essential public services.

Existing Subtopics (covered in the 2008 General Plan, scattered across elements):

- Public facilities and services (e.g., water, wastewater, stormwater).
- Solid waste management.
- Emergency services (e.g., fire, law enforcement, EMS, though primary hazard planning is in Safety).
- Utilities (e.g., electricity, gas, broadband/telecommunications).

New Subtopics to Explore for GPU:

- **Green Infrastructure and Stormwater Management** – Policies supporting multi-benefit stormwater facilities (e.g., water quality, flood reduction, urban greening).
- **Broadband and Digital Equity** – Strategies to expand broadband infrastructure in rural and underserved areas.
- **Sustainable Utilities** – Transition to renewable energy systems, microgrids, and climate-resilient utilities.
- **Community Facilities Equity** – Equitable access to infrastructure and services will be addressed in coordination with the Environmental Justice Element. The Community Facilities Element will include cross-references to ensure consistency.

Subtask 4.2.7.3 Deliverable

- Admin Draft Mobility and Infrastructure Element.

SUBTASK 4.2.7.4: ELEMENT CONSISTENCY REVIEW

Fehr & Peers will provide key information and suggest best practices from the Mobility Element effort that is relevant to other elements or efforts. For example, for school siting, which may be considered during land use alternative development, Safe Systems Approach considerations, as mentioned in 4.2.7.3, should be taken into account. Fehr & Peers will provide the key considerations for other elements for consideration.

Subtask 4.2.7.4 Deliverable

- Recommendations for updates to goals and policies in other elements for consistency with the Mobility Element.

Subtask 4.2.8: Safety Element (Reference) and Noise Element Update (ESA)

Consistent with County direction, the GPU will retain the adopted 2023 Safety Element as the foundation and will not involve a comprehensive update. ESA will conduct a targeted review and refinement of the Safety Element to ensure alignment with the RCCAP, Hazard Mitigation Plan, and relevant Mobility Element policies related to evacuation and emergency access.

Subtask activities include:

- Review the Safety Element for consistency with the CAP, HMP, and Mobility Element.
- Evaluate key topics such as wildfire, flooding, drought, extreme heat, hazardous materials, and emergency preparedness/evacuation.
- Update select goals, policies, and implementation actions, as needed, to reflect current strategies and completed actions, while avoiding duplication with other plans.
- Ensure internal consistency and appropriate cross-referencing with other General Plan elements.

This effort will result in a streamlined set of updates that maintains the integrity of the adopted Safety Element while integrating current hazard and climate planning priorities.

New Noise Element

ESA will prepare a stand-alone Noise Element update to modernize noise policy, improve clarity, and address land use compatibility and noise-sensitive receptors. The Noise Element will include updated setting/context (drawing from the BDR), compatibility standards, and implementation actions addressing transportation noise, stationary sources, construction noise, and best practices for siting and buffering. The element will be coordinated with Land Use and Community Character and Mobility and Infrastructure to ensure consistent thresholds, cross-references, and implementation pathways.

Subtask 4.2.9: Economic Development and Fiscal Sustainability Element (BAE)

BAE will take the lead in preparing an Economic Development Element, drawing from the public/stakeholder outreach and data collection and analysis completed during the BDR project, the additional stakeholder interviews conducted as part of Task 1.2 and other community engagement activities conducted during the GPU process. This will include input collected via relevant TSWs, as well as findings from the Task 3.8 Fiscal, Economic, and Agricultural Sustainability Analysis subtasks. Based on identified economic development and fiscal opportunities and challenges, BAE will draft an Economic Development Element that is structured around several high-level goals addressing topics such as economic growth, diversification, and resilience; creation of economic opportunity for residents; fiscal sustainability for the

County; and/or other topics that arise during the GPU process. Each policy will be bolstered by supporting policies and implementing actions. BAE will align this framework with the overall General Plan vision and local priorities.

Subtask 4.2.10: Historic and Cultural Resources Element (ESA)

ESA will prepare a Historic and Cultural Resources Element to consolidate, organize, and update Napa County’s existing historic, archaeological, and cultural resource policies. This element will draw primarily from policies currently located in the Community Character, Land Use, and Recreation and Open Space components of the 2008 General Plan, as well as relevant findings from the BDR.

The purpose of this element is to improve clarity, usability, and policy coherence by bringing all historic and cultural resource policies into a single, dedicated element, while maintaining consistency with adopted County regulations and CEQA requirements. The scope of work anticipates a focused, policy-level effort rather than a comprehensive reinventory or major regulatory update.

The Historic and Cultural Resources Element will be aligned with the GPU Vision and Guiding Principles and will be coordinated closely with the Land Use and Community Character, Agricultural Preservation and Working Lands, Environmental Justice and Public Health, Economic Development, Fiscal Sustainability, and Natural Resource Conservation elements.

Subtopics may include the following:

- **Historic Resources Framework** – Consolidation and refinement of policies related to the identification, evaluation, and protection of historic structures, districts, and sites.
- **Archaeological and Tribal Cultural Resources** – Policy organization and clarification to support early identification and protection of archaeological and tribal cultural resources, consistent with CEQA and best practices. Policies regarding tribal consultation would be consistent with existing regulations.
- **Cultural Landscapes** – Recognition of Napa County’s agricultural, viticultural, and rural landscapes as cultural resources that reflect the County’s heritage and community identity.
- **Adaptive Reuse and Compatibility** – Policies supporting sensitive reuse of historic resources and compatibility between preservation and contemporary uses.
- **Heritage, Education, and Interpretation** – Opportunities to support education, interpretation, and storytelling related to Napa County’s history and cultures, including connections to tourism and economic vitality.
- **Coordination with Other Elements** – Cross-references to ensure alignment with land use planning, agricultural preservation, natural resource conservation, hazard resilience, and equity-focused policies.

Policy updates, if any, will be limited to addressing gaps identified through the BDR conclusions, engagement input, or changes in best practices since adoption of the 2008 General Plan. The element will not duplicate CEQA requirements but will provide clear policy guidance to support consistent implementation and environmental review. ESA assumes the following:

- Work will rely on existing inventories, studies, and data documented in the BDR and prior planning efforts.
- No parcel-level surveys or new resource inventories are included.
- The element will focus on policy organization, clarity, and targeted refinement rather than major regulatory changes.

Subtask 4.2.11: Housing Element (Reference) (BAE)

The **2023 Housing Element** will be incorporated by reference and cross-checked for internal consistency.

Subtask 4.2.12: Implementation Plan (ESA Team)

This section of the GPU updates the 2008 Implementation Section with modernized tools and monitoring framework. The Implementation framework will include the following:

- **Consolidated Action Item Matrix** – A comprehensive, user-friendly matrix that links goals → policies → actions → responsible department/agency.
- **Implementation Timing** – Actions categorized as ongoing, short-term, medium-term, or long-term, with timeframes to be developed in coordination with County staff.
- **Responsible Parties** – Clear identification of lead and supporting agencies for each action.
- **Funding/Resource Notes** – Where appropriate, the plan will include potential funding sources or partnerships, as in the existing plan.

Subtask 4.2.13: Glossary (ESA)

ESA will update the 2008 Glossary with modern planning terminology and retain relevant existing definitions.

Subtask 4.2.14: Acknowledgements (ESA)

ESA will update the 2008 Acknowledgements to recognize the BOS, TSWs, PAWGs, Planning Commission, County staff, and consultants.

Task 4.2 Deliverables

- Administrative Draft General Plan chapters (Word and PDF).
- Geodatabase of new or updated data sources. This will be developed in collaboration with the County GIS staff to leverage use of existing County GIS data and web services.

Task 4.3: Draft

ESA and subconsultants will revise the Administrative Draft based on staff, TSW, and PAWG input, producing a Draft for County Staff Review.

Task 4.3 Deliverables

- Draft GPU (digital, with maps and graphics).

Task 4.4: Public Review Draft

ESA and subconsultants will revise the Draft based on County staff review, producing a clean, formatted Public Review Draft for distribution.

Task 4.4 Deliverables

- Public Review Draft GPU (digital, with maps and graphics).

Task 4.5: Final GPU

The Final GPU will incorporate feedback from the Planning Commission, BOS, and the public. ESA will ensure consistency across all elements and prepare both digital and web-accessible versions.

Task 4.5 Deliverables

- Final General Plan (clean digital PDF + accessible format) and associated GIS data updates.

Phase 5: Environmental Clearance (EIR)

The EIR portion of the GPU will be undertaken by ESA, with Jill Feyk-Miney acting as Project Manager. As described elsewhere in this proposal, Fehr & Peers will provide transportation analysis as well as data inputs to the analysis of air quality, GHG emissions, energy, and noise. ESA's scope of work assumes preparation of a program-level EIR. ESA intends to use the technical work in the updated BDR, and supplement it with additional analysis, as appropriate, in response to the County's policy developments for the GPU and to ensure that CEQA requirements are met.

Due to the length of time required for the CEQA process, EIR preparation is assumed to begin with public scoping in the fourth quarter of 2027 to align with the completion of the Preferred Land Use Plan and run concurrently with other public outreach and planning tasks. ESA will work with County staff to prepare a Notice of Preparation (NOP) explaining the relationship between the CEQA process and the outreach and planning processes, and to develop a Draft EIR project description to support preparation of a program-level EIR as the planning process is underway.

The proposed program-level EIR will provide an opportunity to update the growth forecast in the County's 2008 GPU EIR and 2022 Housing Element Update EIR, and its scope and analysis will allow for "tiering" of future projects. Although all CEQA checklist topics will require some analysis, primary issues requiring in-depth attention will include agriculture and land use, biological resources, air quality, hydrology and water quality, GHG emissions, transportation, utilities, and wildfire. The following is ESA's proposed approach for the EIR with assumptions requiring discussion with County staff noted.

Tak 5.1: Project Description and Alternatives Development

ESA assumes multiple scenarios (in terms of growth scenarios, land use changes and related intensities, and densities) will be considered for the GPU, and that either: (1) a single scenario will be identified as a preferred scenario early in the planning process and become the basis of the EIR project description; or (2) the project description will describe a "maximum scenario" consisting of the most conservative growth scenario for General Plan buildout for analysis of environmental effects. In either case, the Final GPU that is proposed for adoption may not exactly match the scenario included as the EIR project description but will be sufficiently expansive to adequately analyze a "maximum scenario." Variations of the scenario included as the Draft EIR project description may be included as alternatives.

To solidify ESA's approach to the technical analyses, ESA's EIR Project Manager will participate in a number of key conversations as the GPU is developed. ESA's EIR Project Manager will also require an early understanding of zoning changes (if any) and conforming amendments to the Agricultural Preservation and Land Use Element of the General Plan anticipated as part of the GPU. Principal tasks associated with this effort will include the following:

- 1) Project kickoff meeting;
- 2) Project initiation and data collection;
- 3) Attendance at up to two key community meetings; and
- 4) Attendance at up to six County/ESA team meetings.

Based on this information, ESA will prepare a draft project description for County staff to review. ESA assumes two iterations will be required and that the EIR's technical analyses will begin after the first revised draft project description has been prepared.

Task 5.2: Notice of Preparation and Scoping

ESA will prepare a Draft and Final NOP to initiate the EIR scoping process. This scope of work assumes that an Initial Study will not be prepared, and as such, no CEQA topics will be scoped out from further review in the program-level EIR. ESA assumes the County will be responsible for distributing the NOP, and ESA will file a copy with the State

Clearinghouse. ESA will attend one scoping meeting held by the County Planning Commission. ESA will prepare EIR-related public scoping meeting materials, including a presentation that summarizes the CEQA process and the potential acts of the GPU. ESA will summarize and record all concerns raised at the public scoping meeting and have a court reporter prepare a transcript of the meeting from the online recording posted on the County's website to record comments verbatim for the administrative record. After the NOP's circulation, ESA will assemble and summarize the scoping comments and informally consult with any agencies that provided substantive comments on the NOP.

Task 5.3: Prepare Administrative Draft EIR

ESA will prepare an Administrative Draft EIR in compliance with CEQA requirements, the State CEQA Guidelines, and the County's adopted guidelines/procedures. The EIR will analyze a single scenario, and up to three additional alternatives at a lesser level of detail. Thresholds of significance will be confirmed with the County staff. ESA and Fehr & Peers will make themselves available for in-depth discussions of possible thresholds for GHG emissions and VMT and will document the County's selected thresholds for these two topics with a memo supporting their use in the EIR.

The EIR will analyze direct, indirect, and cumulative impacts of the GPU by analyzing the following: existing conditions, existing plus project, cumulative conditions, and cumulative plus project. The following areas will receive consideration and analysis in the EIR:

Aesthetics

This section of the EIR will evaluate the potential for development activities associated with the proposed GPU to result in substantial adverse impacts related to Visual and Aesthetic Resources. Drawing from the Visual and Aesthetic Resources chapter of the BDR, this section will describe the visual resources of Napa County, including important viewsheds, ridgelines, and scenic corridors. The section will include a regulatory framework that discusses federal, state, and local regulations related to Visual and Aesthetic Resources, including applicable Napa County General Plan policies and related implementing regulations in the Napa County Code, such as the Napa County Viewshed Protection Program (County Code Chapter 18.106). The analysis of impacts will evaluate the potential for development activities associated with the proposed GPU to result in substantial adverse impacts associated with scenic resources, views, visual character, and light and glare. Where applicable, existing or recommended policies will be identified to avoid or minimize adverse impacts related to aesthetics. No visual simulations are proposed.

Agricultural and Forestry Resources

This section of the EIR will evaluate the potential for development activities associated with the proposed GPU to result in significant impacts related to agricultural and forestry resources. Drawing from the Agricultural Resources chapter of the BDR, this section will describe existing agricultural, and forestry uses and resources in Napa County, including major crops, agricultural distribution and production, and agricultural conversion trends. The section will also describe timberland and timberland uses that exist throughout the county. Through text and exhibits, the section will identify locations and acreages of important farmland in the county as defined in the California Department of Conservation's Farmland Mapping and Monitoring Program, lands under Williamson Act contract, and soil types and qualities as classified by the U.S. Department of Agriculture Natural Resources Conservation Service. The section will include a regulatory framework that discusses federal, state, and local regulations related to agricultural and forestry resources, including applicable Napa County General Plan policies and related implementing regulations in the Napa County Code, such as the agricultural and timber preserve districts identified in the County Zoning Ordinance. The analysis of impacts will evaluate the potential for development activities associated with the proposed GPU to result in the conversion of important farmland to non-agricultural uses; conflict with agricultural zoning or existing Williamson Act contracts; conflict with existing zoning for, or cause rezoning of, forest land or timberland; or result in the loss of forest land or conversion of forest land to non-forest use. Where applicable, existing or recommended policies will be identified to avoid or minimize adverse impacts related to agricultural and forestry resources.

Air Quality

This section of the EIR will include or incorporate by reference the environmental and regulatory settings for air quality presented in the BDR, identify significance thresholds used to evaluate impacts based on the Appendix G CEQA checklist criteria, and present results of the impact evaluation. Mitigation measures will be identified to address any significant impacts.

The analysis will address criteria air pollutant emissions, health risks from toxic air contaminants (TACs), and odorous emissions from development associated with implementation of the proposed GPU. Operational air quality impacts associated with growth envisioned under the proposed GPU will be evaluated using guidance from the Bay Area Air District (Air District) for the evaluation of plans. The analysis of criteria air pollutants will evaluate consistency of goals and policies in the proposed GPU with control measures in the most recently adopted Air Quality Plan for the Bay Area (currently the 2017 Clean Air Plan) and consider the rate of population growth under the proposed GPU relative to the associated growth in VMT to evaluate regional impacts. Construction-related emissions associated with the proposed GPU will be evaluated qualitatively but will identify construction-related performance standards as mitigation measures based on recommendations by the Air District.

ESA will qualitatively evaluate potential health risks and odors associated with the proposed GPU, which includes an evaluation of exposure of new sensitive receptors proposed under the proposed GPU to existing and planned sources of TACs and odors. The analysis will be conducted at a programmatic level and evaluate the adequacy of proposed goals and policies in combination with existing regulations from the Air District to address these impacts. Additional mitigation measures will be identified, if needed, which may be incorporated into the proposed GPU as policies. Mitigation measures identified would set performance standards for subsequent projects and identify a suite of measures or best management practices to comply with the identified performance standards.

To complete this task with the scope and budget identified below, ESA has assumed the following:

- No emissions modeling is proposed for criteria pollutant emissions. The analysis will rely on population and VMT data (to be provided by Fehr & Peers).
- No dispersion modeling is proposed for the analysis of TAC and PM_{2.5} emissions.

Biological Resources

This section of the EIR will evaluate the potential for development activities and the maximum projected land use changes associated with the proposed GPU to result in substantial adverse impacts related to biological resources. Drawing from the biological resources chapter of the recently updated BDR, ESA will describe the biological resources of Napa County, including special-status species, habitats of limited distribution, natural communities, wildlife movement, and aquatic resources. The section will include a regulatory framework that discusses federal, state, and local regulations related to biological resources, including applicable Napa County General Plan polices and related implementing regulations in the Napa County Code. The analysis of impacts will evaluate the potential for development activities associated with the proposed GPU to result in substantial adverse impacts associated with biological resources. Where applicable, existing or recommended policies will be identified to avoid or minimize adverse impacts.

Cultural Resources

ESA will rely on information from the BDR and GPU to prepare the Cultural Resources section of the Program-level EIR. It is assumed that many of the policies developed in Phase 4 will be incorporated as mitigation in the EIR. ESA will conduct an archaeological resources records review and archival research to identify any previously documented archaeological resources and archaeological resources studies that have previously occurred within the GPU analysis area. Drawing from the Cultural Resources chapter of the BDR, ESA will draft the historical and archaeological resources section of the EIR based on the results of the background research.

Energy

ESA will include or incorporate by reference the existing environmental and regulatory energy setting information presented in the BDR, and prepare a clear and concise energy analysis that evaluates the following aspects of the proposed GPU's preferred land use plan:

- Energy consumption from existing and proposed land uses in the unincorporated county will be estimated using information from the County's RCAAP and VMT data from Fehr & Peers. ESA's analysis includes evaluation of electricity and natural gas consumption from buildings, as well as energy consumption estimates associated with on-road vehicle travel (i.e., gasoline, diesel, and electricity).
- A qualitative analysis of potential changes to construction fuel demand (i.e., gasoline and diesel) associated with the increased development potential accommodated by the proposed GPU.

ESA will use the information to assess the proposed GPU's potential impacts based on the criteria provided in CEQA Guidelines Appendix G, including the wasteful, inefficient, or unnecessary consumption of energy resources, and GPU's ability to conflict with or obstruct implementation of a state or local plan adopted for renewable energy or energy efficiency. ESA will also address the requirements in CEQA Guidelines Appendix F by evaluating potential changes to energy consumption on a per capita basis and assessing the proposed GPU's reliance on fossil fuels and renewable energy resources.

Impacts will be assessed at a programmatic level. The analysis will consider how existing, amended, and proposed GPU policies would lessen or avoid potential energy impacts associated with implementation of the GPU. ESA will, if necessary, recommend and incorporate mitigation measures into the EIR to reduce the magnitude of impacts that are found to remain potentially significant even after implementation of GPU policies.

Geology, Soils, and Paleontological Resources

As documented in the BDR, Napa County is within a seismically active region due to local and regional faults and, as such, is susceptible to fault rupture, seismic shaking, and seismic-induced ground failures (e.g., liquefaction). In addition, some areas of the county are susceptible to landslides and erosion. However, individual projects would be required to comply with the California Building Code and local building regulations that would require the preparation of a geotechnical investigation to describe site-specific geotechnical conditions and provide geotechnical recommendations to address geotechnical issues, as needed. Preparation of the geotechnical investigation is a condition of permit approval for proposed projects.

ESA will research potential geology, seismicity, soils, and paleontological resources related issues within the county in accordance with CEQA requirements. The evaluation will address whether implementation of projects would result in significant impacts to the public or the environment. ESA will do the following:

- Review the County BDR, site-specific reports, maps, and GIS data published by the USGS, CGS, the County, Natural Resources Conservation Service, and other sources to identify and summarize geologic, seismic, soil, and paleontological resources conditions and develop comprehensive understanding of site conditions to assess the potential issues relative to CEQA Appendix G criteria.
- Identify the relevant regulations, building codes and standards, and local ordinances that would apply to construction and operation of projects, and determine the manner and extent to which compliance would address potential impacts. This will include discussing how the requirements of the California Building Code and local building codes and implementation of project design features would address geologic, seismic, and erosion issues.
- Identify which, if any, impacts are significant, and present mitigation, where applicable and feasible, to reduce the impacts to below applicable significance thresholds.

Greenhouse Gas Emissions

ESA will include or incorporate by reference the existing environmental and regulatory GHG setting information presented in the BDR and prepare a clear and concise GHG analysis that evaluates whether the proposed GPU would generate GHG emissions (directly or indirectly) that may have a significant impact on the environment or conflict with an applicable plan, policy, or regulation adopted for the purpose of reducing GHG emissions.

ESA proposes to leverage the County's recent work on the RCAAP to estimate the GHG emissions associated with existing and proposed land uses in the unincorporated county. ESA anticipates that the level of growth proposed by the proposed GPU will be greater than that currently planned for in the RCAAP's projections and, therefore, could conflict with the County's long-term GHG reduction efforts. By updating the RCAAP's emission calculation spreadsheets with updated growth forecasts from the proposed GPU, ESA will be able to best assess the magnitude of the proposed changes and evaluate how the RCAAP's strategies are anticipated to reduce emissions from the land use changes.

In addition to estimating GHG emissions associated with the proposed GPU and conducting a consistency analysis with the RCAAP, ESA will also review the GPU for consistency with the California Air Resources Board 2022 Scoping Plan, and the Metropolitan Transportation Commission / Association of Bay Area Governments Plan Bay Area 2050 (or whatever the most recent plans are from these entities at the time of EIR preparation).

The analysis will consider how existing, amended, and proposed GPU policies would lessen or avoid potential energy impacts associated with implementation of the GPU. ESA will, if necessary, recommend and incorporate mitigation measures into the EIR to reduce the magnitude of impacts that are found to remain potentially significant even after implementation of GPU policies.

To complete this task with the scope and budget identified below, ESA has assumed the following:

- Electronic RCAAP files containing the County's GHG emissions inventory, forecasts, and GHG reduction strategies will be made available to ESA and growth forecasts and emissions breakdowns specifically identified for the unincorporated County will be provided.
- ESA will assess the level of GHG reductions for the GPU based on the RCAAP's existing strategies. ESA's scope includes neither time nor budget to develop additional strategies for incorporation into the RCAAP's electronic files, or develop a qualified GHG reduction strategy (i.e., a new Climate Action Plan or updated RCAAP) for the unincorporated county. ESA can provide a revised scope of work and cost estimate for client review should the County wish to pursue updates to the RCAAP (including new and revised strategies), based on the level of growth proposed by the GPU, and align the unincorporated county's emissions with the larger, regional plan's GHG reduction goals.
- Any GHG mitigation identified by ESA to reduce a potentially significant GHG impact will be done so at a programmatic level and in such a manner as not to conflict with the RCAAP's existing GHG reduction calculations (i.e., ESA will avoid double counting potential emissions reductions).

Hazards and Hazardous Materials

The primary hazards and hazardous materials issues would be the use of hazardous materials during construction activities and operations for individual projects. Although hazardous materials would be used during the construction of structures and the operation of facilities, the transportation, use, storage, and disposal of hazardous materials is heavily regulated and compliance with the law is anticipated to reduce risks of exposure. ESA will evaluate potential hazards and hazardous materials issues that have the potential to affect development activities in accordance with CEQA

requirements. The evaluation will address whether implementation of projects would result in significant impacts to the public or the environment relative to hazardous materials for individual projects. ESA will do the following:

- Develop a setting of hazards and hazardous materials conditions in the county using the County BDR, published reports and maps, along with other relevant reports. ESA will use the setting to identify the hazards and hazardous materials issues that could result from development activities.
- Identify the relevant regulations, building codes and standards, and local ordinances that would apply to construction and operation of individual projects, and determine the manner and extent to which compliance would address potential impacts. This will include discussing how the requirements of Hazardous Materials Business Plans and the project design features of individual projects would address hazards and hazardous materials issues. The degree to which such requirements will reduce potential effects and any additional actions that might be required will receive careful consideration.
- Identify which, if any, impacts are significant, and present mitigation, where applicable and feasible, to reduce the impacts to below applicable significance thresholds.

Hydrology and Water Quality

ESA will develop a setting of the hydrology and water quality issues within the county through review of the BDR; site-specific reports; the Water Availability Analysis Guidelines, and other available reports, maps, and data published by State, County, FEMA, and other sources to identify and summarize hydrologic and water quality conditions to develop a comprehensive understanding of potential issues of concern. ESA will address the potential hydrology and water quality-related impacts in accordance with CEQA requirements. The evaluation will address whether implementation of projects would result in significant impacts to the public or the environment. ESA would include a programmatic assessment of groundwater supplies and recharge that outlines the regulatory framework (including Napa Valley Subbasin sustainability goals) and project-specific Water Availability Analysis requirements for individual projects. ESA will summarize groundwater information compiled as part of the BDR but will not include new quantitative analysis.

Land Use and Planning

This section of the EIR will evaluate the consistency of the proposed GPU with applicable plans, policies, and regulations adopted for the purpose of avoiding or mitigating an environmental effect, including those of the existing Napa County General Plan, the Napa County Code and Zoning Ordinance, the Napa Countywide Airport Land Use Compatibility Plan, and the San Francisco Bay Conservation and Development Commission San Francisco Bay Plan. This section will also evaluate the potential for development activities associated with the proposed GPU to physically divide an established community.

Mineral Resources

The key mineral resources issue of concern would be the potential to prevent or limit access to aggregate and non-aggregate mineral resources. Drawing from the BDR, which describes the current status of mineral resources, ESA will research potential mineral resources-related issues in accordance with CEQA requirements. The evaluation will address whether implementation of the GPU would result in significant impacts to the public or the environment.

Noise and Vibration

ESA will include or incorporate by reference the existing noise and vibration setting information (both environmental and regulatory) presented in the BDR, and prepare a clear and concise noise and vibration analysis that will evaluate the following aspects of the GPU's preferred land use plan:

- Potential construction noise and vibration impacts will be assessed using standard methodologies such as equipment noise and vibration levels referenced and published by the FHWA, Federal Transit Administration, and the California Department of Transportation.

- Potential noise and vibration impacts from stationary sources (e.g., mechanical equipment) and industrial and other noise-generating land uses (e.g., quarries) will be assessed by using the results of the community noise survey conducted for the BDR and evaluating the potential for the GPU's preferred land use plan to place noise-sensitive uses near noise-generating sources, and vice versa.
- Potential noise and vibration impacts from increases in vehicle traffic on roads and highways will be assessed using changes in traffic volumes estimated for the preferred land use scenario by the TIA prepared for the GPU by Fehr & Peers (see Task 5.3.1 below) and the FHWA's Traffic Noise Model.
- Potential airport and aircraft-related noise impacts will be assessed by reviewing the potential for the GPU's preferred land use plan to place noise-sensitive uses in or near airport environs.

ESA will assess the potential impacts of the GPU at a programmatic level. The analysis will consider and incorporate how proposed GPU policies and mandatory noise control requirements in the County Code would lessen or avoid potential impacts associated with implementation of the proposed GPU. ESA will, if necessary, recommend and incorporate mitigation measures into the EIR to reduce any potential impacts that are found to remain potentially significant even after implementation of GPU policies and code requirements.

To complete this task with the scope and budget identified below, ESA has assumed the following:

- Supplemental community noise monitoring will not be required.
- ESA will estimate changes in traffic noise levels on approximately 30 road segments (the same amount as modeled for existing BDR conditions).

Population and Housing

This section of the EIR will describe the characteristics and trends of population, employment, and housing in Napa County and describe the potential changes to population, employment, and housing, which could occur with implementation of the proposed GPU.

Public Services and Recreation

The proposed GPU would include programs that could increase demand for public services, including fire protection, police, schools, parks, and other public facilities. ESA will evaluate whether the expansion of these services would result in any direct or indirect physical changes to the environment.

Transportation and Circulation (Fehr & Peers)

Transportation and circulation impacts will be evaluated using information provided by Fehr & Peers, as described below. The analysis will be based on VMT generated by land use changes associated with the proposed GPU.

SUBTASK 5.3.1: CEQA EVACUATION IMPACT ANALYSIS

The following subtasks are designed to fulfill the requirements of evaluating a project's effect on evacuations for wildfire hazard areas and/or other hazards that would require an emergency evacuation, as required by CEQA and as required through substantial recent CEQA case law in Northern California. This analysis is separate from the Safety Element (e.g., SB 99 and AB 747) and evaluates the proposed General Plan's effect on evacuation. The methodologies below are consistent with the guidance published by the Office of the Attorney General for the preparation of such studies (i.e., multiple scenarios, use of appropriate traffic modeling software). The approach described below also reflects the recent CEQA court decisions in Sonoma, Contra Costa, Placer, and Lake counties and lessons learned from the findings, which deemed environmental documents to be inadequate due to the lack of sufficient analysis around the project's effect on the ability of the local community to evacuate safely due to wildfire (or other natural disasters). The scope of the tasks below is draft in nature and must be refined through discussions with County staff prior to execution.

Subtask 5.3.1.1: Event Parameter Identification

Based on the updated Mobility Element, the current Safety Element, and CalFire's Fire Hazard Severity Maps for Local Responsibility Areas and State Responsibility Area, Fehr & Peers will organize and facilitate a virtual workshop with County staff (planning, public works, police, and fire department) to identify up to three emergency scenarios representing different evacuation profiles. Fehr & Peers will also lead a discussion about the key evacuation routes for these scenarios and the parameters (e.g., time of day, evacuation pattern, road closures) for the evacuation analyses.

It is understood that due to the complexities and unique challenges of the study area, and the lack of codified standards and/or formal design guidance for evacuation studies (i.e., required evacuation times), Fehr & Peers will rely on expertise from County planning staff and fire/police leaders to identify various hazard conditions and potential constraints to evacuation. This is to ensure compliance with the Attorney General's guidance and recent court decisions under CEQA. The selection of evacuation events to evaluate will be based on events that have the highest evacuation demand in the shortest period. It will also consider the availability of first responders to manage traffic at key locations and the timing and primary purpose of the traffic management efforts. For any daytime evacuation scenarios, this would include whether and when first responders may be assigned to prevent traffic from entering the community at key gateways. Certain types of events like earthquakes do not typically include a large-scale evacuation as residents are typically told to shelter in place. The current scope and fee assume that the evacuation scenarios will be based on a weekday scenario; a weekend scenario may be tested as part subject to a scope and budget amendment (due to the need for additional data to quantify regional travel characteristics for a weekend scenario).

After completion of the previously described work, Fehr & Peers will collaborate with the ESA team on CEQA standards of significance related to the Project's effect on evacuation times; this scope assumes that ESA will be primarily responsible for developing CEQA standards of significance. It is anticipated that these proposed standards of significance will be discussed among the ESA team prior to undertaking Task 5.3.1.2.

Subtask 5.3.1.2: Establishing Project Effect on Evacuation Times

Fehr & Peers will complete a quantitative analysis (using Fehr & Peers EVAC+ tool) of evacuation patterns for up to three evacuation scenarios (e.g., evacuation pattern, road closures, type of emergency event) for the following conditions, to fulfill CEQA impact assessment requirements for the General Plan EIR:

- Baseline year Current General Plan condition.
- Horizon year Current General Plan condition.
- Horizon year Preferred General Plan condition.

Each evacuation scenario will consider one standardized time of day/day of week/time of year to be developed by Fehr & Peers (e.g., a wildfire scenario would occur during peak fire season in the later stages of the year, while flooding would tend to occur during the winter). This analysis will inform an evaluation of the capacity, safety, and viability of evacuation routes and shelters.

Based on the defined evacuation scenarios from Task 5.3.1.1, the first step in the operations analysis will focus on estimating the number of vehicle trips during each evacuation event. Based on the updated SNABM through Task 3.9, Fehr & Peers will develop evacuation trip generation information for the evacuation zones to estimate travel demand. The model data includes a variety of information based on census data, including persons per household, number of employees, auto-ownership information, population, and other factors that could affect the number of vehicles per household used during evacuation. The travel demand will also consider time of day. For example, an evacuation event during the middle of the night would create an evacuation trip for most that would begin at their home and end at either the evacuation center or somewhere external to the evacuation area. Conversely, an event that occurred during the middle of the day (when people are shopping) could delay evacuation movements as people come home first to access their belongings prior to leaving.

Background traffic data will be based on outputs from SNABM and count data, with adjustments made using Big Data to establish an evacuation condition that closely aligns with critical fire seasons or flood seasons. Fehr & Peers have included up to \$3,000 in direct costs and staff time to order, download, and process Big Data to factor traffic counts and SNABM origin-destination matrices. The assessment will be based on a weekday scenario; a weekend scenario may be tested as part subject to a scope and budget amendment (due to the need for additional data to quantify regional travel characteristics for a weekend scenario).

The during-evacuation traffic operations analysis will use Fehr & Peers' EVAC+ Tool. This tool will be customized to reflect the county's evacuation roadway network and traffic demand data extracted from SNABM. The tool then references trip tables for areas outside of the evacuation area to form the "background" traffic estimates on the roadways not affected during an evacuation event. Areas affected by the evacuation event are then processed through the EVAC+ Tool trip estimator to estimate the number and sequencing of trips that occur due to the event.

The sub-area extracted network and new trip tables are then input into a Dynamic Traffic Assignment model. A Dynamic Traffic Assignment model estimates traffic and levels of congestion on 15-minute intervals and, as link congestion builds (roads fill with cars), the model dynamically reassigns traffic to less-congested routes, if available. This is a more accurate way of estimating trip assignment and identifying congested locations on the network that should be considered during an evacuation event. The results of this modeling effort will be used to identify heavily used evacuation routes and key bottlenecks in the city and county's roadway network during each evacuation scenario.

The results of the traffic operations analysis will be illustrated in figures, and metrics will be summarized in tables to highlight the key findings, including evacuation travel times and congestion bottlenecks. Fehr & Peers anticipates two meetings with the ESA team as part of this task.

The change in evacuation patterns and times would be compared against a threshold of significance to be derived as part of Task 5.3.1.1. If significant impacts are identified, mitigation measures will be developed to alleviate the impact.

It is noted that the quantitative evaluation described in this task is conceptual in nature as the historical hazard pattern in and around Napa County shows that wildfire and other hazards are unpredictable in nature and can be sparked by any number of causes. The purpose of the analysis is to assess for one given set of assumptions (which may not reflect an actual emergency event in the future) how evacuation times could potentially change after completion of the Project.

Documentation of the work in this task will occur in the TIA Report (Task 5.3.2).

SUBTASK 5.3.2: PREPARE DRAFT TRANSPORTATION IMPACT ANALYSIS REPORT

Fehr & Peers will document the transportation and evacuation-related studies in a TIA report and submit it to the County and the ESA team for review. The report will include the following components:

- Summary of the VMT metrics for the current General Plan, initial alternatives, and the preferred alternative from Task 3.9. It will also include an evaluation of the Preferred Alternative's effect on VMT generated by the future land use program. Fehr & Peers will rely on input from the County and the ESA team as to the most appropriate significance criteria to be used to determine CEQA transportation impact significance. If a significant CEQA transportation impact is identified, mitigation measures will be developed to reduce the level of impact. The effectiveness of the mitigation measures will be quantified based on the latest available effectiveness research. The mitigation measures may include feedback to General Plan policies that could be modified to reduce impacts to a less-than-significant level, to accomplish the goal of having the General Plan be self-mitigating to the extent feasible.
- Evaluation of the transit and non-motorized effects of the current General Plan (no project) and the preferred alternative scenarios. Mitigation measures to address potentially significant impacts will be recommended, which may include feedback on General Plan policies that could be modified to reduce impacts to a less-than-significant level.

- Summary of the evacuation time estimate analysis results of the current General Plan (no project) and the preferred alternative scenarios. Mitigation measures to address potentially significant impacts will be recommended, which may include feedback on General Plan policies that could be modified to reduce impacts to a less-than-significant level.

SUBTASK 5.3.4: PREPARE FINAL TRANSPORTATION IMPACT ANALYSIS REPORT

Fehr & Peers will respond to one round of consolidated comments from the County and the ESA team and prepare a Final Transportation Impact Analysis Report.

SUBTASK 5.3.5: ADMINISTRATIVE DRAFT, SCREENCHECK DRAFT, AND DRAFT EIR

It is expected that ESA will use this and other technical reports to prepare the Transportation and Circulation section of the Administrative Draft, Screencheck Draft, and Draft EIR. Fehr & Peers will review the draft environmental documents for consistency with ESA's analysis. Fehr & Peers will assist the ESA team in preparing responses to public comments on the Draft EIR; this scope of work assumes 8 hours of staff time to respond to comments on the Admin Draft and Screencheck Draft EIR.

Tribal Cultural Resources

ESA will contact the California Native American Heritage Commission and interested Native American representatives to help identify any locations of concern to the local Native American community and assist the County with consultation requirements of SB 18 and AB 52. Drawing from the Tribal Resources chapter of the BDR, ESA will draft the tribal cultural resources section of the EIR based on the results of the background research and communication with Native American tribes.

Utilities and Service Systems

Drawing from the Utilities and Public Infrastructure chapter of the BDR, ESA will use background information from the County and potential service providers to characterize the existing setting for utilities and service systems, updated as necessary, and will evaluate the impacts on those services. ESA assume that water supply information and changes in demand from the GPU will be provided by the applicable water providers, and that wastewater treatment capacity and changes in demand will also be provided by the service providers. The analysis will describe any improvements necessary to provide utility connections and assess the impacts associated with them.

Wildfire

Areas throughout the county are designated as a High Fire Hazard Severity Zone, and the county has experienced significant fires and fire losses since 2017. ESA will evaluate whether the implementation of the GPU would impair emergency responses or evacuations, exacerbate wildfire risks, require the installation of infrastructure that may result in impacts, or expose people or structures to risks as a result of wildfire or post-wildfire conditions including runoff, slope instability, or drainage changes.

Alternatives

In addition to the No Project Alternative, the EIR will qualitatively evaluate up to three additional alternative scenarios. ESA will consult with the County to determine appropriate alternatives, which will be directed toward those that could lessen identified significant impacts associated with the proposed GPU.

Task 5.4: Prepare Public Draft EIR

ESA will revise the Administrative Draft EIR, including all appendices and studies pertinent to the EIR, to reflect the County staff's recommended changes and will prepare a Final Screencheck EIR for County staff review prior to public circulation. After any minor changes, this version of the document will be distributed for public review. ESA will submit

an Administrative Record (consisting of sources referenced in the Draft EIR) to the County in electronic (PDF) format prior to publication of the Draft EIR.

Task 5.5: Prepare Responses to Comments

ESA assumes that a moderate number of comments will be received, and that the draft responses will be accommodated per the schedule and budget provided. ESA will review the comments and coordinate with the County staff to discuss issues raised and establish an approach for responding. If the number or complexity of comments cannot be responded to with the time and budget provided, ESA will discuss additional schedule and budget requirements with the County, if needed. ESA will then prepare a draft response to comments document and submit it to the County for review. ESA has included an estimate of 328 labor hours and a budget of \$79,878 to respond to comments.

Task 5.6: Prepare Final EIR

ESA will prepare a Final EIR. The Final EIR will consist of the following, with one round of County review assumed: 1) comment letters received during the public review period and public hearing transcript, with responses; and 2) any changes, corrections, or modifications to the Draft EIR resulting from the comments received. Similar to the process for the Draft EIR, the Final EIR document will require preparation of a Public Distribution draft of the Final EIR. The revised draft will be formatted with tracked changes and retain all review comments on the prior draft. ESA will prepare and submit a Final Mitigation, Monitoring, and Reporting Program, incorporating any text changes as a result of the Final EIR, which will be included as an Appendix to the Final EIR. ESA will submit an updated final Administrative Record (consisting of sources referenced in the Final EIR) to the County in electronic (PDF) format prior to publication of the Final EIR.

Task 5.7: EIR Meetings and Project Management

ESA's EIR project manager will be the County's point of contact and will be available for regular check-ins and meetings, supported by the EIR deputy project manager. ESA's EIR project director will be available for the kickoff meeting and periodic check-ins and will provide internal quality control for the environmental document. For purposes of budgeting, ESA has considered the project duration for the EIR preparation to be approximately 12 months, including a set number of meetings during that period, together with a monthly hourly average for project management. ESA has assumed that project team meetings will occur via video or teleconference, and that meetings will occur on a monthly basis, though ESA recognizes that during certain periods, more frequent meetings may be required. To that end, ESA has provided budget for up to 24 meetings with up to 4 hours allotted for each to account for preparation, meeting, and coordination time. ESA has also provided time to account for occasional attendance by ESA's technical specialists as the need arises. For purposes of general project management duties, ESA has allotted 6 hours monthly for this purpose.

Phase 6: Meetings, Hearings, Project, and Data Management

This phase covers all public hearings and ongoing project management activities necessary to successfully deliver the GPU and EIR.

Task 6.1: Public Hearings

The ESA team will support staff in presenting the GPU and EIR at public hearings. A total of **four in-person hearings** are anticipated—two before the Planning Commission (PC) and two before the BOS. Additional hearings may be held at the County's request. This task will include the following:

- Prepare presentations, handouts, and graphics tailored to elected officials and the public.

- Coordinate with staff to rehearse and align messaging.
- Attend and present at all four hearings.
- Provide technical support and answer questions during deliberations.

Task 6.1 Deliverables

- Presentation materials, hearing attendance, and summary notes.

Task 6.1 Assumptions

- County staff will be responsible for preparing staff reports for each hearing before the PC and BOS.

Task 6.2: Staff Coordination Meetings

ESA will hold bi-weekly virtual coordination meetings with County staff to ensure smooth progress throughout the GPU. ESA will prepare the agenda, discussion notes, and follow-up on action items in Airtable. Meetings will typically last an hour and be attended by ESA’s project manager and members of the ESA team as needed. ESA has budgeted for 65 meetings, including time to prepare the agenda, attend the meetings, and prepare follow-up minutes and action items.

Task 6.2 Deliverables

- Agendas, meeting notes, and updated action tracker.

Task 6.2 Assumptions

- Up to three members of the ESA team will attend.
- The ESA team may require contingency funding should additional meetings be needed beyond the budgeted 65 meetings.

Task 6.3: Project Administration

ESA will provide overall project management to ensure the GPU remains on scope, on schedule, and within budget. This includes coordinating across ESA and subconsultants, managing deliverables, submitting monthly invoices and progress reports, and maintaining high quality deliverables through quality assurance/quality control (QA/QC) protocols. The scope for this effort includes:

- Maintaining and regularly updating the master project schedule and task tracker.
- Preparing monthly progress reports and invoices summarizing status, upcoming milestones, and budget-to-date.
- Conducting QA/QC reviews of all deliverables to ensure accuracy and consistency.
- Coordinating with subconsultants to manage workflow and deliverables.
- Maintaining the CEQA Administrative Record.

Task 6.3 Deliverables

- ESA will prepare detailed workflows at the kickoff of each task to ensure the task deliverables are submitted on schedule and that the overall schedule remains on track.
- Monthly invoices and progress reports.

Task 6.3 Assumptions

- Project Administration is assumed to account for no more than 13 percent of the total technical labor hours anticipated for the budgeted GPU process.

Task 6.4: Data Management

ESA will designate a Data Steward for the overall project effort to track and manage data source and data visualization updates and additions across all components of the GPU and EIR preparation in close coordination with the County GIS lead. The Data Steward will track changes across spatial data, as well as non-spatial data, to the extent allowed by budget, and will coordinate with the County GIS, IT, and Public Information leads to ensure data repositories and visualization products, including the Napa County BDR Explorer web app, are maintained and revised where needed.

Task 6.4 Deliverables

- Bi-weekly check-in calls with the GIS lead and other information managers as needed to facilitate tracking and implementation of updates to County document and GIS data repositories.
- The General Plan may require updates to GIS figures and data that is provided in the background summary for the General Plan Elements. The ESA Data Steward will coordinate with the County GIS lead to deliver new or revised data arising from data that are presented in the General Plan elements and to update the Napa County BDR Explorer web app as necessary to incorporate these data.

Task 6.4 Assumptions

- Update efforts will be limited to addition of content in the subject areas specifically included in this scope of work for the GPU and EIR. Significant updates to existing application design or functionality are not included.
- County will provide the ESA team with editor/publisher-level logins and access permissions to access its ArcGIS online environment.
- County will provide review, approval and publication of submitted datasets within two weeks of delivery by ESA.

Task 6.5: GIS Specifications

New or modified mapping products created by ESA and delivered to Napa County for the GPU shall meet the following requirements:

- GIS Data and Maps
 - All new GIS data should be delivered as standard Esri file geodatabases with ISO 19239 and AGOL compliant metadata and using the County's standard projection (EPSG:2226).
 - PDF maps and graphics shall comply with the accessibility standards described in Task 2.3.
 - Should there be information such as symbology that is unable to be transferred through file geodatabases, a copy of the data in other formats such as lyrx or similar files may be included alongside the file geodatabase.
- Usage and Documentation of GIS Data
 - When creating maps for inclusion in the GPU, ESA will source data from County-hosted feature services where available and will include source citations in the map figure.
 - Layers ESA obtain from authoritative sources outside the County will include point of access information and date and time of access/download and compliant metadata per requirements stated above. . p
 - Per Task 1.2 Assumptions, if source organizations issue updates to authoritative data that ESA previously acquired for the BDR, County GIS will be responsible for updating the County's hosted services accordingly. ESA will provide such updated data to the County when ESA's scope includes reconfiguration of the source data for GPU purposes.
 - Datasets ESA develops for the GPU will have within their metadata a description of:
 - » The sources used to develop the dataset, to the level of accepted citation (i.e., the source organization, the date the data was created (if available), and the location or website from which the data were obtained).

- » Description of replicable steps/methods used to create the dataset. For datasets obtained from external sources, providing the original metadata along with a brief description of any modifications made (for example clipping, filtering, or reprojecting) will be sufficient.
- » The intent behind the development of the dataset.

Task 6.5 Assumptions

- The BDR provides the Existing Conditions for the GPU. As stated in Task 1.2 Assumptions, County GIS will be responsible for maintenance of the BDR data to incorporate updates issues by government agencies and other authoritative sources. ESA will assist in identifying when such changes have occurred during the time period of the GPU when such updated source data are required for GPU analysis.



Napa County General Plan Update		ESA LABOR COST		SUBCONSULTANT & EXPENSES					TOTAL PROJECT COST	VALIDATE FORMULA <i>Should Match Total Project Cost from Fee Proposal Planning Worksheet</i>	
		ESA Total Hours	Total ESA Labor Cost	Alta Total (\$) Amount	Fehr & Peers Total (\$) Amount	BAE Total (\$) Amount	Total Subconsultant (\$ Amount)	Total Expense (\$ Amount)			
1.1	Kickoff & Tour of Key Sites	56.00	\$ 18,285	\$ 12,408.00	\$ 3,652.00	\$ 4,400.00	\$ 20,460	\$ 880	\$ 39,625	\$ 39,625	\$ -
1.2	Additional Existing Conditions Analysis	318.00	\$ 86,834	\$ 15,840.00	\$ -	\$ 6,050.00	\$ 21,890	\$ -	\$ 108,724	\$ 108,724	\$ -
1.3	Policy Audit & Retention Review	276.00	\$ 74,895	\$ 31,900.00	\$ 1,204.50	\$ 2,750.00	\$ 35,855	\$ -	\$ 110,749	\$ 110,749	\$ -
1	New Data Collection & Policy Audit	650.00	\$ 180,014	\$ 60,148	\$ 4,857	\$ 13,200	\$ 78,205	\$ 880	\$ 259,098	\$ 259,098	\$ -
2.1	Community Engagement Plan	23.00	\$ 7,184	\$ 17,391.00	\$ -	\$ -	\$ 17,391	\$ -	\$ 24,575	\$ 24,575	\$ -
2.2	Branding and Templates	18.00	\$ 6,219	\$ 12,210.00	\$ -	\$ -	\$ 12,210	\$ -	\$ 18,429	\$ 18,429	\$ -
2.3	Outreach Activities, Social Media and Newsletters	20.00	\$ 6,411	\$ 44,550.00	\$ -	\$ -	\$ 44,550	\$ -	\$ 50,961	\$ 50,961	\$ -
2.4	website	10.00	\$ 4,147	\$ 29,194.00	\$ -	\$ -	\$ 29,194	\$ -	\$ 33,341	\$ 33,341	\$ -
2.5	Initial Outreach and Engagement	-	\$ -	\$ 70,290.00	\$ -	\$ -	\$ 70,290	\$ -	\$ 70,290	\$ 70,290	\$ -
2.6	Topic Specific Workshops (TSWs)	516.00	\$ 161,132	\$ 143,880.00	\$ 2,227.50	\$ 5,775.00	\$ 151,883	\$ 18,370	\$ 331,385	\$ 331,385	\$ -
2.7	Countywide Workshops	276.00	\$ 92,798	\$ 154,445.50	\$ 2,227.50	\$ 13,090.00	\$ 169,763	\$ 10,560	\$ 273,121	\$ 273,121	\$ -
2.8	Online Surveys/Feedback Forms	16.00	\$ 5,384	\$ 33,165.00	\$ -	\$ -	\$ 33,165	\$ -	\$ 38,549	\$ 38,549	\$ -
2.9	Public Agency Working Group (PAWG)	165.00	\$ 52,665	\$ 19,030.00	\$ 2,227.50	\$ 3,850.00	\$ 25,108	\$ -	\$ 77,772	\$ 77,772	\$ -
2.10	Ongoing Stakeholder Meetings	88.00	\$ 24,991	\$ 11,880.00	\$ 2,227.50	\$ 4,620.00	\$ 18,728	\$ -	\$ 43,719	\$ 43,719	\$ -
2	Community Engagement & Facilitation	1,484.00	\$ 461,966	\$ 622,441	\$ 16,352	\$ 27,335	\$ 666,127	\$ 38,390	\$ 1,166,483	\$ 1,166,483	\$ -
3.1	Community Vision Plan Document	16.00	\$ 5,220	\$ 28,204.00	\$ -	\$ -	\$ 28,204	\$ -	\$ 33,424	\$ 33,424	\$ -
3.2	Conceptual Alternatives and Concepts	272.00	\$ 78,956	\$ 44,660.00	\$ -	\$ 23,100.00	\$ 67,760	\$ -	\$ 146,716	\$ 146,716	\$ -
3.3	Preferred Land Use and Policy Alternatives Report	94.00	\$ 28,216	\$ 27,082.00	\$ -	\$ -	\$ 27,082	\$ -	\$ 55,298	\$ 55,298	\$ -
3.4	Land Use Alternatives Analysis	20.00	\$ 6,226	\$ 25,146.00	\$ -	\$ -	\$ 25,146	\$ -	\$ 31,372	\$ 31,372	\$ -
3.5	Growth Projections	76.00	\$ 22,680	\$ 15,004.00	\$ -	\$ -	\$ 15,004	\$ -	\$ 37,684	\$ 37,684	\$ -
3.6	Preferred Land Use Plan Development	32.00	\$ 8,921	\$ 19,932.00	\$ -	\$ -	\$ 19,932	\$ -	\$ 28,853	\$ 28,853	\$ -
3.7	Land Use, Health and EJ Policy Framework	6.00	\$ 1,805	\$ 25,652.00	\$ -	\$ -	\$ 25,652	\$ -	\$ 27,457	\$ 27,457	\$ -
3.8	Fiscal, Economic and Agricultural Sustainability Analysis	102.00	\$ 25,297	\$ -	\$ -	\$ 36,850.00	\$ 36,850	\$ -	\$ 62,147	\$ 62,147	\$ -
3.9	Transportation Analysis	-	\$ -	\$ -	\$ 55,621.50	\$ -	\$ 55,622	\$ -	\$ 55,622	\$ 55,622	\$ -
3	Land Use Alternatives	618.00	\$ 177,321	\$ 185,680	\$ 55,622	\$ 59,950	\$ 301,252	\$ -	\$ 478,572	\$ 478,572	\$ -
4.1	Outline & Format	26.00	\$ 7,597	\$ 5,456.00	\$ -	\$ -	\$ 5,456	\$ -	\$ 13,053	\$ 13,053	\$ -
4.2.1	Introduction (ESA)	22.00	\$ 6,476	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ 6,476	\$ 6,476	\$ -
4.2.2	Summary & Vision (ESA/Raimi)	6.00	\$ 1,821	\$ 12,056.00	\$ -	\$ -	\$ 12,056	\$ -	\$ 13,877	\$ 13,877	\$ -
4.2.3	Land Use & Community Character (R&A)	18.00	\$ 5,167	\$ 64,680.00	\$ -	\$ -	\$ 64,680	\$ -	\$ 69,847	\$ 69,847	\$ -
4.2.4	Natural Resource Conservation Element (ESA)	410.00	\$ 114,776	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ 114,776	\$ 114,776	\$ -
4.2.5	Agricultural Preservation & Working Lands (ESA)	194.00	\$ 53,681	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ 53,681	\$ 53,681	\$ -
4.2.6	Environmental Justice and Public Health Element (R&A)	20.00	\$ 5,674	\$ 44,440.00	\$ -	\$ -	\$ 44,440	\$ -	\$ 50,114	\$ 50,114	\$ -
4.2.7	Mobility & Infrastructure Element (Fehr & Peers and ESA)	258.00	\$ 72,907	\$ -	\$ 106,084.00	\$ -	\$ 106,084	\$ -	\$ 178,991	\$ 178,991	\$ -
4.2.8	Safety Element (Reference) and Noise Element Update (ESA)	199.00	\$ 59,512	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ 59,512	\$ 59,512	\$ -
4.10	Community Facilities Element (ESA)	-	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -
4.2.9	Economic Development & Fiscal Sustainability (BAE)	14.00	\$ 4,153	\$ -	\$ -	\$ 19,800.00	\$ 19,800	\$ -	\$ 23,953	\$ 23,953	\$ -
4.2.10	Historic and Cultural Resources Element	48.00	\$ 15,299	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ 15,299	\$ 15,299	\$ -
4.2.11	Housing (Reference)	2.00	\$ 505	\$ -	\$ -	\$ 5,500.00	\$ 5,500	\$ -	\$ 6,005	\$ 6,005	\$ -
4.2.12	Implementation Plan (Team)	122.00	\$ 33,708	\$ 21,252.00	\$ -	\$ 3,850.00	\$ 25,102	\$ -	\$ 58,810	\$ 58,810	\$ -
4.2.13	Glossary (ESA)	12.00	\$ 3,337	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ 3,337	\$ 3,337	\$ -
4.2.14	Acknowledgements (ESA)	6.00	\$ 1,821	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ 1,821	\$ 1,821	\$ -
4.3	Draft GPU	714.00	\$ 202,318	\$ 21,252.00	\$ 3,877.50	\$ 3,850.00	\$ 28,980	\$ -	\$ 231,297	\$ 231,297	\$ -
4.4	Public Draft	377.00	\$ 106,205	\$ 21,252.00	\$ 2,255.00	\$ 3,850.00	\$ 27,357	\$ -	\$ 133,562	\$ 133,562	\$ -
4.5	Final GPU	183.00	\$ 51,659	\$ 21,252.00	\$ 2,255.00	\$ 3,850.00	\$ 27,357	\$ -	\$ 79,016	\$ 79,016	\$ -
4	General Plan Development	2,631.00	\$ 746,613	\$ 211,640	\$ 114,472	\$ 40,700	\$ 366,812	\$ -	\$ 1,113,425	\$ 1,113,425	\$ -
5.1	Project Description & Alternatives Development	84.00	\$ 23,099	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ 23,099	\$ 23,099	\$ -
5.2	Notice of Preparation & Scoping	48.00	\$ 13,294	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ 13,294	\$ 13,294	\$ -
5.3	Administrative Draft EIR	1,228.00	\$ 337,728	\$ -	\$ 117,931.00	\$ -	\$ 117,931	\$ -	\$ 455,659	\$ 455,659	\$ -
5.4	Public Draft EIR	397.00	\$ 118,353	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ 118,353	\$ 118,353	\$ -
5.5	Responses to Comments	328.00	\$ 98,250	\$ -	\$ 6,154.50	\$ -	\$ 6,155	\$ -	\$ 104,404	\$ 104,404	\$ -
5.6	Final EIR	258.00	\$ 78,090	\$ -	\$ 1,595.00	\$ -	\$ 1,595	\$ -	\$ 79,685	\$ 79,685	\$ -
5.7	EIR Meetings & Project Management	204.00	\$ 64,014	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ 64,014	\$ 64,014	\$ -
5	Environmental Clearance (EIR)	2,547.00	\$ 732,829	\$ -	\$ 125,681	\$ -	\$ 125,681	\$ -	\$ 858,510	\$ 858,510	\$ -
6.1	Public Hearings	104.00	\$ 33,776	\$ 22,968.00	\$ 23,892.00	\$ 6,160.00	\$ 53,020	\$ 4,620	\$ 91,416	\$ 91,416	\$ -
6.2	Staff Coordination Meetings	423.00	\$ 134,694	\$ 73,590.00	\$ 5,148.00	\$ 7,150.00	\$ 85,888	\$ -	\$ 220,582	\$ 220,582	\$ -



Napa County General Plan Update		ESA LABOR COST	
		ESA Total Hours	Total ESA Labor Cost
Task #	Task Name/Description		
6.3	Project Administration	1,300.00	\$ 416,699
6.4	Data Management	396.00	\$ 106,852
6	Meetings, Hearings, Project & Data Management	2,223.00	\$ 692,021
	Total Hours	10,153.00	\$ 2,990,763
	Total (\$) Amount		\$ 2,990,763

SUBCONSULTANT & EXPENSES					TOTAL PROJECT COST	VALIDATE FORMULA <i>Should Match Total Project Cost fm Fee Proposal Planning Worksheet</i>	
<i>Alta</i>	<i>Fehr & Peers</i>	<i>BAE</i>	Total Subconsultant (\$ Amount)	Total Expense (\$ Amount)			
Total (\$) Amount	Total (\$) Amount	Total (\$) Amount					
\$ 61,150.10	\$ -	\$ 1,100.00	\$ 62,250	\$ 16,500	\$ 495,449	\$ 495,449	\$ -
\$ 9,724.00	\$ -	\$ -	\$ 9,724	\$ -	\$ 116,576	\$ 116,576	\$ -
\$ 167,432	\$ 29,040	\$ 14,410	\$ 210,882	\$ 21,120	\$ 924,023	\$ 924,023	\$ -
\$ 1,247,341	\$ 346,022	\$ 155,595	\$ 1,748,957	\$ 60,390	\$ 4,800,110	\$ 4,800,110	\$ -
			\$ 1,748,957	\$ 60,390	\$ 4,800,110	\$ 4,800,110	\$ -

PROJECT COST ESTIMATE SUMMARY TABLE

ESA Labor	\$2,475,030	\$2,475,030
Annual Rate Escalation Allowance	\$70,228	\$70,228
Contingency	\$371,255	\$371,255
Technology and Data Management Fee	\$74,251	\$74,251
ESA Labor Amount	\$2,990,763	\$2,990,763
ESA Non-Labor Expenses		
Reimbursable Expenses (see Attachment A for detail)	\$60,390	\$60,390
ESA Equipment Usage (see Attachment A for detail)		
Subtotal ESA Non-Labor Expenses	\$60,390	\$60,390
Subconsultant Costs	\$1,748,957	\$1,748,957
PROJECT TOTAL	\$4,800,110	\$4,800,110



Attachment A

Cost Proposal: ESA Non-Labor Expenses Summary

Reimbursable Expenses	
Project Supplies	\$ -
Printing/Reproduction	\$ -
Document and Map Reproductions (CD + Digital Photo)	\$ -
Postage and Deliveries	\$ -
Mileage	\$ 1,600
Vehicle Rental	\$ 2,800
Lodging	\$ 6,300
Airfare	\$ 14,700
Other Travel Related	\$ 1,500
Airtable subscription for 2.5 years	\$ 15,000
Urban Footprint Subscription for 2.5 years	\$ -
Translator	\$ 13,000
Subtotal Reimbursable Expenses	\$ 54,900
10% Fee on Reimbursable Expenses	\$ 5,490
Total Reimbursable Expenses	\$ 60,390

ESA Equipment Usage	
Project Specific Equipment:	\$ -
Vehicles - Standard size (no off-road usage)	\$ -
Vehicles - 4x4 /Truck (light duty)	\$ -
Vehicles - 4x4 /Truck (heavy duty)	\$ -
Vehicles - ATV	\$ -
Noise Meter	\$ -
Hydroacoustic Noise Monitoring Equipment	\$ -
Electrofisher	\$ -
Field Traps	\$ -
Digital Hypsometer (Nikon)	\$ -
Backpack Sprayer	\$ -
360-Degree 4k Camera	\$ -
High Resolution Time-Lapse Camera	\$ -
Beach Seine	\$ -
Otter Trawl	\$ -
Wildlife Acoustics Bat Detector	\$ -
Wildlife Trail Camera	\$ -
Fiber Optic Endoscope	\$ -
Spotting Scope	\$ -
Topographic/Bathymetric Survey Equipment:	\$ -
Total Station	\$ -
UAV/Drone	\$ -
RTK-GPS	\$ -



Attachment A

Cost Proposal: ESA Non-Labor Expenses Summary

RTK-GPS Smartnet Subscription	\$	-
Hypack Survey Software	\$	-
Laser/Auto Level	\$	-
Single-Beam Echoshounder	\$	-
Sidescan Sonar	\$	-
1m GNSS Data Collection System (iPad)	\$	-
Sub-meter GNSS Data Collection System	\$	-
Sub-foot Data Collection System	\$	-
Garmin GPS or equivalent (iPad)	\$	-
<hr/>		
Hydrologic Data Collection, Water Current, Level and Wave Measurement Equipment:	\$	-
ISCO 2150 Area Velocity Flow Logger	\$	-
SonTek IQ-Plus Area Velocity Flow Logger	\$	-
Logging Rain Gage	\$	-
Hand-Held Current Meter	\$	-
Surface Velocity Radar	\$	-
Wave Pressure Sensor	\$	-
Wave Buoy	\$	-
Sonic Wave Sensor	\$	-
Logging Water Level - Pressure Transducer	\$	-
Logging Barometric Pressure Logger	\$	-
Well Probe / Water Level Meter	\$	-
Bottom-Mounted Tripod / Mooring	\$	-
Stormwater Crest Sampler	\$	-
<hr/>		
Water Quality Equipment:	\$	-
Logging Turbidimeter/Water Level Recorder	\$	-
Logging Conductivity/Water Level Recorder	\$	-
Recording Conductivity Meter w/Datalogger	\$	-
Hand-Held Turbidimeter	\$	-
Hand-Held Salinity Meter or pH meter	\$	-
Logging Salinity Gauge	\$	-
Logging DO/Temp Probe	\$	-
Logging Water Quality Sonde 1 Sensor	\$	-
Logging Water Quality Sonde 2 Sensor	\$	-
Logging Water Quality Sonde 3 Sensor	\$	-
Logging Water Quality Sonde 4 Sensor	\$	-
Telemetry System Hardware	\$	-
Water Quality Multi-Probe Depth Profiler	\$	-
Niskin Water Sampler	\$	-
ISCO 6712 Portable Sampler w/ISCO 2105 Module	\$	-
<hr/>		
Sedimentation / Geotechnical Equipment:	\$	-
Peat Corer	\$	-
60lb Helly-Smith Bedload Sampler	\$	-
Mini-Ponar Grab Sampler	\$	-



Attachment A Cost Proposal: ESA Non-Labor Expenses Summary

DH-76 Suspended Sediment Sampler	\$	-
D-96 Suspended Sediment Sampler	\$	-
Bridge Crane	\$	-
RSET	\$	-
AMS Soil Sampling Kit	\$	-
Hand-Held Helley-Smith Bedload Sampler	\$	-
Guelph Permeameter	\$	-
Sludge Sampler	\$	-
Shear Strength Vane	\$	-
<hr/>		
Boats:	\$	-
Small Watercraft	\$	-
15'-17' Boat	\$	-
20'-21' Boat	\$	-
22'-25' Boat	\$	-
Houseboat Floating Laboratory	\$	-
Other	\$	-
<hr/>		
Total Equipment Usage Costs	\$	-
<hr/>		
TOTAL NON-LABOR EXPENSES	\$	60,390