

COUNTY OF NAPA
PLANNING, BUILDING AND ENVIRONMENTAL SERVICES DEPARTMENT
1195 THIRD STREET SUITE 210
NAPA, CA 94559
(707) 253-4417

Initial Study Checklist

1. **Project Title:** Soscol Creek Investors Residential Viewshed: P19-00019
2. **Property Owner:** Napa Soscol Creek Investors, LP
3. **County Contact Person, Phone Number and email:** Joan E. Gargiulo, Planner II (707) 299-1361
joan.gargiulo@countyofnapa.org
4. **Project Location and Assessor's Parcel Number (APN):** The project is located on an approximately 18.64 acre parcel within the AW:AC (Agricultural Watershed:Airport Compatibility Combination District) on Soscol Creek Road, approximately 1.5 miles from Hwy 29. APN: 057-020-084-000
5. **Project sponsor's name and address:** Napa Soscol Creek Investors, LP; contact: Joe Farrel, 1 Commercial Blvd. Ste. 106, Novato, CA (415) 884-2860, jfarrel@farrelarc.com
6. **General Plan description:** AWOS (Agriculture, Watershed, and Open Space) Designation
7. **Zoning:** AW:AC (Agricultural Watershed:Airport Compatibility Combination) District
8. **Background/Project History:** The 18.64 acre parcel is comprised of approximately 2 acres of existing vineyard development. An Erosion Control Plan Permit (No. 2003081) was issued for the parcel in 2003, a well permit (E05-0004) was issued for the parcel in 2004, and a building permit (B17-01312) was issued for electrical service to the well.
9. **Description of Project.** Approval of a Viewshed Permit for the development of a new single-family residence and associated accessory dwelling unit on a vacant parcel on Soscol Creek Road. The project includes new grading for the residential building pads and driveway improvements. Specifically, the project proposes the construction of a new 6,180 sq. ft. single-family residence; a new detached 1,199 sq. ft. accessory dwelling unit; a new detached 884 sq. ft. garage, a new detached 641 sq. ft. pool pavilion (includes a 77 sq. ft. conditioned bathroom); and a new pool. The project includes the construction of a residential wastewater system as well as improvements to the driveway designed to comply with County Roads and Streets Standards.
10. **Describe the environmental setting and surrounding land uses.**
The 18.64 acre project site is located within the AW:AC zoning district on Soscol Creek Road. The parcel is situated on a north-facing slope in the foothills of southeastern Napa County, approximately 2 miles north of the City of American Canyon and approximately 1.5 miles southeast of the City of Napa. The parcel is composed of sensitive Coast Live Oak Woodland, non-native grasslands, and an existing 2 acre vineyard area. The project area also contains one unnamed ephemeral stream and one seasonal wetland area. Site topography ranges from slopes of less than 5% to slopes over 20%, with an approximate maximum slope of 22%. Soil types include Bale Clay Loam, 0 to 2 percent slopes; Hambright-Rock Outcrop complex, 30 to 75 percent slopes; and rock outcrops. There is a known landslide deposit area located in the southwest quadrant of the subject parcel, however, no grading or development is proposed for this area. The proposed development area lies within Napa Airport Compatibility Zone E; the demarcation line between compatibility zone D and E bisects the subject parcel. The site lies outside of both the 100 and 500 year flood hazard boundaries. The project site is located within an area designated as Moderate Fire Hazard Severity.

The subject parcel is surrounded by rural residential and agricultural (vineyard) uses. The proposed residence is to be located approximately 650 feet eastward of the nearest neighboring residence located at 710 Soscol Creek Road.

11. **Other agencies whose approval is required.**

The proposed project would require various ministerial approvals from the County, including but not limited to building permits, grading permits, waste disposal permits, in addition to approvals from CalFire.

12. **Tribal Cultural Resources.**

On August 12, 2019, County staff sent invitations to consult on the proposed project to Native American tribes who had a cultural interest in the area and who, as of the above-mentioned date, had requested to be invited to consult on projects, in accordance with the requirements of Public Resources Code Section 21080.3.1. No responses were received within 30-days of the tribes receipt of the invitations.

Note: Conducting consultation early in the CEQA process allows tribal governments, lead agencies, and project proponents to discuss the level of environmental review, identify and address potential adverse impacts to tribal cultural resources, and reduce the potential for delay and conflict in the environmental review process. (See Public Resources Code section 21080.3.2.) Information may also be available from the California Native American Heritage Commission’s Sacred Lands File per Public Resources Code section 5097.96 and the California Historical Resources Information System administered by the California Office of Historic Preservation. Please also note that Public Resources Code section 21082.3(c) contains provisions specific to confidentiality.

ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACTS AND BASIS OF CONCLUSIONS:

The conclusions and recommendations contained herein are professional opinions derived in accordance with current standards of professional practice. They are based on a review of the Napa County Environmental Resource Maps, the other sources of information listed in the file, and the comments received, conversations with knowledgeable individuals; the preparer’s personal knowledge of the area; and, where necessary, a visit to the site. For further information, see the environmental background information contained in the permanent file on this project.

On the basis of this initial evaluation:

- I find that the proposed project COULD NOT have a significant effect on the environment, and a NEGATIVE DECLARATION will be prepared.
- I find that although the proposed project could have a significant effect on the environment, there will not be a significant effect in this case because revisions in the project have been made by or agreed to by the project proponent. A MITIGATED NEGATIVE DECLARATION will be prepared.
- I find that the proposed project MAY have a significant effect on the environment, and an ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACT REPORT is required.
- I find that the proposed project MAY have a “potentially significant impact” or “potentially significant unless mitigated” impact on the environment, but at least one effect 1) has been adequately analyzed in an earlier document pursuant to applicable legal standards, and 2) has been addressed by mitigation measures based on the earlier analysis as described on attached sheets. An ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACT REPORT is required; but it must analyze only the effects that remain to be addressed.
- I find that although the proposed project could have a significant effect on the environment, because all potentially significant effects (a) have been analyzed adequately in an earlier EIR or NEGATIVE DECLARATION pursuant to applicable standards, and (b) have been avoided or mitigated pursuant to that earlier EIR or NEGATIVE DECLARATION, including revisions or mitigation measures that are imposed upon the proposed project, nothing further is required.

Signature

Date

Name: _____

Joan E. Gargiulo, Planner II
Napa County Planning, Building and Environmental Services Department

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

I. **AESTHETICS.** Except as provided in Public Resources Code Section 21099, would the project:

- | | | | | |
|---|--------------------------|--------------------------|-------------------------------------|--------------------------|
| a) Have a substantial adverse effect on a scenic vista? | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> |
| b) Substantially damage scenic resources, including, but not limited to, trees, rock outcroppings, and historic buildings within a state scenic highway? | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> |
| c) In non-urbanized areas, substantially degrade the existing visual character or quality of public views of the site and its surroundings? (Public views are those that are experienced from a publicly accessible vantage point.) If the project is in an urbanized area, would the project conflict with applicable zoning and other regulations governing scenic quality? | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> |
| d) Create a new source of substantial light or glare which would adversely affect day or nighttime views in the area? | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> |

Discussion:

- a-c. Visual resources are those physical features that make up the environment, including landforms, geologic features, water, trees, and other plants, and elements of the human cultural landscape. A scenic vista, then, would be a publicly accessible vantage point such as a road, park, trail, or scenic overlook from which distant or landscape-scale views of a beautiful or otherwise important assembly of visual resources can be taken-in.

The project site is subject to Napa County Zoning Ordinance, Chapter 18.106 (Viewshed Protection Ordinance) because Highway 29, Highway 12, and West Imola Avenue are identified as designated public roads in the *Napa County General Plan*. As proposed, the project has been designed in substantial conformance with the County’s viewshed protection manual because it would avoid grading on slopes in excess of 30 percent and would be located more than 25 feet below the minor ridgeline to the south.

The proposed architectural design of these structures would utilize manufactured siding that mimics natural wood siding, non-reflective standing seam metal roof, charcoal colored shingle roof, as well as concrete tiles and decomposed granite pathways, all of which will further allow the structures to blend in with the surrounding environment. In order to address potential visual impacts resulting from the proposed development, the Applicant prepared a visual assessment (March, 2019). The site was evaluated from five (5) different points along Highway 221, Highway 12, and Highway 121 to determine project visibility and possible visual and/or aesthetic impacts of the proposed project. The results of this study clearly indicate that the project shall be less than 50% visible from the aesthetically protected roadways listed above as required. The Applicant has also submitted a detailed landscape plan that further conceals the project and includes the planting of 5 oak trees along the western façade of the proposed residence.

Per Section 18.106.050 of the Napa County Code, prior to the issuance of a building permit, the property owner shall be required to execute and record in the County Recorder’s office a use restriction, in a form approved by County Counsel, requiring building exteriors and existing and proposed covering vegetation, as well as any equivalent level of replacement vegetation, to be maintained by the owner, or the owner’s successor so as to maintain conformance with the Municipal Code.

- d. The installation of lighting that may have the potential to impact nighttime views is proposed with development of the property. Pursuant to the standard conditions of approval for discretionary residential projects, outdoor lighting would be required to be shielded and directed downwards with only low-level lighting. As subject to the standard conditions of approval below, the project would not have a significant impact resulting in new sources of outdoor lighting.

4.8 General Property Maintenance – Lighting, Landscaping, Painting, Outdoor Equipment Storage, Mechanical Equipment, and Trash Enclosure Areas

- a. *All lighting shall be permanently maintained in accordance with the lighting and building plans approved by the County.*

6.3 Lighting

- a. Two (2) copies of a detailed lighting plan showing the location and specifications for all lighting fixtures to be installed on the property shall be submitted for Planning Division review and approval. All lighting shall comply with the California Building Code (CBC).
- b. All exterior lighting, including landscape lighting, shall be shielded and directed downward; located as low to the ground as possible; the minimum necessary for security, safety, or operations; on timers; and shall incorporate the use of motion detection sensors to the greatest extent practical. All lighting shall be shielded or placed such that it does not shine directly on adjacent properties or impact vehicles on adjacent streets. No flood-lighting or sodium lighting of the building is permitted, including architectural highlighting and spotting. Low-level lighting shall be utilized in parking areas as opposed to elevated high-intensity light standards.

Mitigation Measures: None Required.

	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporation	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
II. AGRICULTURE AND FOREST RESOURCES.¹ Would the project:				
a) Convert Prime Farmland, Unique Farmland, or Farmland of Statewide Important (Farmland) as shown on the maps prepared pursuant to the Farmland Mapping and Monitoring Program of the California Resources Agency, to non-agricultural use?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
b) Conflict with existing zoning for agricultural use, or a Williamson Act contract?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
c) Conflict with existing zoning for, or cause rezoning of, forest land as defined in Public Resources Code Section 12220(g), timberland as defined in Public Resources Code Section 4526, or timberland zoned Timberland Production as defined in Government Code Section 51104(g)?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
d) Result in the loss of forest land or conversion of forest land to non-forest use in a manner that will significantly affect timber, aesthetics, fish and wildlife, biodiversity, water quality, recreation, or other public benefits?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
e) Involve other changes in the existing environment which, due to their location or nature, could result in conversion of Farmland to non-agricultural use?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>

Discussion:

a/b/e: The project site is designated as 'Grazing Land' as shown on the Napa County Important Farmland Map 2016 prepared by the California Department of Conservation District, Division of Land Resource Protection, pursuant to the Farmland mapping and Monitoring Program of the California Resources Agency and no portion of the property qualifies as 'Prime' or 'Unique' farmland. Moreover, the subject property has a General Plan designation of Agriculture, Watershed, and Open Space (AWOS) and is zoned Agricultural Watershed: Airport Compatibility District (AW:AC), all of which allow single-family dwellings and accessory uses thereto.

¹ "Forest land" is defined by the State as "land that can support 10-percent native tree cover of any species, including hardwoods, under natural conditions, and that allows for management of one or more forest resources, including timber, aesthetics, fish and wildlife, biodiversity, water quality, recreation, and other public benefits." (Public Resources Code Section 12220(g)) The Napa County General Plan anticipates and does not preclude conversion of some "forest land" to agricultural use, and the program-level EIR for the 2008 General Plan Update analyzed the impacts of up to 12,500 acres of vineyard development between 2005 and 2030, with the assumption that some of this development would occur on "forest land." In that analysis specifically, and in the County's view generally, the conversion of forest land to agricultural use would constitute a potentially significant impact only if there were resulting significant impacts to sensitive species, biodiversity, wildlife movement, sensitive biotic communities listed by the California Department of Fish and Wildlife, water quality, or other environmental resources addressed in this checklist.

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

Within the study area, sensitive coast oak woodland is dominant along the hilltop and associated northern slope. The canopy is continuous, comprised primarily of large trees. Large cavities were observed within many of the oak trees. The understory is highly disturbed by non-native wildlife activity and dominance of non-native plant species. The study area contains 7.41 acres of sensitive coast oak woodland, 0.88 of which are within the project area. Twenty-three (23) individual oak trees are to be removed to accommodate the project (within or directly adjacent to the development footprint) and the remainder of the on-site oaks will be retained at an acreage ratio of greater than 9:1 which is substantially larger than the required 3:1 ratio (see Mitigation Measure BIO-1). Additionally, the overall health and condition of the retained trees is comparable, if not superior, to that of the trees scheduled for removal.

The subject property is not under a Williamson Act contract. Therefore, the project would not have an impact on farmland within Napa county or a Williamson Act contract. No impacts would occur.

c/d: The project site is zoned Agricultural Watershed:Airport Compatibility (AW:AC) which allows for the development of single-family residences and associated access roads. The proposed project will not conflict with existing zoning for or cause rezoning of forest land, timberland, or timberland zoned Timberland Production. The property is zoned for agricultural use and not forest or timberland use. Therefore there would be no impact.

Mitigation Measures: None required.

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

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

- | | | | | |
|---|--------------------------|--------------------------|-------------------------------------|--------------------------|
| a) Conflict with or obstruct implementation of the applicable air quality plan? | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> |
| b) Result in a cumulatively considerable net increase of any criteria pollutant for which the project region is non-attainment under an applicable federal or state ambient air quality standard? | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> |
| c) Expose sensitive receptors to substantial pollutant concentrations? | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> |
| d) Result in other emissions (such as those leading to odors adversely affecting a substantial number of people)? | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> |

Discussion:

On June 2, 2010, the Bay Area Air Quality Management District's (BAAQMD) Board of Directors unanimously adopted thresholds of significance to assist in the review of projects under the California Environmental Quality Act. These Thresholds are designed to establish the level at which BAAQMD believed air pollution emissions would cause significant environmental impacts under CEQA and were posted on BAAQMD's website and included in BAAQMD's updated CEQA Guidelines (updated May 2012). The Thresholds are advisory and may be followed by local agencies at their own discretion.

The Thresholds were challenged in court. Following litigation in the trial court, the court of appeal, and the California Supreme Court, all of the Thresholds were upheld. However, in an opinion issued on December 17, 2015, the California Supreme Court held that CEQA does not generally require an analysis of the impacts of locating development in areas subject to environmental hazards unless the project would exacerbate existing environmental hazards. The Supreme Court also found that CEQA requires the analysis of exposing people to environmental hazards in specific circumstances, including the location of development near airports, schools near sources of toxic

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

contamination, and certain exemptions for infill and workforce housing. The Supreme Court also held that public agencies remain free to conduct this analysis regardless of whether it is required by CEQA.

In view of the Supreme Court’s opinion, local agencies may rely on Thresholds designed to reflect the impact of locating development near areas of toxic air contamination where such an analysis is required by CEQA or where the agency has determined that such an analysis would assist in making a decision about the project. However, the Thresholds are not mandatory and agencies should apply them only after determining that they reflect an appropriate measure of a project’s impacts. These Guidelines may inform environmental review for development projects in the Bay Area, but do not commit local governments or BAAQMD to any specific course of regulatory action.

BAAQMD published a new version of the Guidelines dated May 2017, which includes revisions made to address the Supreme Court’s opinion. The May 2017 Guidelines update does not address outdated references, links, analytical methodologies or other technical information that may be in the Guidelines or Thresholds Justification Report. The Air District is currently working to revise any outdated information in the Guidelines as part of its update to the CEQA Guidelines and thresholds of significance.

a-b: The mountains bordering Napa Valley block much of the prevailing northwesterly winds throughout the year. Sunshine is plentiful in Napa County, and summertime can be very warm in the valley, particularly in the northern end. Winters are usually mild, with cool temperatures overnight and mild-to-moderate temperatures during the day. Wintertime temperatures tend to be slightly cooler in the northern end of the valley. Winds are generally calm throughout the county. Annual precipitation averages range from about 24 inches in low elevations to more than 40 inches in the mountains.

Ozone and fine particle pollution, or PM2.5, are the major regional air pollutants of concern in the San Francisco Bay Area. Ozone is primarily a problem in the summer, and fine particle pollution in the winter. In Napa County, ozone rarely exceeds health standards, but PM2.5 occasionally does reach unhealthy concentrations. There are multiple reasons for PM2.5 exceedances in Napa County. First, much of the county is wind-sheltered, which tends to trap PM2.5 within the Napa Valley. Second, much of the area is well north of the moderating temperatures of San Pablo Bay and, as a result, Napa County experiences some of the coldest nights in the Bay Area. This leads to greater fireplace use and, in turn, higher PM2.5 levels. Finally, in the winter easterly winds often move fine-particle-laden air from the Central Valley to the Carquinez Strait and then into western Solano and southern Napa County (BAAQMD, *In Your Community: Napa County*, April 2016)

The impacts associated with implementation of the project were evaluated consistent with guidance provided by BAAQMD. Ambient air quality standards have been established by state and federal environmental agencies for specific air pollutants most pervasive in urban environments. These pollutants are referred to as criteria air pollutants because the standards established for them were developed to meet specific health and welfare criteria set forth in the enabling legislation. The criteria air pollutants emitted by development, traffic and other activities anticipated under the proposed development include ozone, ozone precursors oxides of nitrogen and reactive organic gases (NOx and ROG), carbon monoxide (CO), nitrogen dioxide (NO2), and suspended particulate matter (PM10 and PM2.5). Other criteria pollutants, such as lead and sulfur dioxide (SO2), would not be substantially emitted by the proposed development or traffic, and air quality standards for them are being met throughout the Bay Area.

BAAQMD has not officially recommended the use of its thresholds in CEQA analyses and CEQA ultimately allows lead agencies the discretion to determine whether a particular environmental impact would be considered significant, as evidenced by scientific or other factual data. BAAQMD also states that lead agencies need to determine appropriate air quality thresholds to use for each project they review based on substantial evidence that they include in the administrative record of the CEQA document. One resource BAAQMD provides as a reference for determining appropriate thresholds is the *California Environmental Quality Act Air Quality Guidelines* developed by its staff in 2010 and as updated through May 2017. These guidelines outline substantial evidence supporting a variety of thresholds of significance.

As mentioned above, in 2010, the BAAQMD adopted and later incorporated into its 2011 CEQA Guidelines project screening criteria (Table 3-1 – Operational-Related Criteria Air Pollutant and Precursors Screening Level Sizes) and thresholds of significance for air pollutants, which have now been updated by BAAQMD through May 2017. The Air District’s threshold of significance provided in Table 3-1 has determined that 325 single family dwelling units will not significantly impact air quality and do not require further study (BAAQMD CEQA Guidelines, May 2017 Pages 3-2 & 3-3.). Given the size of the entire project, which is one single family dwelling unit, a second dwelling unit and associated access road compared to the BAAQMD’s screening

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

criterion of 325 single family dwelling units for NO_x (oxides of nitrogen), the project would contribute an insignificant amount of air pollution and would not result in a conflict or obstruction of an air quality plan.

The project falls well below the screening criteria as noted above, and consequently will not significantly affect air quality individually or contribute considerably to any cumulative air quality impacts.

c-d: In the short term, potential air quality impacts are most likely to result from earthmoving and construction activities required for project construction related to the residences and access driveway improvements. Earthmoving and construction emissions would have a temporary effect; consisting mainly of dust generated during grading and other construction activities, exhaust emissions from construction related equipment and vehicles, and relatively minor emissions from paints and other architectural coatings. The Air District recommends incorporating feasible control measures as a means of addressing construction impacts. If the proposed project adhere to these relevant best management practices identified by the Air District and the County's standard conditions of project approval, construction-related impacts are considered less than significant:

7.1 SITE IMPROVEMENTS

c. AIR QUALITY

During all construction activities the permittee shall comply with the most current version of BAAQMD Basic Construction Best Management Practices including but not limited to the following, as applicable:

1. *Post a publicly visible sign with the telephone number and person to contact at the lead agency regarding dust complaints. The BAAQMD's phone number shall also be visible.*
2. *Water all exposed surfaces (e.g., parking areas, staging areas, soil piles, grading areas, and unpaved access roads) two times per day.*
3. *Cover all haul trucks transporting soil, sand, or other loose material off-site.*
4. *Remove all visible mud or dirt traced onto adjacent public roads by using wet power vacuum street sweepers at least once per day. The use of dry power sweeping is prohibited.*
5. *All vehicle speeds on unpaved roads shall be limited to 15 mph.*
6. *All roadways, driveways, and sidewalks to be paved shall be completed as soon as possible. Building pads shall be laid as soon as possible after grading unless seeding or soil binders are used.*
7. *Idling times shall be minimized either by shutting off equipment when not in use or reducing the maximum idling time to five (5) minutes (as required by State Regulations). Clear signage shall be provided for construction workers at all access points.*
8. *All construction equipment shall be maintained and properly tuned in accordance with manufacturer's specifications. All equipment shall be checked by a certified visible emissions evaluator. Any portable engines greater than 50 horsepower or associated equipment operated within the BAAQMD's jurisdiction shall have either a California Air Resources Board (ARB) registration Portable Equipment Registration Program (PERP) or a BAAQMD permit. For general information regarding the certified visible emissions evaluator or the registration program, visit the ARB FAQ http://www.arb.ca.gov/portable/perp/perpfact_04-16-15.pdf or the PERP website <http://www.arb.ca.gov/portable/portable.htm>.*

Furthermore, while earthmoving and construction on the site would generate dust particulates in the short-term, the impact would be less than significant with dust control measures as specified in Napa County's standard condition of approval relating to dust:

7.1 SITE IMPROVEMENTS

b. DUST CONTROL

Water and/or dust palliatives shall be applied in sufficient quantities during grading and other ground disturbing activities on-site to minimize the amount of dust produced. Outdoor construction activities shall not occur when average wind speeds exceed 20 mph.

While the Air District defines public exposure to offensive odors as a potentially significant impact, single family residences are not known operational producers of pollutants capable of causing substantial negative impacts to sensitive receptors. The closest residence is approximately 650 feet to the west of the project site. Construction-phase pollutants would be reduced to a

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

less than significant level by the above-noted standard condition of approval. The project would not create pollutant concentrations or objectionable odors affecting a substantial number of people. Impacts would be less than significant.

Mitigation Measures: None required.

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

IV. BIOLOGICAL RESOURCES. Would the project:

- | | | | | |
|--|--------------------------|-------------------------------------|-------------------------------------|-------------------------------------|
| a) Have a substantial adverse effect, either directly or through habitat modifications, on any species identified as a candidate, sensitive, or special status species in local or regional plans, policies, or regulations, or by the California Department of Fish and Wildlife or the U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service? | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> |
| b) Have a substantial adverse effect on any riparian habitat or other sensitive natural community identified in local or regional plans, policies, regulations or by the California Department of Fish and Wildlife or U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service? | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> |
| c) Have a substantial adverse effect on state or federally protected wetlands (including, but not limited to, marsh, vernal pool, Coastal, etc.) through direct removal, filling, hydrological interruption, or other means? | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> |
| d) Interfere substantially with the movement of any native resident or migratory fish or wildlife species or with established native resident or migratory wildlife corridors, or impede the use of native wildlife nursery sites? | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> |
| e) Conflict with any local policies or ordinances protecting biological resources, such as a tree preservation policy or ordinance? | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> |
| f) Conflict with the provisions of an adopted Habitat Conservation Plan, Natural Community Conservation Plan, or other approved local, regional, or state habitat conservation plan? | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> |

Discussion:

A Biological Resources Survey (March, 2019) and an Addendum to the Biological Resources Survey (June 2019) were prepared for this property by WRA Environmental Consultants. This report and associated addendum were prepared to determine the presence or absence of biological resources and potential impacts, if any, as a result of this proposed project. Based on the presence of suitable habitat, two special-status bats, and one special-status bird have the potential to occur in the project area. The reports identify a seasonal wetland and an ephemeral stream on the property. The reports also identified 7.41 acres of oak woodlands across the property which are considered a sensitive species under the Napa County General Plan.

a-d. Within the study area, sensitive coast oak woodland is dominant along the hilltop and associated northern slope. The canopy is continuous, comprised primarily of large trees. Large cavities were observed within many of the oak trees. The understory is highly disturbed by non-native wildlife activity and dominance of non-native plant species. The study area contains 7.41 acres of sensitive coast oak woodland, 0.88 of which are within the project area. Twenty-three (23) individual oak trees are to be removed to accommodate the project (within or directly adjacent to the development footprint) and the remainder of the on-site oaks will be retained at an acreage ratio of greater than 9:1 which is substantially larger than the required 3:1 ratio (see Mitigation Measure BIO-1). Additionally, the overall health and condition of the retained trees is comparable, if not superior, to that of the trees scheduled for removal.

While no special-status wildlife species were observed in the project area, without targeted assessments, their presence cannot be ruled out. The large trees within the oak woodland forest do provide suitable breeding habitat for special-status wildlife, including oak titmouse, swainson's hawk, white-tailed kite, pallid bats, and fringed myotis (bat). Some trees within the project area that are scheduled for removal, contain cavities or snags that are suitable for roosting. As described in the mitigation measures section

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

below, work shall occur outside of nesting season if feasible and if not, then a preconstruction nesting bird survey is recommended prior to any site disturbance.

The biological evaluations for this property included protocols for the detection of wetlands and potential impacts of the project's development on adjacent wetland/riparian habitat. Within the subject property, the biological report identified the presence of an ephemeral stream and a wetland. The seasonal wetland and ephemeral stream will be entirely avoided by development; the proposed residential structure would be located approximately 250 ft. southwest. The existing wellhead and pad-mounted transformer in the northern portion of the property are located within 50 feet of the seasonal wetland, and these elements are needed to supply servicing to the new residences (Mitigation Measure BIO-2). The footprint of the new utility line would be located a minimum distance of 50 feet from the wetland boundary save for the portion of the line that is required to tie into the existing transformer. Groundbreaking and construction shall occur during the dry season (Mitigation Measure BIO-3) and protective setbacks will buffer any potential effects to the on-site aquatic resources.

- e. As illustrated in the submitted plans, up to 23 oak trees may be removed as part of the proposed project. Impacts would be less than significant with the implementation of mitigation measures BIO-5 and BIO-6 consistent with General Plan Policy CON-24(c) which requires the provision of replacement of lost oak or preservation of like habitat at a 3:1 ration when retention of existing vegetation is found to be infeasible. Retention of these oak trees was determined to be infeasible as it would require the disturbance of sloped areas in excess of 30 percent to relocate the proposed home site.
- f. The proposed project would not conflict with the provisions of an adopted Habitat Conservation Plan, Natural Community Conservation Plan, or other approved local, regional, or state habitat conservation plan because there are no plans applicable to the subject site. No impacts would occur.

Mitigation Measures:

BIO-1. An area of oak woodlands in the study area that is a minimum of three times the size and of an equivalent kind and quality of the area of oak woodlands impacted shall be identified to be retained on-site to compensate for the loss of oak woodland. Prior to issuance of a grading permit, oak woodland areas identified for preservation in perpetuity shall be identified in a deed restriction, conservation easement to be held by an organization such as the Napa County Regional Park and Open Space District or Land Trust of Napa County (as the grantee), or other means of permanent protection acceptable to Napa County.

The final location subject to deed restriction/conservation easement shall be selected based on its ecological value and shall be identified in conjunction with the property owner and Napa County prior to any vegetation removal, grading, and earthmoving activities. The deed restriction/conservation easement in a form acceptable to Napa County shall be recorded in the Official Records of Napa County prior to the commencement of any vegetation removal, grading, and earthmoving activities.

Monitoring: Proof of recordation of the deed restriction/conservation easement shall be submitted to Planning Division staff prior to issuance of the grading permit.

BIO-2. For the seasonal wetland, development (including utility installation) shall be set back a minimum of 50 feet from the wetland's boundary, save only where it is necessary to tie the new utility line into the existing, pad-mounted transformer (located within 50 feet of the wetland). The footprint of the utility line shall exit the 50-foot setback as efficiently as feasible. A minimum 35-foot setback shall be maintained from the ephemeral stream. Impacts to Soscol Creek (adjacent to the study area) shall be completely avoided.

Monitoring: Development of the project shall occur consistent with approved project plans and shall be verified in the field prior to final approval of the project.

BIO-3. Construction personnel shall be informed of the location of the site's aquatic resources with high-visibility flagging or staking prior to construction. No materials or equipment shall be lain down in or near the aquatic resources, and spill

prevention materials shall be deployed for all construction equipment. Throughout the duration of construction, an erosion control fence shall be installed and effectively maintained between areas of ground disturbance and the seasonal wetland and ephemeral stream.

Monitoring: Prior to commencement of work on the project, all project personnel shall attend a preconstruction environmental training to review potential special-status wildlife that could be found in the Project Area and to ensure that mitigation measures for the project are understood and implemented. Proof of such training shall be submitted to the Planning Division prior to issuance of a grading permit.

BIO-4. Tree trimming and/or removal should only be conducted during seasonal periods of bat activity; August 31 through October 15, when young bats would be able to fly and forage independently, and March 1 to April 15 to avoid hibernating bats, and prior to formation of maternity colonies. Any trees proposed for removal containing suitable bat roost habitat shall be removed using a two-day phased removal method. On day one (in the afternoon), limbs and branches would be removed using chainsaws only. Limbs with cavities, crevices, and deep bark fissures would be avoided. On day two, the rest of the tree would be removed under the supervision of a qualified bat expert. If tree removal must occur outside of the seasonal activity periods mentioned above, i.e., between October 16 and February 28/29, or between April 16 and April 30, a qualified bat expert should conduct pre-construction surveys within 14 days of starting construction. Survey methods, timing, duration, and species should be reviewed and approved by CDFW prior to starting construction. If bats or evidence of their presence is found during the survey then the qualified bat expert should develop a plan for removal and exclusion, in conjunction with CDFW.

Monitoring: If trees are to be removed outside of the dates listed above, the pre-construction bat survey shall be submitted to Planning Division staff prior to issuance of the grading permit.

BIO-5. Prior to working on the Project, the project sponsor shall hire a qualified biologist to conduct pre-construction surveys for special status bird species, nesting birds, and raptors. The pre-construction surveys shall include the following:

- a.) Conduct clearing and tree and shrub removal operations between September 1 and February 14 to minimize potential impacts to nesting birds
- b.) Conduct pre-construction survey for active migratory bird and raptor nests within 14 days to 72 hours prior to commencement of constructions activities or tree removal, if anticipated to commence during the nesting season (February 15 – August 31).
 - i. If an active nest is found, the area around the tree with the active nest will be marked with high visibility fencing or flagging and the qualified biologist shall determine a suitable buffer distance to avoid nest disturbance during Project activities.
 - ii. The qualified biologist should supervise nest activity during the first couple of days of construction to ensure construction activities are not disturbing the nest.
 - iii. Alternatively, construction can wait until September 1 or until the young have fledged, or a qualified biologist has determined the nest is no longer active, whichever comes first.

Monitoring: If vegetation clearing or other land disturbance is proposed during the bird breeding season (February 15 through August 31), the special-status bird species and other migratory passerines (perching birds) survey shall be submitted to Planning Division staff prior to issuance of the grading permit.

	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporation	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
V. CULTURAL RESOURCES. Would the project:				
a) Cause a substantial adverse change in the significance of a historical resource pursuant to CEQA Guidelines §15064.5?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
b) Cause a substantial adverse change in the significance of an archaeological resource pursuant to CEQA Guidelines §15064.5?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
c) Disturb any human remains, including those interred outside of dedicated cemeteries?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>

Discussion:

a-d. Except for the vineyard, the project site is vacant and does not contain any structures within the development area. According to the Napa County Environmental Resources Map (based on the following layers – Cultural Resources: Historical Sites, Arch Sensitive Areas, Arch Sites, and Arch Surveys) archaeological sites have been identified in proximity to the site. An Archaeological Resource Study was prepared by William Roop of Archaeological Resource Service (June, 2019). This study was conducted to determine the presence or absence of archaeological resources and potential impacts, if any, as a result of the proposed project. This cultural resource evaluation has resulted in a negative finding. A negative result indicates that no artifacts or potentially significant cultural features were observed. The potential for undiscovered resources is low in the proposed residential site, and low to medium within the driveway. No indications of the presence of potentially significant cultural resources were observed at any examined location. While potentially significant cultural resources have been identified nearby in association with Suscol Creek, the investigation found no indication that these resources are present in the project area. If archaeological resources are found during any earth disturbing activities associated with the project, construction of the project is required to cease, and a qualified archaeologist will be retained to investigate the site in accordance with the following standard condition of approval:

7.2: Archaeological Finding

In the event that archaeological artifacts or human remains are discovered during construction, work shall cease in a 50-foot radius surrounding the area of discovery. The permittee shall contact the PBES Department for further guidance, which will likely include the requirement for the permittee to hire a qualified professional to analyze the artifacts encountered and to determine if additional measures are required.

If human remains are encountered during project development, all work in the vicinity must be halted, and the Napa County Coroner informed, so that the coroner can determine if an investigation of the cause of death is required, and if the remains are of Native American origin. If the remains are of Native American origin, the permittee shall comply with the requirements of Public Resources Code Section 5097.98.

Mitigation Measures: None required.

	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporation	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
VI. ENERGY. Would the project:				
a) Result in potentially significant environmental impact due to wasteful, inefficient or unnecessary consumption of energy resources during project construction or operation?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
b) Conflict with or obstruct a state or local plan for renewable energy or energy efficiency?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>

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

Discussion:

- a. The proposed project would comply with energy use requirements and would not result in significant environmental impacts due to wasteful, inefficient, or unnecessary consumption of energy resources during project construction or operation. Impacts would be less than significant.
- b. The proposed project would not conflict with the provisions of a state or local plan for renewable energy or energy efficiency because there are no plans applicable to the subject site. No impacts would occur.

Mitigation Measures: None required.

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

VII. GEOLOGY AND SOILS. Would the project:

- | | | | | |
|--|--------------------------|--------------------------|-------------------------------------|--------------------------|
| a) Directly or indirectly cause potential substantial adverse effects, including the risk of loss, injury, or death involving: | | | | |
| i) Rupture of a known earthquake fault, as delineated on the most recent Alquist-Priolo Earthquake Fault Zoning Map issued by the State Geologist for the area or based on other substantial evidence of a known fault? Refer to Division of Mines and Geology Special Publication 42. | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> |
| ii) Strong seismic ground shaking? | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> |
| iii) Seismic-related ground failure, including liquefaction? | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> |
| iv) Landslides? | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> |
| b) Result in substantial soil erosion or the loss of topsoil? | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> |
| c) Be located on a geologic unit or soil that is unstable, or that would become unstable as a result of the project, and potentially result in on- or off-site landslide, lateral spreading, subsidence, liquefaction or collapse? | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> |
| d) Be located on expansive soil creating substantial direct or indirect risks to life or property? Expansive soil is defined as soil having an expansive index greater than 20, as determined in accordance with ASTM (American Society of Testing and Materials) D 4829. | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> |
| e) Have soils incapable of adequately supporting the use of septic tanks or alternative waste water disposal systems where sewers are not available for the disposal of waste water? | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> |
| f) Directly or indirectly destroy a unique paleontological resource or site or unique geologic feature? | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> |

Discussion:

- a.
 - i.) There are no known faults on the project site as shown on the most recent Alquist-Priolo Earthquake Fault Zoning Map. As such, the proposed project would result in a less than significant impact with regards to rupturing a known fault.
 - ii.) All areas of the Bay Area are subject to strong seismic ground shaking. Construction of the project would be required to comply with the latest building standards and codes, including the California Building Code that would reduce any potential impacts to a less than significant level.

- | | Potentially
Significant
Impact | Less Than
Significant
With
Mitigation
Incorporation | Less Than
Significant
Impact | No Impact |
|---|--------------------------------------|---|------------------------------------|-----------|
| iii.) No subsurface conditions have been identified on the project site that indicated a susceptibility to seismic-related ground failure or liquefaction. Compliance with the latest edition of the California Building Code for seismic stability would result in less than significant impacts. | | | | |
| iv.) According to the Napa County Environmental Resource Maps (Landslides line, polygon, and geology layers) there is a known landslide deposit area located in the southwest quadrant of the subject parcel. However, because no grading or development is proposed for this area, impacts would be less than significant. | | | | |
| b. The proposed improvements would occur on slopes of five percent to 22 percent. The project would require incorporation of best management practices and would be subject to the Napa County Stormwater Ordinance which addresses sediment and erosion control measures and dust control as applicable. Impacts would be less than significant. | | | | |
| c/d. Based on the Napa County Environmental Sensitivity Maps (liquefaction layer) the improvements are proposed for an area which has a very low susceptibility for liquefaction. Soil types include Bale Clay Loam, 0 to 2 percent slopes; Hambright-Rock Outcrop complex, 30 to 75 percent slopes; and rock outcrops. Impacts would be less than significant. | | | | |
| e. The site's wastewater system for the proposed single-family residence and Accessory Dwelling Unit was reviewed and concurred with findings made by the Division of Environmental Health based on the wastewater system's consistency with County standards. Impacts would be less than significant. | | | | |
| f. Based on the Cultural Resource Evaluation prepared by William Roop of the Archaeological Resource Service, dated June, 2019, there are no known unique paleontological resources or unique geologic features that will be effected by the proposed project. If resources are found during any earth disturbing activities associated with the project, construction of the project is required to cease, and a qualified archaeologist would be retained to investigate the site in accordance with standard condition of approval 7.2 identified in Section V above. Impacts would be less than significant. | | | | |

Mitigation Measures: None required.

	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporation	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
VIII. GREENHOUSE GAS EMISSIONS. Would the project:				
a) Generate a net increase in greenhouse gas emissions in excess of applicable thresholds adopted by the Bay Area Air Quality Management District or the California Air Resources Board which may have a significant impact on the environment?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
b) Conflict with a county-adopted climate action plan or another applicable plan, policy or regulation adopted for the purpose of reducing the emissions of greenhouse gases?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>

Discussion:

Napa County has been working to develop a Climate Action Plan (CAP) for several years. In 2012, a Draft CAP (March 2012) was recommended using the emissions checklist in the Draft CAP, on a trial basis, to determine potential greenhouse gas (GHG) emissions associated with project development and operation. At the December 11, 2012, Napa County Board of Supervisors (BOS) hearing, the BOS considered adoption of the proposed CAP. In addition to reducing Napa County's GHG emissions, the proposed plan was intended to address compliance with CEQA for projects reviewed by the County and to lay the foundation for development of a local offset program. While the BOS acknowledged the plan's objectives, the BOS requested that the CAP be revised to better address transportation-related greenhouse gas, to acknowledge and credit past accomplishments and voluntary efforts, and to allow more time for establishment of a

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

cost-effective local offset program. The Board also requested that best management practices be applied and considered when reviewing projects until a revised CAP is adopted to ensure that projects address the County’s policy goal related to reducing GHG emissions.

In July 2015, the County re-commenced preparation of the CAP to: i) account for present day conditions and modeling assumptions (such as but not limited to methods, emission factors, and data sources), ii) address the concerns with the previous CAP effort as outlined above, iii) meet applicable State requirements, and iv) result in a functional and legally defensible CAP. On April 13, 2016 the County, as part of the first phase of development and preparation of the CAP, released Final Technical Memorandum #1: 2014 Greenhouse Gas Emissions Inventory and Forecast, April 13, 2016. This initial phase included: i) updating the unincorporated County’s community-wide GHG emissions inventory to 2014, and ii) preparing new GHG emissions forecasts for the 2020, 2030, and 2050 horizons. Additional information on the County CAP can be obtained at the Napa County Department of Planning, Building and Environmental Services or <http://www.countyofnapa.org/CAP/>. The final draft of the CAP was released on June 5, 2017 for public review and Planning Commission consideration and recommendation to the Board of Supervisors. A Revised Draft CAP and Notice of Preparation (NOP) for the Draft Environmental Impact Report (EIR) to be prepared were released for public review on July 24, 2018. Comments on both were solicited at the Planning Commission hearing of August 15, 2018. Based on comments received, a Second Revised Draft CAP and released for public review on May 10, 2019 concurrent with a Draft EIR.

a/b. Overall increases in Greenhouse Gas (GHG) emissions in Napa County were assessed in the Environmental Impact Report (EIR) prepared for the Napa County General Plan Update and certified in June 2008. GHG emissions were found to be significant and unavoidable in that document, despite the adoption of mitigation measures incorporating specific policies and action items into the General Plan.

Consistent with these General Plan action items, Napa County participated in the development of a community-wide GHG emissions inventory and “emission reduction framework” for all local jurisdictions in the County in 2008-2009. This planning effort was completed by the Napa County Transportation and Planning Agency in December 2009, and served as the basis for development of a refined inventory and emission reduction plan for unincorporated Napa County.

In 2011, the Bay Area Air Quality Management District (BAAQMD) released California Environmental Quality Act (CEQA) Project Screening Criteria and Significance of Thresholds [1,100 metric tons per year (MT) of carbon dioxide and carbon dioxide equivalents (CO₂e)]. This threshold of significance is appropriate for evaluating projects in Napa County.

During our ongoing planning effort, the County requires project applicants to consider methods to reduce GHG emissions consistent with Napa County General Plan Policy CON-65(e). (Note: Pursuant to State CEQA Guidelines Section 15183, because this initial study assesses a project that is consistent with an adopted General Plan for which an environmental impact report (EIR) was prepared, it appropriately focuses on impacts which are “peculiar to the project,” rather than the cumulative impacts previously assessed.)

The proposed project has been evaluated against the BAAQMD thresholds and it was determined that the project would not exceed the 1,100 MT/yr of CO₂e. Greenhouse Gas Emission reductions from local programs and project level actions, such as application of the Cal Green Building Code and vehicle fuel efficiency standards, would combine to further reduce emissions below BAAQMD thresholds.

The anticipated increase in emissions from the construction of the new paved access roadway, single-family residence and accessory dwelling unit would be minor and the project is in compliance with the County’s efforts to reduce emissions as described above. Accordingly, projects impacts would be less than significant.

Mitigation Measures: None required.

	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporation	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
IX. HAZARDS AND HAZARDOUS MATERIALS. Would the project				
a) Create a significant hazard to the public or the environment through the routine transport, use, or disposal of hazardous materials?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
b) Create a significant hazard to the public or the environment through reasonable foreseeable upset and accident conditions involving the release of hazardous materials into the environment?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
c) Emit hazardous emissions or handle hazardous or acutely hazardous materials, substances, or waste within one-quarter mile of an existing or proposed school?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
d) Be located on a site which is included on a list of hazardous materials sites compiled pursuant to Government Code Section 65962.5 and, as a result, would it create a significant hazard to the public or the environment?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
e) For a project located within an airport land use plan or, where such a plan has not been adopted, within two miles of a public airport or public use airport, would the project result in a safety hazard or excessive noise for people residing or working in the project area?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
f) Impair implementation of or physically interfere with an adopted emergency response plan or emergency evacuation plan?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
g) Expose people or structures, either directly or indirectly, to a significant risk of loss, injury or death involving wild-land fires, including where wild-lands?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>

Discussion:

- a. The proposed project would not involve the transport of hazardous materials other than those small amounts utilized for a typical single-family residence. Impacts would be less than significant
- b. Hazardous materials such as diesel, maintenance fluids, and paints would be used onsite during construction. Should they be stored onsite, these materials would be stored in secure locations to reduce the potential for upset or accident conditions. The proposed project consists of the construction a new single-family residence, accessory dwelling unit, and associated access road which would not be expected to use any substantial quantities of hazardous materials. Therefore, it would not be reasonably assumed for the proposed project to create upset or accident conditions that involve the release of hazardous materials into the environments. Impacts would be less than significant.
- c. There are no schools located within one-quarter mile from the project site. According to Google Earth, the nearest schools to the project site are The Napa County Community School approximately 2.5 miles north, Mt. George Elementary School approximately 3.7 miles north, and the Napa Christian Campus of Education approximately 4.3 miles northwest. No impacts would occur.
- d. Based on a search of the California Toxic Substances Control Database, the project site does not contain any known EPA National Priority List sites, State response sites, voluntary cleanup sites, or any school cleanup sites. No impact would occur as the project site is not on any known list of hazardous materials sites.
- e. The project site is located within two miles of the Napa County Airport, and is therefore subject to the requirements of the County's Airport Compatibility Combination zoning district and the requirements of the Napa County Airport Land Use Compatibility Plan (ALUCP). While the subject parcel is located within both Compatibility Zones D and E of the Airport Land Use area, the development area of the proposed residence is entirely within Zone E, which is defined as "Other Airport Environs" in the Airport Land Use Compatibility Plan. The proposed residential use is considered to be compatible with the risk and noise impacts associated with parcels within Zone E. As a condition of approval, the project will require an overflight easement be recorded on the property that provides for the right of aircraft operation, overflight and related noises, and for the regulation of light emissions, electrical emissions, or the release of substances such as steam or smoke which could interfere with aircraft operations as required by Section 18.80.030 of the Napa County Municipal Code.

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

18.80.030 ALUCP Zone E Regulations

A. Overflight easements in a form acceptable to the airport proprietor shall be required as a condition of subdivision approval and/or discretionary permits for new construction, and for any project requiring a building permit. Such easements shall be prepared prior to issuance of a building permit or recordation of a final map.

- f. The proposed driveway that would serve the project will be designed to comply with County standards and access to the building has been designed to accommodate fire apparatus and large trucks. The project has been reviewed by the County Fire Department and Engineering Services Division and found acceptable as conditioned. Therefore, the design of the project will not negatively impact or hinder emergency vehicle access.
- g. The project would not increase exposure of people and/or structures to a significant loss, injury, or death involving wild land fires. The proposed driveway would provide adequate access to Soscol Creek Road. The project would comply with current California Department of Forestry and California Building Code requirements for fire safety. Impacts would be less than significant.

Mitigation Measures: None required.

	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporation	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
X. HYDROLOGY AND WATER QUALITY. Would the project:				
a) Violate any water quality standards or waste discharge requirements or otherwise substantially degrade surface or groundwater quality?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
b) Substantially decrease groundwater supplies or interfere substantially with groundwater recharge such that the project may impede sustainable groundwater management of the basin?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
c) Substantially alter the existing drainage pattern of the site or area, including through the alteration of the course of a stream or river or through the addition of impervious surfaces which would:				
i) result in substantial erosion or siltation on- or off-site?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
ii) substantially increase the rate or amount of surface runoff in a manner which would result in flooding on- or off-site?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
iii) create or contribute runoff water which would exceed the capacity of existing or planned stormwater drainage systems or provide substantial additional sources of polluted runoff?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
iv) impede or redirect flood flows?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
d) In flood hazard, tsunami, or seiche zones, risk release of pollutants due to project inundation?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
e) Conflict with or obstruct implementation of a water quality control plan or sustainable groundwater management plan?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>

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

Discussion:

On January 14, 2014, Governor Jerry Brown declared a drought emergency in the State of California. That declaration was followed up on April 1, 2015, when the Governor directed the State Water Resources Control Board to implement mandatory water reductions in cities and towns across California to reduce water usage by 25 percent. These water restrictions do not apply to agricultural uses, However, on April 7, 2017, Governor Jerry Brown signed an executive order lifting California's drought emergency in all but four counties (Fresno, Kings, Tulare, and Tuolumne). The County of Napa had not adopted or implemented any additional mandatory water use restrictions. The County requires all Use Permit applicants to complete necessary water analyses in order to document that sufficient water supplies are available for the proposed project and to implement water saving measures to prepare for periods of limited water supply and to conserve limited groundwater resources.

In general, recent studies have found that groundwater levels in the Napa Valley Floor exhibit stable long-term trends with a shallow depth to water. Historical trends in the Milliken-Sarco-Tulucay (MST) area, however, have shown increasing depths to groundwater, but recent stabilization in many locations. Groundwater availability, recharges, storage, and yield are not consistent across the County. More is known about the resource where historical data have been collected. Less is known in areas with limited data or unknown geology. In order to fill existing data gaps and to provide a better understanding of groundwater resources in the County, the Napa County Groundwater Monitoring Plan recommended 18 Areas of Interest (AOIs) for additional groundwater level and water quality monitoring. Through the well owner and public outreach efforts of the Groundwater Resources Advisory Committee (GRAC), approximately 40 new wells have been added to the monitoring program in these areas. Groundwater Sustainability Objectives were developed and recommended by the GRAC and adopted by the Board. The recommendations included the goal of developing sustainability objectives, provided a definition, explained the shared responsibility of Groundwater Sustainability, and the important role of monitoring as a means to achieving groundwater sustainability.

In 2009 Napa County began a comprehensive study of its groundwater resources to meet identified action items in the County's 2008 General Plan update. The study, by Luhdorff and Scalmanini Consulting Engineers (LSCE), emphasized developing a sound understanding of groundwater conditions and implementing an expanded groundwater monitoring and data management program as a foundation for integrated water resources planning and dissemination of water resources information. The 2011 baseline study by LSCE, which included over 600 wells and data going back over 50 years, concluded that "the groundwater levels in Napa County are stable, except for portions of the MST district." Most wells elsewhere within the Napa Valley floor with a sufficient record indicate that groundwater levels are more affected by climatic conditions, are within historical levels, and seem to recover from dry periods during subsequent wet or normal periods. The LSCE Study also concluded that, on a regional scale, there appears to be no current groundwater quality issues except north of Calistoga (mostly naturally occurring boron and trace metals) and in the Carneros Region (mostly salinity). The subject property is located within the Jameson/American Canyon subarea of Napa County according to the Napa County Groundwater Monitoring Plan 2013. The County has no record of problems or complaints of diminished groundwater at the project site or in the general vicinity.

Minimum thresholds for water use have been established by the department of Public Works using reports by the United States Geological Survey (USGS). These reports are the result of water resources investigations performed by the USGS in cooperation with the napa County Flood Control and Water Conservation District. Any project which reduces water usage or any water usage which is at or below the established threshold is assumed not to have a significant effect on groundwater levels. The project site is considered "all other areas" based upon current County Water Availability Analysis policies. Permeability of the Bale Clay Loam soil is moderate with a water table typically within four feet of the surface (Soil Survey of Napa County, California, 1978). The Hambright-Rock Outcrop complex soil series also has moderate permeability (Soil Survey of Napa County, California, 1978). Based on the parcel's size and soil characteristics, the estimated groundwater recharge rate for the site is anticipated to far exceed the project's proposed water demand for the new single-family residence.

- a/b. The project is not expected to violate any water quality standards or waste discharge requirements nor substantially deplete local groundwater supplies. The site's wastewater system for the proposed project was reviewed and approved by the County Division of Environmental Health.

The total projected water demand for the parcel would be 1.5 acre-feet per year based on a conservative estimate of average water demand of the proposed residential use.

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

Projected Water Demand	Water Use (acre-feet/year)
Single-Family Residence (includes landscaping)	1.00
Accessory Dwelling Unit	0.5
TOTAL	1.50

The estimated water demand, based on conservative assumptions of the water usage for residential development, of 1.5 af/yr is below the projected minimum annual recharge for the parcel based on the site's soil characteristics and size.

In response to regional drought and the general Statewide need to protect groundwater resources, the Governor enacted new legislation requiring local governments to monitor and manage groundwater resources. Napa County's prior work on the Napa Valley Groundwater Management Plan provides a strong foundation for Napa County to comply with this State mandated monitoring and management objective. As a direct result, the project site is now subject to this new legislation requiring local agencies too monitor groundwater use. Assembly Bill AB 1739 by Assembly member Roger Dickinson (D-Sacramento) and Senate Bills 1168 and 1319 by Senator Fran Pavley (D-Agoura Hills) establish a framework for sustainable, local groundwater management for the first time in California history. The legislation requires local agencies to tailor sustainable groundwater plans to their regional economic and environmental needs. The legislation prioritizes groundwater basin management Statewide, which includes the Napa Valley/Napa River Drainage Basin, and sets a timeline for implementation of the following:

- By 2017, local groundwater management agencies must be identified;
- By 2020, overdrafted groundwater basins must have sustainability plans;
- By 2022, other high and medium priority basins not currently in overdraft must have sustainability plans; and
- By 2040, all high and medium priority groundwater basins must achieve sustainability.

The State has classified the Napa River Drainage Basin as a medium priority resource. Additionally, the legislation provides measurable objectives and milestones to reach sustainability and a State role of limited intervention when local agencies are unable or unwilling to adopt sustainable management plans. Napa county supports this legislation and has begun the process of developing a local groundwater management agency which is anticipated to be in place and functioning within the timeline prescribed by the State.

The proposed project would result in a modest increase on the demand of ground water supplies and therefore would not interfere with groundwater recharge or lowering of the local groundwater level. There are no known offsite wells located within 500 feet of the project well. According to Napa County environmental resource mapping (*Water Deficient Areas/Storage Areas*), the project site is not located within a water deficient area and the County is not aware of, nor has it received any reports of groundwater deficiencies in the area. Impacts would be less than significant.

- c/d. Any drainage alterations would be included in the grading and improvement plans that are required for project construction. The applicant is required to submit a Notice of Intent (NOI) for a Storm Water Pollution Prevention Plan permit (SWPPP) from the Regional Water Quality Control Board for pre & post construction activities, as well as a grading permit from the Engineering Services Division to ensure that no excessive run-off occurs during pre/post construction. Review and approval by the Division of Engineering of the grading and improvement plans will ensure that no there is no potential for significant on- or off-site erosion, impact to blue-line streams, siltation, or flooding.
- e. There are no existing or planned stormwater systems that would be affected by this project. The area surrounding the dwellings is pervious ground with the capacity to absorb runoff.
- f. There is nothing included in this proposal that would otherwise substantially degrade water quality. No information has been encountered that would indicate a substantial impact to water quality.
- g-i. The project site is not located within a flood hazard area, nor would it impede or redirect flood flows or expose structures or people to flooding. The project site is not located within a dam or levee failure inundation zone.

	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporation	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
j. The parcel is not located in an area that is subject to inundation by tsunamis, seiches, or mudflows.				
<u>Mitigation Measures:</u> None required.				

	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporation	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
XI. LAND USE AND PLANNING. Would the project:				
a) Physically divide an established community?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
b) Cause a significant environmental impact due to a conflict with any land use plan, policy, or regulation adopted for the purpose of avoiding or mitigating an environmental effect?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>

Discussion:

a-b. The project would not occur within an established community, nor would it result in the division of an established community.

The project complies with the Napa County Code and all other applicable regulations. Mitigation Measures BIO-1 through BIO-5, discussed under “Biological Resources” Section above, are intended to address any potential biological impacts from the proposed project and are precautionary in nature. The subject parcel is located within the AW (Agricultural Watershed) zoning district, which allows single-family residential development such as the proposed project. The proposed project is compliant with the physical limitations of the Napa County Zoning Ordinance. The property’s General Plan Designation is AWOS (Agriculture, Watershed, and Open Space) which allows “agriculture, processing or agricultural products, and single-family dwellings.” Impacts would be less than significant.

Mitigation Measures: None required.

	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporation	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
XII. MINERAL RESOURCES. Would the project:				
a) Result in the loss of availability of a known mineral resource that would be of value to the region and the residents of the state?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
b) Result in the loss of availability of a locally-important mineral resource recovery site delineated on a local general plan, specific plan or other land use plan?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>

Discussion:

a/b. Historically, the two most valuable mineral commodities in Napa County in economic terms have been mercury and mineral water. More recently, building stone and aggregate have become economically valuable. Mines and Mineral Deposits mapping included in the Napa County Baseline Data Report (*Mines and Mineral Deposits*, BDR Figure 2-2) indicates that there are no known mineral resources nor any locally important mineral resource recovery sites located on the project site.

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

Mitigation Measures: None required.

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

XIII. NOISE. Would the project result in:

- | | | | | | |
|----|--|--------------------------|--------------------------|-------------------------------------|-------------------------------------|
| a) | Generation of a substantial temporary or permanent increase in ambient noise levels in the vicinity of the project in excess of standards established in the local general plan or noise ordinance, or applicable standards of other agencies? | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> |
| b) | Generation of excessive groundborne vibration or groundborne noise levels? | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> |
| c) | For a project located within the vicinity of a private airstrip or an airport land use plan or, where such a plan has not been adopted, within two miles of a public airport or public use airport, would the project expose people residing or working in the project area to excessive noise levels? | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> |

Discussion:

a/b. The project would result in a temporary increase in noise levels during construction of the proposed residences and driveway improvements. Construction activities would be limited to daylight hours using properly muffled vehicles. Noise generated during this time is not anticipated to be significant. Because the proposed development is approximately 650 feet to the east from the nearest neighboring residence, there is a low potential for impacts related to construction noise to result in a significant impact. Further, construction activities would occur during the period of 7 AM to 7 PM on weekdays, during normal hours of human activity. All construction activities would be conducted in compliance with the Napa County Noise Ordinance (Napa County Municipal Code Section 8.16). The proposed project would not result in long-term significant permanent noise impacts because residential land use is proposed. Continuing enforcement of Napa County’s Noise Ordinance by the Division of Environmental Health and the Napa County Sheriff, as needed, would further ensure that the single-family residence does not create a significant noise impact. Impacts would be less than significant.

7.3 Construction Noise

Construction noise shall be minimized to the greatest extent practica and feasible under State and Local safety laws, consistent with construction noise levels permitted by the General Plan Community Character Element and the County Noise Ordinance. Construction equipment muffling and hours of operation shall be in compliance with the County Code. Equipment shall be shut down when not in use. Construction equipment shall be staged, loaded, and unloaded on the project site, if at all practicable. If project terrain or access road conditions require constrction equipment to be staged, loaded, or unloaded off the project site (such as on a neighboring road ro at the base of a hill), such activities only shall occur daily between the hours of 8:00 AM to 5:00 PM.

- c. The development area of the project is located within Airport Compatibility Zone E as identified in the County of Napa Airport Land Use Compatibility Plan (ALUCP). Per Chapter 5 of the ALUCP, an analysis of the underlying land use designations, noise compatibility criteria, and the projected noise contours indicate that noise exposure levels will not present a significant problem with respect to land use compatibility in the Airport’s environs. Residential development is limited to areas outside of the common traffic pattern; residential development uses are only permitted in Zone E. Therefore, impacts would be less than significant.

Mitigation Measures: None required.

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

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

XIV. POPULATION AND HOUSING. Would the project:

- | | | | | |
|---|--------------------------|--------------------------|--------------------------|-------------------------------------|
| a) Induce substantial unplanned population growth in an area, either directly (for example, by proposing new homes and businesses) or indirectly (for example, through extension of roads or other infrastructure)? | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> |
| b) Displace substantial numbers of existing people or housing, necessitating the construction of replacement housing elsewhere? | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> |

Discussion:

- a. The Association of Bay Area Governments' Projections 2003 figures indicate that the total population of Napa County is projected to increase some 23 percent by the year 2030 (Napa County Baseline Data Report, Novemebr 30, 2005). Additionally, the County's Baseline Data Report indicates that total housing units currently programmed in county and municipal housing elements exceed ABAG growth projections by approximately 15 percent. The project will be subject to the County's housing impact mitigation fee, which provides funding to meet local housing needs.

Cumulative impacts related to population and housing balance were identified in the 2008 General Plan Environmental Impact Report (EIR). As set forth in Government Code §65580, the County of Napa must facilitate the improvement and development of housing to make adequate provision for the housing needs of all economic segments of the community. Similarly, CEQA recognizes the importance of balancing prevention of environmental damage with the provision of a "decent home and satisfying living environment for every Californian." (See Public Resources Code § 21000(g)). The 2008 General Plan sets forth the County's long-range plan for meeting regional housing needs, during the present and future housing cycles, while balancing environmental, economic, and fiscal factors and community goals. The policies and programs identified in the General Plan Housing Element function, in combination with the County's housing impact mitigation fee, to ensure adequate cumulative volume and diversity of housing. Cumulative impacts on the local and regional population and housing balance will be less than significant.

- b. There are no existing homes on the project parcel. The project will not result in the displacement of any housing units or people.

Mitigation Measures: None required.

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

XV. PUBLIC SERVICES. Would the project result in:

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

	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporation	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
i) Fire protection?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
ii) Police protection?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
iii) Schools?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
iv) Parks?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
v) Other public facilities?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>

Discussion:

- a. Public services are currently provided to the project site and the additional demand placed on existing services would be marginal. Fire protection measures are required as part of the development pursuant to the Napa County Fire Marshall conditions of approval and there will be no foreseeable impact to emergency response times with the adoption of standard conditions of approval. The Fire Department and Engineering Services Division have reviewed the application and recommend approval, as conditioned. School impact mitigation fees, which assist local school districts with capacity building measures, will be levied pursuant to building permit submittal. The proposed project will have little to no impact on public parks. County revenue resulting from any building permit fees and property tax increases will help meet the costs of providing public services to the property. The proposed project will have a less than significant impact on public services.

Mitigation Measures: None required.

	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporation	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
XVI. RECREATION. Would the project:				
a) Increase the use of existing neighborhood and regional parks or other recreational facilities such that substantial physical deterioration of the facility would occur or be accelerated?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
b) Does the project include recreational facilities or require the construction or expansion of recreational facilities which might have an adverse physical effect on the environment?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>

Discussion:

- a/b. The project would not significantly increase the use of recreational facilities, nor does the project include recreational facilities that may have a significant adverse effect on the environment. No impact would occur.

Mitigation Measures: None required.

	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporation	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
XVII. TRANSPORTATION. Would the project:				
a) Cause an increase in traffic which is substantial in relation to the existing traffic load and capacity of the street system and/or conflict with General Plan Policy CIR-16, which seeks to maintain an adequate Level of Service (LOS) at signalized and unsignalized intersections, or reduce the effectiveness of existing transit services or pedestrian/bicycle facilities?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
b) Conflict with a program, plan, ordinance or policy addressing the circulation system, including transit, roadway, bicycle and pedestrian facilities?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
c) Would the project conflict or be inconsistent with CEQA Guidelines section 15064.3, subdivision (b)?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
d) Substantially increase hazards due to a geometric design feature, (e.g., sharp curves or dangerous intersections) or incompatible uses (e.g., farm equipment)?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
e) Result in inadequate emergency access?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
f) Conflict with General Plan Policy CIR-23, which requires new uses to meet their anticipated parking demand, but to avoid providing excess parking which could stimulate unnecessary vehicle trips or activity exceeding the site's capacity?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>

Discussion:

a/b. The project site is located on Soscol Creek Road, approximately 1.5 miles from State Highway 29. The project includes the construction of a new single-family residence, an accessory dwelling unit, and associated access road improvements to serve the proposed residence.

Traffic conditions on roads and intersections are generally characterized by their "Level of Service" or LOS. LOS standards for roads in the unincorporated areas have been established by the County in its General Plan Circulation Element, last updated in February 2019. LOS is a convenient way to express the ration between volume and capacity on a given link or at a given intersection, and is expressed as a letter grade ranging from LOS A through LOS F. Each level of service is generally described as follows:

LOS A – Free-flowing travel with an excellent level of comfort and convenience and freedom to maneuver.

LOS B – Stable operating conditions, but the presence of other road users causes a noticeable, though slight, reduction in comfort, convenience, and maneuvering freedom.

LOS C – Stable operating conditions, but the operation of individual users is substantially affected by the interaction with others in the traffic stream.

LOS D – High-density, but stable flow. Users experience severe restrictions in speed and freedom to maneuver, with poor levels of comfort and convenience.

LOS E – Operating conditions at or near capacity. Speeds are reduced to a low but relatively uniform value. Freedom to maneuver is difficult with users experiencing frustration and poor comfort and convenience. Unstable operation is frequent, and minor disturbances in traffic flow can cause breakdown conditions.

LOS F – Forced or breakdown conditions. This condition exists wherever the volume of traffic traveling in a stop-and-go fashion. (2000 Highway Capacity Manual, Transportation Research Board)

The proposed single-family residence is anticipated to generate approximately 10 new daily trips per day based upon the ITE Trip Generation Manual, 10th Edition. An Accessory Dwelling Unit is also proposed and would generate an additional 10 trips per day. Projected trips (20 total) would result in less than a one percent contribution to existing traffic volumes at this location. Therefore, impacts would be less than significant.

As proposed, the project would not conflict with any adopted policies, plans, or programs supporting alternative transportation.

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

- c. Impacts associated with the proposed project's vehicle miles traveled (VMT) would be less than significant based upon the proposed land use (single-family residence with associated accessory dwelling unit), and the proximity to the City of Napa for services which is approximately 4.5 miles from the project site.
- d-f. After implementation of the proposed project, the site would be accessed via a driveway from Soscol Creek Road. The project would result in no significant off-site circulation impacts nor any site line impacts at the project driveway. The proposed access driveway improvements and on-site circulation configuration meets the Napa County Road and Street Standards. The proposed site access was reviewed and approved by the Napa County Fire Department and the Engineering Division. Therefore, impacts would be less than significant.

Mitigation Measures: None required.

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

XVIII. TRIBAL CULTURAL RESOURCES. Would the project cause a substantial adverse change in the significance of a tribal cultural resource, defined in Public Resources Code section 21074 as either a site, feature, place, cultural landscape that is geographically defined in terms of the size and scope of the landscape, sacred place, or object with cultural value to a California Native American tribe, and that is:

- | | | | | |
|--|--|--|--|--|
| <ul style="list-style-type: none"> a) Listed or eligible for listing in the California Register of Historical Resources, or in a local register of historical resources as defined in Public Resources Code section 5020.1(k); or b) A resource determined by the lead agency, in its discretion and supported by substantial evidence, to be significant pursuant to criteria set forth in subdivision (c) of Public Resources Code section 5024.1? In applying the criteria set forth in subdivision (c) of Public Resources Code section 5024.1, the lead agency shall consider the significance of the resource to a California Native American tribe. | <input type="checkbox"/>

<input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/>

<input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/>

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

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

Discussion:

a/b. According to the Napa County Environmental Resource Maps (based on the following layers – historical sites points and lines, Archaeology surveys, sites, sensitive areas, and flags) the project is located within an area indicated as sensitive for historical, archaeological, or paleontological resources, sites, or unique geological features have been identified on the property. A cultural resource reconnaissance survey was prepared by William Roop of Archaeological Resouce Service (June, 2019) and no historical sites or tribal resources have been identified on the property. A letter dated Septemebr 5, 2019 was sent to native American tribes who had a cultural interest in the area and who, as of that date, had requested to be invited to consult on projects, in accordance with the requirements of Public Resources Code Section 21080.3.1. No responses were receivd within the 30-days of the tribes receipt of the invitations. Standard condition of approval 7.3 will be applied to the project as discussed in **Section V** above. Therefore, no impacts would occur.

Mitigation Measures: None required.

	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporation	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
XIX. UTILITIES AND SERVICE SYSTEMS. Would the project:				
a) Require or result in the relocation or construction of a new or expanded water, wastewater treatment or storm water drainage, electric power, natural gas or telecommunications facilities, the construction or relocation of which could cause significant environmental effects?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
b) Have sufficient water supplies available to serve the project and reasonably foreseeable future development during normal, dry and multiple dry years?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
c) Result in a determination by the wastewater treatment provider which serves or may serve the project that it has adequate capacity to serve the project's projected demand in addition to the provider's existing commitments?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
d) Generate solid waste in excess of State or local standards, or in excess of the capacity of local infrastructure, or otherwise impair the attainment of solid waste reduction goals?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
e) Comply with federal, state, and local management and reduction statutes and regulations related to solid waste?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>

Discussion:

a/b. The project would not require the construction of a new or expanded water, wastewater treatment, or storm water drainage, electrical power, natural gas, or telecommunications facilities, the construction or relocation of which could cause significant environmental effects.

An existing well was constructed on the site in 2005 and is proposed as the project's water source. The estimated water demand of 1.5 acre-feet/year is below the projected minimum annual recharge for the parcel. Based on this information, adequate water would be available to serve the project. Impacts would be less than significant as there is sufficient water supply available to serve the proposed residential project.

c. The waste water disposal can be accommodated on-site in compliance with State and County regulations and since there is sufficient water on the site to support the system, the proposed project would not be expected to result in a significant impact to the environment. The project will not exceed wastewater requirements of the Regional Water Quality Control Board and will not result in a significant impact on the environment relative to wastewater discharge. Wastewater disposal will be accommodated on-site and in compliance with Federal, State, and County regulations. Therefore, impacts would be less than significant.

d/e. The project would be served by Keller Canyon Landfill which has a capacity which exceeds current demand. As of January 2004, the Keller Landfill had 64.8 million cubic yards of remaining capacity and has enough permitted capacity to receive solid waste through 2030. The project would comply with federal, state, and local statutes and regulations related to solid waste. Therefore, impacts would be less than significant.

Mitigation Measures: None required.

	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporation	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
XX. WILDFIRE. If located in or near state responsibility areas or lands classified as very high fire hazard severity zones, would the project:				
a) Substantially impair an adopted emergency response plan or emergency evacuation plan?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
b) Due to slope, prevailing winds and other factors, exacerbate wildfire risks and thereby expose project occupants to pollutant concentrations from a wildfire or the uncontrolled spread of a wildfire?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>

	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporation	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
c) Require the installation or maintenance of associated infrastructure (such as roads, fuel breaks, emergency water sources, power lines or other utilities) that may exacerbate fire risk or that may result in temporary or ongoing impacts to the environment?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
d) Expose people or structures to significant risks, including downslope or downstream flooding or landslides, as a result of runoff, post-fire slope instability, or drainage changes?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>

Discussion:

a-d. The proposed project is located within the state responsibility area and is classified as a moderate fire hazard severity zone. The project would not increase exposure of people and/or structures to a significant loss, injury, or death involving wildland fires. There are no project features that would impair an adopted emergency response plan or evacuation plan. The project would comply with current California Department of Forestry and California Building Code requirements for fire safety. All utilities are proposed to be undergrounded. Therefore, impacts would be considered less than significant.

Mitigation Measures: None required.

	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporation	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
XXI. MANDATORY FINDINGS OF SIGNIFICANCE				
a) Does the project have the potential to substantially degrade the quality of the environment, substantially reduce the habitat of a fish or wildlife species, cause a fish or wildlife population to drop below self-sustaining levels, threaten to eliminate a plant or animal community, substantially reduce the number or restrict the range of a rare or endangered plant or animal or eliminate important examples of the major periods of California history or prehistory?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
b) Does the project have impacts that are individually limited, but cumulatively considerable? ("Cumulatively considerable" means that the incremental effects of a project are considerable when viewed in connection with the effects of past projects, the effects of other current projects, and the effects of probable future projects)?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
c) Does the project have environmental effects that will cause substantial adverse effects on human beings, either directly or indirectly?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>

Discussion:

- As discussed in **Section IV** above, the project site contains vegetation suitable for nesting birds and oak woodlands protected by County regulations. Mitigation is proposed for those biological topics that would reduce potentially significant impacts to a level of less than significant. As identified in **Section V** above, no known historically sensitive sites or structures, archaeological, or paleontological resources, sites, or unique geologic features have been identified within the project site. In summary, all potentially significant effects on biological and cultural resources can be mitigated to a level of less than significant.
- There are no impacts from this project that would be individually limited, but cumulatively considerable. Potential air quality, green house gas emissions, and traffic impacts are discussed in the respective sections above. The project would also increase the demands for public services to a limited extent, very slightly increase traffic and air pollution, all of which contribute to cumulative effects when future development in Napa Valley is considered. Cumulative impacts of these issues are discussed in previous sections of this Initial Study.
- This project would not have any environmental effects that would cause substantial adverse effects on human beings. All environmental effects from this project have been mitigated to a level of insignificance. No other environmental effects have been identified that would cause, either directly or indirectly, adverse effects on human beings.

Mitigation Measures: None required.

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