

“D”

2021 Adopted Mitigated Negative
Declaration for P20-00230

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

Initial Study Checklist
(form updated January 2019)

1. **Project Title:** Sebastien Marineau-Mes Residence Viewshed #P20-00230-VIEW
2. **Property Owner:** Sebastien Marineau-Mes, 619 Diamond Street, San Francisco, CA 94114, sebastien.marineau@gmail.com
3. **County Contact Person, Phone Number and email:** Sean Trippi, 707-299-1353; sean.trippi@countyofnapa.org
4. **Project Location and Assessor's Parcel Number (APN):** The project is located on a \pm 4.07 acre site on the east side of Silverado Trail, approximately 1,900 feet south of Larkmead Lane, 4000 Silverado Trail, Calistoga, CA 94515, APN: 021-010-077
5. **Project sponsor's name and address:** Jessica Stuenkel / Feldman Architecture, 1648 Pacific Ave., Ste. B, San Francisco, CA 94019
6. **General Plan description:** Agriculture, Watershed & Open Space
7. **Zoning:** Agricultural Watershed
8. **Background/Project History:** The project site is planted in \pm 0.6 acres of vineyard on the lower portion of the site along Silverado Trail and, is otherwise undeveloped.
9. **Description of Project:** Approval under the Viewshed Protection Program to allow the construction of a new 3,996 sq. ft. single family residence; construction of a new 1,125 sq. ft. garage; construction of a new 972 sq. ft. accessory dwelling unit (ADU) over the garage; swimming pool; driveway improvements to County standards; construction of a \pm 5,000 gallon water storage tank; installation of wastewater treatment system; and, associated infrastructure consistent with the Napa County Code.
10. **Describe the environmental setting and surrounding land uses.** The project is located on the Calistoga, CA USGS Quad at elevation 300–435 ft. MSL. The \pm 4.07 acre parcel has frontage on the east side of Silverado Trail, \pm 0.35 miles south of Larkmead Lane, approximately 2.9 miles southeast of the City of Calistoga. The land is moderately sloping northeasterly from 0% to 30%, with approximately 3.01 acres of coastal live oak woodland native vegetation and \pm 0.6 acres of vineyards. The dominant tree is the coast live oak (*Quercus agrifolia*) with substantial cover of Douglas fir (*Pseudotsuga menziesii*), Ponderosa Pine (*Pinus ponderosa*), California black oak (*Quercus kelloggii*), Pacific Madrone (*Arbutus menziesii*), and California bay (*Umbellularia californica*). The County Environmental Sensitivity maps indicate the parcel is located within areas of biological and cultural sensitivity. The Biological Resource Reconnaissance Report by WRA (July 2020), prepared for the project indicated the area has potential habitat for two special-status bats and two special-status birds. The Cultural Resources Survey Report (August, 2020), prepared by Ashleigh Sims, advised that the results of the records search indicate no cultural resources have been previously recorded within the project area and that upon examinations of all areas of open ground surface, they did not identify archaeological resources or other evidence of past prehistoric use or occupation in the project area. Foundation materials consist of Pre Quaternary surficial deposits and bedrock, overlain by Holocene fan deposits and Volcanic bedrock, with Bale clay loam soils on the west side of the parcel and Boomer gravelly loam soils, on the east side major portion of parcel. Vegetative cover consists of \pm 0.6 acres of vineyard along the flat areas adjacent to the road on the westerly side of the parcel, with increasing slope toward the east, covered by coniferous forest on the major northeast portion of the parcel. Surrounding land uses include: a winery (Davis Estates), vineyards and rural residences to the north; vineyard to the west, rural residences to the south; and undeveloped areas to the east.
11. **Other agencies whose approval is required** (e.g., permits, financing approval, or participation agreement).
The project would also require various ministerial approvals by the County, including but not limited to building permits, grading permits, waste disposal permits, and an encroachment permit, in addition to meeting CalFire standards.

Responsible (R) and Trustee (T) Agencies: California Department of Fish and Wildlife

Other Agencies Contacted: None

12. **Tribal Cultural Resources.** Have California Native American tribes traditionally and culturally affiliated with the project area requested consultation pursuant to Public Resources Code section 21080.3.1? If so, is there a plan for consultation that includes, for example, the determination of significance of impacts to tribal cultural resource, procedures regarding confidentiality, etc.?

Notifications of Proposed Project, Pursuant to PRC Code Section 210803.2, were forwarded to the three tribes who have requested notification on October 23, 2020 and on October 26, 2020. On November 5, 2020, Middletown Rancheria of Pomo Indians of California concluded that the project is within the aboriginal territories of the Middletown Rancheria and requested any additional information regarding the project – details including, but not limited to, any additional surveys and reports, geotech reports, grading plans, dates and timelines of project activities. The Yoche Dehe tribal representative advised the project is not within their aboriginal boundaries and deferred to the Middletown Rancheria. Staff met with a representative of the Middletown Rancheria on December 22, 2020, at the project site to discuss issues or concerns regarding the proposed project. See Section XVIII of this initial study.

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 (SUBSEQUENT) 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. (Biological)
- ☐ 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.

Sean Trippi

Signature

February 17, 2021

Date

Sean Trippi, Project Planner

Napa County Planning, Building and Environmental Services Department

| I. AESTHETICS. Except as provided in Public Resources Code Section 21099, would the project: | Potentially Significant Impact | Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporation | Less Than Significant Impact | No Impact |
|---|--------------------------------|---|-------------------------------------|--------------------------|
| 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. The project site is subject to *Napa County Zoning Ordinance*, Chapter 18.106 (*Viewshed Protection Ordinance*) because Silverado Trail is identified as a designated public road 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, located about the 1700-1800 ft. elevation contour east of the project. Although 20 trees will be removed the Conservation Regulation's require 70% retention and 3:1 ratio for preservation of similar canopy top to be achieved. As shown in the submitted Viewshed analysis and Biological Survey, the proposed residence, garage/ADU, and associated driveway improvements would be predominantly screened from Silverado Trail by 12 existing trees, however, four trees were lost in the Glass fire and will need to be replaced by new vegetation. No rock outcroppings or historic buildings are located at the subject site. Impacts would be less than significant based upon the project's conformance with the County's Viewshed Protection Manual. The architectural design of these structures would utilize a neutral gray cementitious shingle siding on main body of the buildings with cementitious siding along the base, gray tile or metal roof, and low E windows, reflecting 10%-15% of visible light. As such, the project would not degrade the existing character of the site and its surroundings and impacts would be less than significant.
- d. The installation of lighting that may have the potential to impact nighttime views is proposed on the proposed structures as part of the project. Pursuant to standard Napa County conditions of approval for Viewshed applications, outdoor lighting would be required to be shielded and directed downwards, with only low-level lighting allowed in parking areas. As subject to the standard conditions of approval, below, the project would not have a significant impact resulting from new sources of outside lighting.

6.3 LIGHTING – PLAN SUBMITTAL

- 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 CBC.
- b. All exterior lighting, including landscape lighting, shall be shielded and directed downward, shall be located as low to the ground as possible, shall be 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.

| II. | AGRICULTURE AND FOREST RESOURCES. ¹ Would the project: | Potentially Significant Impact | Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporation | Less Than Significant Impact | No Impact |
|-----|---|--------------------------------------|---|------------------------------------|-------------------------------------|
| 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 portion of the project site planted in vines is designated as "Prime Farmland." The remainder and majority of the site is designated "Other Land" (Common examples include brush, timber, wetland, and riparian areas not suitable for livestock grazing; confined livestock, poultry or aquaculture facilities) on the Napa County Important Farmland Map 2002 prepared by the California Department of Conservation District, Division of Land Resource Production, pursuant to the Farmland Mapping and Monitoring Program of the California Resources Agency. All changes as a result of the project would occur within the portion designated as "Other Lands. The proposed residential use would not conflict with existing zoning for agricultural uses. There are no existing agricultural contracts on the property. There are no other changes in this proposal that would result in the conversion of Farmland. No impact would occur.
- c-d. The project site is zoned AW, which allows a single family residence, ADU and other residential or agricultural accessory structures. The project site is within an area designated a sensitive biotic community of Douglas-Fir/Redwood Forest mixed with oak. The project does not propose any timber harvesting, has tree removal to allow for the construction of the project, and proposes that the rest of tree canopy remain. Napa County General Plan Policy CON-24 promotes the maintenance and improvement of oak woodland habitat to provide for slope stabilization, soil, protection, species diversity, and wildlife habitat. This policy specifically calls for the replacement of lost oak woodlands or preservation of like habitat at a 2:1 ratio when retention of existing vegetation is found to be infeasible. In addition, Napa County Code Section (NCC) 18.108.020(C) requires that in the AW zoning district, a minimum of seventy percent vegetation canopy cover as configured on the parcel existing on June 16, 2016 shall be maintained as part of any use involving earth-disturbing activity. NCC Section 18.108.020(D) requires that in the AW zoning district, the removal of any vegetation canopy cover shall be mitigated by permanent replacement or preservation of comparable vegetation canopy cover, on an acreage basis at a minimum 3:1 ratio. Replacement or preservation shall first be accomplished on-site on lands with slopes of thirty percent or less and outside of stream and wetland setbacks. Further, NCC Section 18.108.020(E) requires that preserved vegetation canopy cover shall be enforceably restricted with a perpetual protective easement or perpetual deed restriction preserving and conserving the preserved vegetation canopy cover, which is included as a project condition of approval.

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.

According to the Biological Resources Reconnaissance Survey Report, prepared by WRA, Inc., dated July 2020, the 4.07 property contains 3.01 acres of coast live oak woodland (see Figure A-4 of the WRA report.) In order to ensure that a 3:1 ratio is maintained, approximately 0.75 acres of the property can be developed. Approximately 0.23 acres of coast live oak woodland will be impacted as part of the project (see Figure A-5 of the WRA report.), which was designed to be in compliance with the 3:1 ratio. The project was designed to comply with both the 70 percent retention and the 3:1 tree canopy preservation requirements, and therefore no further recommendations are needed to ensure compliance with the County Code.

Mitigation Measures: None required.

| 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: | Potentially Significant Impact | Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporation | Less Than Significant Impact | No Impact |
|------|--|--------------------------------|---|-------------------------------------|-------------------------------------|
| | | | | | |
| a) | Conflict with or obstruct implementation of the applicable air quality plan? | .. | <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 type="checkbox"/> | <input checked="" 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 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-c. 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 PM_{2.5}, 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. Given the size of the entire project, which is approximately one main dwelling and an accessory dwelling unit (6,093 square feet of enclosed floor area for residence, garage and accessory dwelling unit) compared to the BAAQMD's screening criterion of 325 dwelling units for NOX (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.

- d. In the short term, potential air quality impacts are most likely to result from earthmoving and construction activities required for the proposed winery buildings, parking areas, cave tunnels and associated site 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 adheres 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. 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.*
- 4. All vehicle speeds on unpaved roads shall be limited to 15 mph.*
- 5. 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.*
- 6. 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.*
- 7. 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.

Mitigation Measures: None required.

| IV. | BIOLOGICAL RESOURCES. Would the project: | Potentially Significant Impact | Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporation | Less Than Significant Impact | No Impact |
|-----|---|--------------------------------|---|-------------------------------------|-------------------------------------|
| 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 type="checkbox"/> | <input checked="" 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 type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input checked="" 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. A protocol-level rare plant survey (Biological Resources Reconnaissance Survey Report, WRA, Inc., July 2020) resulted in no special-status plant species in the Study Area; therefore, there will be no impacts to these species. Two special-status bats and two special-status birds, as well as non-status birds with baseline legal protections, have the potential to occur in the Project Area. Trees within the Study Area (primarily oaks) may contain cavities or snags suitable for roosting by the Pallid Bat (*Antrozous pallidus*) species, and may contain cavities or exfoliating bark suitable for Fringed myotis (*Myotis thysanodes*) roosting. The CNDDB indicates that there are occurrences in the vicinity for both species. The trees also provide potential habitat for White-tailed kite (*Elanus leucurus*) and Purple martin (*Progne subis*). Mitigation measures BIO-1 and BIO-2 and best management practices have been developed and provided herein to avoid impacts to these

resources.

- b-d. The Study Area does not contain any designated Critical Habitat (USFWS 2020b) or Essential Fish Habitat (NMFS 2020). The Study Area does not contain streams or rivers for migration and/or dispersal of aquatic wildlife; anadromous habitat is completely absent. Two ephemeral drainage courses traverse the site per the County Environmental Sensitivity maps, however, according to the biological study, the two non-jurisdictional drainageways do not contain bed-and-bank, ordinary high water marks, or hydrophytic vegetation and therefore do not meet the definition of an ephemeral stream. The stormwater control plan proposes to carry the sheet flow over the parcel to the southern property line. The Study Area is not within a designated wildlife corridor (CalTrans 2010, Napa County 2005). The site is located within a much larger tract of forest/woodland and lightly-developed land within a rural portion of Napa County. While common wildlife species presumably utilize the site to some degree for movement at a local scale, the Study Area itself does not provide corridor functions beyond connecting similar forested and heavily wooded land parcels in surrounding areas. The project would have a less than significant impact.
- e. As discussed in Section II, Agriculture and Forest Resources, the Napa County General Plan and Napa County Code (NCC) include provisions for retaining and/or replacing oak woodlands impacted by development. General Plan Policy CON-24 promotes the maintenance and improvement of oak woodland and requires replacement of lost oak woodlands or preservation of like habitat at a 2:1 ratio when retention of existing vegetation is found to be infeasible. In addition, NCC 18.108.020(C) requires that in the AW zoning district, a minimum of seventy percent vegetation canopy cover as configured on the parcel existing on June 16, 2016 must be maintained and NCC Section 18.108.020(D) requires that the removal of any vegetation canopy cover be mitigated by permanent replacement or preservation of comparable vegetation canopy cover, on an acreage basis at a minimum 3:1 ratio.
- As noted above, the 4.07 property contains 3.01 acres of coast live oak woodland. In order to ensure that a 3:1 ratio is maintained, per NCC Section 18.108.020(D) approximately 0.75 acres of the property can be developed. Approximately 0.23 acres of coast live oak woodland will be impacted as part of the project, which was designed to be in compliance with both the 70 percent retention and the 3:1 tree preservation requirements. Further, NCC Section 18.108.020(E) requires that preserved vegetation canopy cover shall be enforceably restricted with a perpetual protective easement or perpetual deed restriction preserving and conserving the preserved vegetation canopy cover, which is included as a project condition of approval.
- f. This project would not interfere with any ordinances protecting biological resources. There are no Habitat Conservation Plans or other similar plans in effect for this area that would be affected by this project, therefore the proposed project would not conflict with the provisions of an adopted Habitat Conservation Plans, Natural Community Conservation Plans or other approved local, regional or state habitat conservation plans.

Mitigation Measures:

- MM BIO-1. Tree removal shall be performed from September 1 through March 31, outside of the general bat maternity season. If tree removal is proposed during this period, it is recommended that a bat habitat assessment and survey effort (the latter if needed) be performed by a qualified biologist prior to tree removal to determine if bats are present in the trees. If no suitable roosting habitat for bats is found, then no further study is warranted. If special-status bat species or bat maternity roosts are detected, then roost trees shall be avoided until the end of the maternity roosting season as determined by a qualified biologist in consultation with CDFW. Irrespective of time of year, all felled trees should remain on the ground for at least 24 hours prior to chipping, off-site removal, or other processing to allow any bats present within the felled trees to escape.

Method of Monitoring:

The permittee shall have a bat habitat assessment and survey, as applicable, prior to any tree removal during the bat maternity season (April 1 to August 31). In the event special-status bat species or bat maternity roosts are detected, construction activities will be scheduled to avoid the maternity roosting season.

- MM BIO-2 Tree/vegetation removal and initial ground disturbance shall occur from August 16 to January 31, outside of the general bird nesting season. If tree/vegetation is proposed during this time, a pre-construction nesting bird survey shall be performed by a qualified biologist no more than 14 days prior to the initiation of tree removal or ground disturbance. The survey should cover the Project Area (including tree removal areas) and surrounding areas within 500 feet. If active bird nests are found during the survey, an appropriate no-disturbance buffer shall be established by the qualified biologist. Once it is determined that the young have fledged (left the nest) or the nest otherwise becomes inactive (e.g., due to predation), the buffer may be lifted and work may be initiated within the buffer.

Method of Monitoring: The permittee shall have a nesting bird survey completed prior to any ground disturbing activities scheduled to occur on the site from February 1 through August 15. The survey results shall be provided to the Napa County Planning, Building and Environmental Services. In the event any special-status or other protected nesting birds are found to occur on-site

construction activities shall be scheduled to avoid nesting and breeding periods and consultation will be sought with CDFW to develop appropriate measures to reduce potential impacts to nesting birds protected under the Migratory Bird Treaty Act.

| V. CULTURAL RESOURCES. Would the project: | Potentially Significant Impact | Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporation | Less Than Significant Impact | No Impact |
|---|--------------------------------|---|-------------------------------------|--------------------------|
| 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-b County Environmental Sensitivity maps indicate that the project is located within an area sensitive for cultural resources. A cultural Resources Survey Report was prepared by Ashleigh Sims, MA, RPA, Environmental Associates (August 2020) for the project. The report states that the results from the records search indicate that no cultural resources have been previously recorded within the project site. Further, upon examining all areas of open ground surface, the survey did not identify archaeological resources or other evidence of past prehistoric use or occupation of the project.

However, upon inspection by the Middletown Rancheria tribal representative on December 23, 2020, obsidian flakes were found. Due to the possibility of unearthing tribal cultural resources which include, but are not limited to, Native American human remains, funerary objects, items or artifacts, sites, features, places, landscapes or objects with cultural values to the Middletown Rancheria, during ground disturbance activities, mitigation measures discussed in Section XVIII below, shall be incorporated into the Project for preservation or mitigation of significant impacts to tribal cultural resources in addition to the following standard condition of approval:

7.2 ARCHAEOLOGICAL FINDING

In the event that archeological 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.

c. No information has been encountered that would indicate that this project would encounter human remains. However, if resources are found during any grading of the project, construction of the project is required to cease, and a qualified archaeologist will be retained to investigate the site in accordance with standard condition of approval as noted above, reducing potential impacts to a less than significant level.

Mitigation Measures: Refer to Section XVIII below.

| VI. | ENERGY. Would the project: | Potentially Significant Impact | Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporation | Less Than Significant Impact | No Impact |
|-----|---|--------------------------------|---|-------------------------------------|-------------------------------------|
| | 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"/> |

Discussion:

- a. The proposed project would comply with Title 24 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.

| VII. | GEOLOGY AND SOILS. Would the project: | Potentially Significant Impact | Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporation | Less Than Significant Impact | No Impact |
|------|--|--------------------------------|---|-------------------------------------|--------------------------|
| | 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. Exposure of people or structures to potential substantial adverse effects:
- 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 will be required to comply with all the latest building standards and codes, including the California Building Code that would reduce any potential impacts to a less than significant level.
 - 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 editions 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 are no landslide deposits in the proposed development area.
- b. The proposed development is minimal and will occur on slopes less than 30%. Based upon the Soil Survey of Napa County, prepared by the United States Department of Agriculture (USDA), the soils on site are comprised of the Bale clay loam soils on the west side of the parcel and boomer gravelly loam soils, on the east side or the majority of the parcel. The project will require incorporation of best management practices and will be subject to the Napa County Stormwater Ordinance, which addresses sediment and erosion control measures and dust control, as applicable. There would be a less than significant impact.
- c/d. According to preliminary geologic mapping of the Calistoga Quadrangle performed by the California Geologic Survey (CGS-2004), the Foundation materials consist of Pre-Quaternary surficial deposits and volcanic bedrock, overlain by Holocene fan deposits. Based on the Napa County Environmental Sensitivity Maps (liquefaction layer) the project site has medium to very low risk for liquefaction. Development will be required to comply with all the latest building standards and codes, including the California Building Code that would reduce any potential impacts to the maximum extent possible. There would be a less than significant impact.
- e. The construction of a new septic system is proposed as part of the project. The system will be designed by a licensed engineer and will be reviewed and approved by the Department of Environmental Management. There does not appear to be any limitation on this parcel's ability to support an on-site septic system to support the proposed project. There would be a less than significant impact.

Mitigation Measures: None Required

| VIII. | GREENHOUSE GAS EMISSIONS. Would the project: | Potentially Significant Impact | Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporation | Less Than Significant Impact | No Impact |
|-------|--|--------------------------------|---|-------------------------------------|--------------------------|
| | | | | | |
| 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 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 the 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/>.

- 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.

| IX. | HAZARDS AND HAZARDOUS MATERIALS. Would the project | Potentially Significant Impact | Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporation | Less Than Significant Impact | No Impact |
|-----|--|--------------------------------|---|-------------------------------------|-------------------------------------|
| 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 | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> |

public or the environment?

- | | | | | |
|---|--------------------------|--------------------------|-------------------------------------|-------------------------------------|
| e) For a project located within an airport land use plan or, where such a plan has not been adopted, within two miles of a public airport or public use airport, would the project result in a safety hazard or excessive noise for people residing or working in the project area? | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input checked="" 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? | <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 and accessory dwelling unit. 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 reasonable for the proposed project to create upset or accident conditions that involve the release of hazardous materials into the environment. 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 school to the project site is Palisades High School, located approximately 3.7 miles to the northwest. No impacts would occur.
- d. Based on a search of the California Department of 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. No impact would occur, as the project site is not located within an airport land use plan.
- f. The proposed access driveway improvements and on-site circulation configuration meets Napa County Road and Street Standards. The project has been reviewed by the County Fire Department and Engineering Services Division and found acceptable, as conditioned. Therefore, the proposed project would not obstruct emergency vehicle access and impacts would be less than significant.
- 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 improvements would provide direct access to Silverado Trail. 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.

| X. | HYDROLOGY AND WATER QUALITY. Would the project: | Potentially Significant Impact | Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporation | Less Than Significant Impact | No Impact |
|----|--|--------------------------------|---|-------------------------------------|--------------------------|
| | | | | | |
| 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 checked="" type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> |

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 town across California to reduce water usage by 25 percent. These water restrictions do not apply to agricultural users. 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 discretionary 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, recharge, 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 understand 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 (GRAC) approximately 40 new wells have been added to the monitoring program within 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 for Groundwater Sustainability and the important role 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 appear 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 Western Mountains 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 supplies 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 is categorized as "Napa Valley Floor" based upon current County Water Availability

Analysis policies and therefore water use criteria is 1-acre foot per acre of land per year for a total of 4.0-acre feet of groundwater per year (af/yr).

- a-b. The project would not violate any water quality standards or waste discharge requirements nor substantially deplete local groundwater supplies. The site's wastewater system for the proposed project will be prepared by a licensed engineer and reviewed and approved by the Division of Environmental Health. There does not appear to be any limitation on this parcel's ability to support an on-site septic system which will be able to support the proposed project. There would be a less than significant impact.

An existing well is proposed as the project's water source located on the southern side of the property near the vineyards. The well is located within the area designated as Valley Floor. According to the May 29, 2012 Well Completion Report the well had a measured yield of 35 gpm. The site is currently in ± 0.6 acre of vineyard. According to the Napa County Water Availability Analysis Guidance Document - Appendix B, the total projected water demand for the parcel would conservatively be 2.05 af/yr (includes the main residence, accessory dwelling unit, swimming pool, irrigated landscaping, and vineyard) which is below the 4 af/yr minimum thresholds established for the single-family residential parcel, based on the site's soil characteristics and property size of ± 4.07 acres.

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 management 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 to 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.

- c. The project would not substantially alter the drainage pattern on site or cause a significant increase in erosion or siltation on or off the project site. Improvement plans prepared prior to the issuance of a building permit would ensure that the proposed project does not increase runoff flow rate or volume as a result of project implementation. General Plan Policy CON-50 (c) requires discretionary projects, including this project, to meet performance standards designed to ensure peak runoff in 2-, 10-, 50-, and 100-year events following development is not greater than predevelopment conditions. The preliminary grading and drainage plans have been reviewed by the Engineering Division. The proposed project would implement standard stormwater quality treatment controls to treat runoff prior to discharge from the project site. The incorporation of these features into the project would ensure that the proposed project would not create substantial sources of polluted runoff. In addition, the proposed project does not have any unusual characteristics that create sources of pollution that would degrade water quality. Impacts would be less than significant.
- d. The site lies outside the boundaries of the 100- and 500-year flood hazard boundaries. The parcel is not located in an area that is subject to inundation by tsunamis, seiches, or mudflows. No impacts would occur.
- e. The proposed project would not conflict with a water quality control plan or sustainable groundwater management plan because there are no such plans applicable to the subject site. No impacts would occur.

Mitigation Measures: None required.

| XI. | LAND USE AND PLANNING. Would the project: | Potentially Significant Impact | Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporation | Less Than Significant Impact | No Impact |
|-----|---|--------------------------------|---|------------------------------|-----------|
|-----|---|--------------------------------|---|------------------------------|-----------|

a) Physically divide an established community?

☐
☐
☐
☒

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?

☐
☐
☐
☒

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. The subject parcel is located in the AW (Agricultural Watershed) zoning district which allows single family residences, accessory dwelling units, and associated infrastructure. The proposed project is compliant with the physical limitations of the Napa County Zoning Ordinance. The property's General Plan land use designation is Agriculture, Watershed, and Open Space (AWOS) which allows "agriculture, processing of agricultural products, and single-family dwellings." Impacts would be less than significant.

Mitigation Measures: None Required

| XII. | MINERAL RESOURCES. Would the project: | Potentially Significant Impact | Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporation | Less Than Significant Impact | No Impact |
|------|---------------------------------------|--------------------------------|---|------------------------------|-----------|
|------|---------------------------------------|--------------------------------|---|------------------------------|-----------|

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?

☐
☐
☐
☒

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?

☐
☐
☐
☒

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. No impacts would occur.

Mitigation Measures: None required.

| XIII. | NOISE. Would the project result in: | Potentially Significant Impact | Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporation | Less Than Significant Impact | No Impact |
|-------|-------------------------------------|--------------------------------|---|------------------------------|-----------|
|-------|-------------------------------------|--------------------------------|---|------------------------------|-----------|

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?

☐
☐
☒
☐

b) Generation of excessive groundborne vibration or groundborne noise levels?

☐
☐
☒
☐

- 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?

☐
☐
☐
☒

Discussion:

- a/b. The project would result in a temporary increase in noise levels during construction of the proposed residence, garage, accessory dwelling unit, 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. As such, the project would not result in potentially significant temporary construction noise impacts or operational impacts. Because the proposed structures at the project site are located approximately 400 feet to the southeast of the nearest neighboring residences, 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 7am-7pm on weekdays, during normal hours of human activity. All construction activities would be conducted in compliance with the Napa County Noise Ordinance (Napa County Code Chapter 8.16). The proposed project would not result in long-term significant construction noise impacts. Conditions of approval identified below would require construction activities to be limited to daylight hours, vehicles to be muffled, and backup alarms adjusted to the lowest allowable levels. The proposed project would not result in long-term significant permanent noise impacts because a residential land use is proposed. Continuing enforcement of Napa County's Noise Ordinance by the Environmental Health Division 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. Impacts would be less than significant.

8.3. CONSTRUCTION NOISE

Construction noise shall be minimized to the greatest extent practical 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 normally be staged, loaded, and unloaded on the project site, if at all practicable. If project terrain or access road conditions require construction equipment to be staged, loaded, or unloaded off the project site (such as on a neighboring road or at the base of a hill), such activities shall only occur daily between the hours of 8 am to 5 pm.

- c. The project site is not located within an airport land use plan or the vicinity of a private airstrip. No impact would occur.

Mitigation Measures: None required.

| XIV. | POPULATION AND HOUSING. Would the project: | Potentially Significant Impact | Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporation | Less Than Significant Impact | No Impact |
|------|--|--------------------------------|---|-------------------------------------|-------------------------------------|
| | | | | | |
| 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 checked="" type="checkbox"/> | <input 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 proposed project includes the construction of one single-family dwelling, an accessory dwelling unit, and associated access road improvements. The Association of Bay Area Governments' *Projections 2003* figures indicate that the total population of Napa County is projected to increase approximately 23 percent by the year 2030 (*Napa County Baseline Data Report*, November 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 additional housing proposed would result in minor population growth in Napa County, but would not rise to a level of environmental significance.

Cumulative impacts related to population and housing balance were identified in the 2008 General Plan 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 the prevention of environment

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 would be less than significant.

- b. No existing housing or people would be displaced as a result of the project. Therefore, the project would not displace substantial numbers of existing housing or numbers of people necessitating the construction of replacement housing elsewhere and no impact would occur.

Mitigation Measures: None required.

| XV. | PUBLIC SERVICES. Would the project result in: | Potentially Significant Impact | Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporation | Less Than Significant Impact | No Impact |
|-----|---|--------------------------------------|---|-------------------------------------|--------------------------|
| | 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: | | | | |
| | 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 area and the additional demand placed on existing services as a result of the proposed project would be minimal. Fire protection measures would be required as part of the development pursuant to Napa County Fire Marshall conditions and there would be no foreseeable impact to emergency response times with compliance with these conditions of approval. The Fire Department and Engineering Services Division have reviewed the application and recommend approval, as conditioned. School impact fees, which assist local school districts with capacity building measures, would be levied pursuant to building permit submittal. The proposed project would have minimal impact on public parks as two residences are proposed. Impacts to public services would be less than significant.

Mitigation Measures: None required

| XVI. | RECREATION. Would the project: | Potentially Significant Impact | Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporation | Less Than Significant Impact | No Impact |
|------|--|--------------------------------------|---|-------------------------------------|-------------------------------------|
| | | | | | |
| | 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 checked="" type="checkbox"/> | <input 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. The project would not significantly increase use of existing park or recreational facilities based on its limited scope. No new parks or other public recreational amenities are proposed to be built as part of the project. Impacts would be less than significant.

Mitigation Measures: None required

| XVII. | TRANSPORTATION. Would the project: | Potentially Significant Impact | Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporation | Less Than Significant Impact | No Impact |
|-------|---|--------------------------------------|---|-------------------------------------|--------------------------|
| | | | | | |
| | a) 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"/> |
| | b) 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"/> |
| | c) 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 checked="" type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> |
| | d) Result in inadequate emergency access? | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> |
| | e) Conflict with General Plan Policy CIR-14, 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 checked="" type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> |

Discussion:

- a/b. The project site has frontage and direct access to Silverado Trail, approximately 0.3 miles south of its intersection with Larkmead Lane, southeast of the city of Calistoga. The project includes the construction of a new single-family residence, garage, accessory dwelling unit, and associated access road improvements to serve the proposed residence. According to Adobe Associates, Inc., the total soil amount of off-haul from project grading is ± 267 cubic yards, which would result in ± 19 -26 truck trips during project construction.

The proposed single-family residence and accessory dwelling unit, are anticipated to generate approximately 9.57 new daily trips each based upon the ITE Trip Generation Manual, 10th Edition. Projected project trips would result in less than a one percent contribution to existing traffic volumes on Silverado Trail 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.

- 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 and accessory dwelling unit), proximity to the city of Calistoga (approximately 5 miles via Silverado Trail), and proximity to public transit (approximately two and a half miles).

- d-f. After implementation of the proposed project, the site would have direct access via a driveway to Silverado Trail. The project would result in no significant off-site circulation system operational impacts nor any sight line impacts at the project driveway. The proposed access driveway improvements and on-site circulation configuration meets Napa County Road and Street Standards. Proposed site access was reviewed and approved by the Napa County Fire Department and Engineering Services Division.

Three parking spaces (total) would be required for the proposed single-family dwelling and accessory dwelling unit, pursuant to Chapter 18.110.030. Sufficient parking is included in the proposed project and impacts would be less than significant.

Mitigation Measures: None required

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

Discussion:

- a. The project site is currently developed with ± 0.6 acres of vineyards. There are no structures or other resources that would be listed or eligible for listing in a local, state or federal register of historic resources.
- b. Previous ground disturbance has occurred to remove native vegetation and grade the site to accommodate planting the vineyard along the lower, western portion of the property. There is no documentation of cultural resources discovered during these construction activities. The Cultural Resources Report, discussed in Section V above, stated that the results from the records search indicate no cultural resources have been previously recorded within the project site. Upon the examination all areas of open ground surface, the survey did not identify archaeological resources or other evidence of past prehistoric use or occupation of the project site.

As noted above, on October 23, 2020 and on October 26, 2020, 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 that date had requested to be invited to consult on projects, in accordance with the requirements of Public Resources Code section 21080.3.1. A response was received from the Middletown Rancheria requesting consultation on November 5, 2020. Per the request, additional information was forwarded to the Tribal Representative. Staff met with a representative of the Middletown Rancheria on December 23, 2020, at the project site to discuss any issues or concerns regarding the proposed project. During the site visit the tribal representative unearthed obsidian flakes which appeared to be worked. Based on this discovery, the tribe is very interested in this property and has requested the implementation of mitigation measures for monitoring of the excavations required to develop the site for the residence and associated structures.

Therefore, due to the possibility of unearthing tribal cultural resources which include, but are not limited to, Native American human remains, funerary objects, items or artifacts, sites, features, places, landscapes or objects with cultural values to the Middletown Rancheria ("Tribe"), during ground disturbance activities, the following mitigation measures, in addition to the standard conditions of approval stated in Section V above, shall be incorporated into the Project, for preservation or mitigation of significant impacts to tribal cultural resources.

Mitigation Measures:

- MM TCR-1: Ground disturbing activities occurring in conjunction with the Project (including surveys, testing, concrete pilings, debris removal, rescrapes, punch lists, erosion control (mulching, waddles, hydroseeding, etc.), pot-holing or auguring, boring, grading, trenching, foundation work and other excavations or other ground disturbance involving the moving of dirt or rocks with heavy equipment or hand tools within the Project area) shall be monitored on a full-time basis by qualified tribal monitor(s) approved by the Tribe. The tribal monitoring shall be supervised by the project Tribal Cultural Advisor. Tribal monitoring should be conducted by qualified tribal monitor(s) approved by the Tribe, who is defined as qualified individual(s) who has experience with identification, collection and treatment of tribal cultural resources of value to the Tribe. The duration and timing of the monitoring will be determined by the project Tribal Cultural Advisor. If the project Tribal Cultural Advisor determines that full-time monitoring is no longer warranted, he or she may recommend that tribal monitoring be reduced to periodic spot-checking or cease entirely. Tribal monitoring would be reinstated in the event of any new or unforeseen ground disturbances or discoveries.
- MM TCR-2: The project Tribal Cultural Advisor and tribal monitor(s) may halt ground disturbance activities in the immediate area of discovery when known or suspected tribal cultural resources are identified until further evaluation can be made in determining their significance and appropriate treatment or disposition. There must be at minimum one tribal monitor for every separate area of ground disturbance activity that is at least 30 meters or 100 feet apart unless otherwise agreed upon in writing between the Tribe and applicant. Depending on the scope and schedule of ground disturbance activities of the Project (e.g., discoveries of cultural resources or simultaneous activities in multiple locations that requires multiple tribal monitors, etc.) additional tribal monitors may be required on-site. If additional tribal monitors are needed, the Tribe shall be provided with a minimum of three (3) business days advance notice unless otherwise agreed upon between the Tribe and applicant. The on-site tribal monitoring shall end when the ground disturbance activities are completed, or when the project Tribal Cultural Advisor have indicated that the site has a low potential for tribal cultural resources.
- MM TCR-3: All on-site personnel of the Project shall receive adequate cultural resource sensitivity training approved by the project Tribal Cultural Advisor or his or her authorized designee prior to initiation of ground disturbance activities on the Project. The training must also address the potential for exposing subsurface resources and procedures if a potential resource is identified. The Project applicant will coordinate with the Tribe on the cultural resource sensitivity training.
- MM TCR-4: The Project applicant must meet and confer with the Tribe, at least 45 days prior to commencing ground disturbance activities on the Project to address notification, protection, treatment, care and handling of tribal cultural resources potentially discovered or disturbed during ground disturbance activities of the Project. All potential cultural resources unearthed by Project activities shall be evaluated by the project Tribal Cultural Advisor. The Tribe must have an opportunity to inspect and determine the nature of the resource and the best course of action for avoidance, protection and/or treatment of tribal cultural resources to the extent permitted by law. If the resource is determined to be a tribal cultural resource of value to the Tribe, the Tribe will coordinate with the Project applicant to establish appropriate treatment and disposition of the resources with appropriate dignity which may include reburial or preservation of resources. The Project applicant must facilitate and ensure that the determination of treatment and disposition by the Tribe is followed to the extent permitted by law. No laboratory studies, scientific **analysis**, collection, curation, or video recording are permitted for tribal cultural resources without the prior written consent of the Tribe.

Method of Monitoring: Prior to initial ground disturbance the permittee shall provide documentation to the Planning Division that the permittee has retained a project Tribal Cultural Advisor designated by the Tribe, to direct all mitigation measures related to tribal cultural resources.

| XIX. | UTILITIES AND SERVICE SYSTEMS. Would the project: | Potentially Significant Impact | Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporation | Less Than Significant Impact | No Impact |
|------|--|--------------------------------------|---|-------------------------------------|--------------------------|
| 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 checked="" type="checkbox"/> | <input 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 checked="" type="checkbox"/> | <input 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 checked="" type="checkbox"/> | <input 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 checked="" type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> |

Discussion:

- a. The project would not require the 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.
- b. An existing on-site well is proposed as the project's water source. According to the 5/29/2012, Well Completion Report, the existing well had a measured yield of 35 gpm. The site is currently developed in \pm 0.6 acre of vineyard. According to the Napa County Water Availability Analysis Guidance Document, Appendix B, the total projected water demand for the parcel would conservatively be 2.05 af/yr (includes the main residence, accessory dwelling unit, pool, irrigated landscaping, and vineyard) which is below the 4.0 af/yr minimum thresholds established for the single-family residential parcel based on the site's soil characteristics and property size of \pm 4.07 acres. Based on this information, the parcel water demand can be met with the existing on site well. The existing yield would be sufficient to serve all uses on the property. 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. Impacts would be less than significant as there is sufficient water supply available to serve the proposed project.
- c. Wastewater would be treated on-site per the proposed septic system and would not require a wastewater treatment provider. Impacts would be less than significant.
- d/e. The project would be served by Clover Flat Landfill which has a capacity that exceeds current demand. As of July 2011, the Clover Flat Landfill had 2.91 million cubic yards of remaining capacity and has enough permitted capacity to receive solid waste through 2045. 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

| XX. | WILDFIRE. If located in or near state responsibility areas or lands classified as very high fire hazard severity zones, would the project: | Potentially Significant Impact | Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporation | Less Than Significant Impact | No Impact |
|-----|---|--------------------------------|---|-------------------------------------|--------------------------|
| 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"/> |
| 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/b. The proposed project is located within the state responsibility area and is classified as a high fire hazard severity zone. The project would not substantially impair an adopted emergency response plan or emergency evacuation plan because the proposed driveway improvements would provide direct access to Silverado Trail. The project would comply with current California Department of Forestry and California Building Code requirements for fire safety. Impacts would be less than significant.
- c/d. Implementation of the project would include the development of a new access driveway designed to County standards. As part of the project, the property owner would implement a horizontal and vertical vegetation management plan consistent with California Department of Forestry and Fire Protection requirements along the entire length of the driveway to provide defensive space and improve sight distance. The vegetation and management plan would be reviewed and approved by the Napa County Fire Marshal. Proposed retaining walls would be constructed as part of the project to address potential slope instability and drainage issues. Impacts would be less than significant.

Mitigation Measures: None required.

| XXI. | MANDATORY FINDINGS OF SIGNIFICANCE | Potentially Significant Impact | Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporation | Less Than Significant Impact | No Impact |
|------|---|--------------------------------|---|-------------------------------------|--------------------------|
| 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:

- a. As discussed in **Section IV** above, the project site contains vegetation suitable for special status bat species and nesting birds. 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 geological features have been identified within the project site. However, **Section XVIII**, includes mitigation measures to address potential impacts to tribal cultural resources. In summary, all potentially significant effects on biological and cultural resources can be mitigated to a level of less than significant.
- b. The project does not have impacts that are individually limited, but cumulatively considerable. Potential air quality, greenhouse gas emissions, hydrology, and traffic impacts are discussed in the respective sections above. The project would also increase the demands for public services to a limited extent, increase traffic and air pollutants 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. Potential cumulative impacts would be less than significant.
- c. All impacts identified in this Initial Study are either less than significant after mitigation or less than significant and do not require mitigation. Therefore, the proposed project would not result in environmental effects that cause substantial adverse effects on human being either directly or indirectly. Impacts would be less than significant.

Mitigation Measures: None required.

Sebastien Marineau-Mes Residence
Viewshed (File #P20-00230-VIEW)
4000 Silverado Trail, Calistoga, CA 94515, APN 021-010-077

MITIGATION MONITORING AND REPORTING PROGRAM

| Mitigation Measure | Monitoring Responsibility | Monitoring/Reporting Action and Schedule | Monitoring Compliance Complete (Name / Date) |
|--|---------------------------|--|--|
| Biological Resources (IV) | | | |
| MM BIO-1: Tree removal shall be performed from September 1 through March 31, outside of the general bat maternity season. If tree removal is proposed during this period, it is recommended that a bat habitat assessment and survey effort (the latter if needed) be performed by a qualified biologist prior to tree removal to determine if bats are present in the trees. If no suitable roosting habitat for bats is found, then no further study is warranted. If special-status bat species or bat maternity roosts are detected, then roost trees shall be avoided until the end of the maternity roosting season as determined by a qualified biologist in consultation with CDFW. Irrespective of time of year, all felled trees should remain on the ground for at least 24 hours prior to chipping, off-site removal, or other processing to allow any bats present within the felled trees to escape. | Planning Division | The permittee shall have a bat habitat assessment and survey, as applicable, prior to any tree removal during the bat maternity season (April 1 to August 31). In the event special-status bat species or bat maternity roosts are detected, construction activities will be scheduled to avoid the maternity roosting season. | |
| MM BIO-2: Tree/vegetation removal and initial ground disturbance shall occur from August 16 to January 31, outside of the general bird nesting season. If tree/vegetation is proposed during this time, a pre-construction nesting bird survey shall be performed by a qualified biologist no more than 14 days prior to the initiation of tree removal or ground disturbance. The survey should cover the Project Area (including tree removal areas) and surrounding areas within 500 feet. If active bird nests are found during the survey, an appropriate no-disturbance buffer shall be established by the qualified biologist. Once it is determined that the young have fledged (left the nest) or the nest otherwise becomes inactive (e.g., due to predation), the buffer may be lifted and work may be initiated within the buffer. | Planning Division | The permittee shall have a nesting bird survey completed prior to any ground disturbing activities scheduled to occur on the site from February 1 through August 15. The survey results shall be provided to the Napa County Planning, Building and Environmental Services. In the event any special-status or other protected nesting birds are found to occur on-site construction activities shall be scheduled to avoid nesting and breeding periods and consultation will be sought with CDFW to develop appropriate measures to reduce potential impacts to nesting birds protected under the Migratory Bird Treaty Act. | |

PROJECT REVISION STATEMENT

Sebastien Marineau-Mes Residence
Viewshed (File #P20-00230-VIEW)
4000 Silverado Trail, Calistoga, CA 94515, APN: 021-010-077

Napa County - Environmental Review

I hereby revise my request to include the measures specified above.

I understand and explicitly agree that with regards to all California Environmental Quality Act, Permit Streamlining Act, and Subdivision Map Act processing deadlines, this revised application will be treated as a new project, filed on the date this project revision statement is received by the Napa County Conservation, Development and Planning Department. For purposes of Section 66474.2 of the Subdivision Map Act, the date of application completeness shall remain the date this project was originally found complete.

Signature of Owner(s)

Interest

Print Name