

**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:** Kateley Property, Grading Permit Application ENG15-00086
2. **Property Owner:** Jim Kateley; 1393 Beattie Ct, San Jose, CA 95120; (408) 996-1010
3. **County Contact Person, Phone Number and email:** Curtis Sawyer, Planner II; (707) 299-1361;  
[curtis.sawyer@countyofnapa.org](mailto:curtis.sawyer@countyofnapa.org)
4. **Project Location and Assessor's Parcel Number (APN):** The project is located on an approximately 69.67 acre parcel, within the AW (Agricultural Watershed) zoning district on the east side of Dry Creek Road; APN: 034-030-061; Napa, CA 94558
5. **Project sponsor's name and address:** Randy Bryant, REB Engineering, P.O. Box 113, St. Helena, CA 94574 (707) 963-8638; [randy@rebengineering.com](mailto:randy@rebengineering.com)
6. **General Plan description:** Agriculture, Watershed, and Open Space (AWOS) Designation
7. **Zoning:** Agricultural Watershed (AW) District
8. **Background/Project History:** In 2017, the Napa County Planning Division approved an Administrative Viewshed application (P19-00196) for the construction of a new single-family home at APN 034-030-061. This approval allowed the construction of a 3,346-square-foot single family home with basement level mechanical wine storage, an unconditioned attached garage, and a 144-square-foot barn/tea room. Since then, the previously approved home has been redesigned in substantial conformance with the previously approved Viewshed application. Planning staff found the resigned residential application project to be categorically exempt and approved the Viewshed application.
9. **Description of Project:** Approval of a Grading Permit to allow the construction of a new 2,400-foot long 14-foot wide driveway access road leading to a previously approved, not-yet constructed, single-family home, garage, and 384-square-foot accessory dwelling unit ADU). Grading spoils shall be stored at the adjacent parcel to the north (APN 034-370-038-000). Spoils will be stored out of required stream setbacks. Remaining excess spoils would be transported off-site to a County approved location. The project also includes a request for an exception to the Napa County Road and Street Standards (NCRSS). The request proposes an exception to the roads and street standards to accommodate steep terrain and ground slopes to allow for a short segment of non-compliant slope at a single location. Construction activities shall occur on portions of the site previously graded without approval. The County formally opened a code enforcement case in 2014 due to illegal grading between 2009 and 2011.

The NCRSS allows a maximum longitudinal driveway slope of 20 percent. To make the slope of this segment compliant would require extensive grading on the steep hillside that is adjacent to the driveway. The applicant is requesting an exception to the maximum length requirements for a driveway having 18-20 percent grade. The NCRSS specifies a maximum slope length of 300 feet for roadway segments with 18-20 percent slopes. The plan proposes 20 percent grade for approximately 545 feet in length. The required 100-foot preceding and ensuing sections having no more than 10 percent grade would be installed. The driveway width would also be expanded to 20 feet for the first 300 feet, which includes the section where the exception is requested. A total of 41 trees, consisting of Live Oak, Cypress, and Bay Laurel, are proposed for removal. To mitigate this impact, the applicant will replant on a 3:1 ratio a total of 36 Live Oak trees each 5 gallons in size. Replacement trees will be located

near the south east section of the new road, near Dry Creek Road.

- 10. **Describe the environmental setting and surrounding land uses:** The 69.67-acre parcel is located on the east side of Dry Creek Road, approximately 3.4 miles south of its intersection with Oakville Grade Road and zoned Agricultural Watershed. Site topography within the existing and proposed development area ranges from 0-20 percent slope. The parcel is not currently developed, although an unpaved path begins at Dry Creek Road and continues for 2,400 feet to the site of the approved but unbuilt residence. The existing habitats within the project area include oak woodlands and open grassland areas populated with primarily non-native annual and perennial forbs. According to Napa County GIS records, soil types at the subject parcel include those of the Lodo-Maymen-Felton association and natural slopes range from 30-75 percent.

The surrounding land uses are primarily agricultural and residential development on large parcels, the nearest of which is approximately 700 feet to the southeast of the proposed project area. The project site is located outside the boundaries of the 100 and 500 year flood hazard zones.

- 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

Additional permits are not required from CDFW.

- 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.?**

On October 1, 2021, 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. No request to initiate consultation was received.

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.
- 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.

Curtis Sawyer  
Signature

March 23, 2022  
Date

Name: Curtis Sawyer  
Curtis Sawyer, Planner II  
Napa County Planning, Building and Environmental Services Department

| I. <b>AESTHETICS.</b> 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 checked="" type="checkbox"/>                 | <input 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-d. Visual resources are those physical features that make up the environment, including landforms, geological features, water, trees and other plants, and elements of the human cultural landscape. A scenic vista, then, would be a publicly accessible vantage point such as a road, park, trail, or scenic overlook from which distant or landscape-scale views of a beautiful or otherwise important assembly of visual resources can be taken-in. The project site is currently undeveloped. Proposed physical improvements as part of the project consist of a new 2,400-foot long driveway access road. As generally described in the **Environmental Setting and Surrounding Land Uses** section, above, the immediate surrounding land uses are primarily residential and agricultural. The project would not result in substantial damage to scenic resources or substantially degrade the visual character or quality of the site and its surroundings. Per the Napa County Code, there are two designated Viewshed roads in proximity to the property, Dry Creek Road and Mount Veeder Road. The proposed development is not visible from Dry Creek Road because of the topography, existing vegetation, and location. However, due to loss of vegetation from recent fires, including the LNU Complex Fire and the 2017 Napa County fires, the proposed road can be seen from Mount Veeder Road which is directly west of the proposed project site. Mitigation measures are proposed to ensure the project area is screened from Mount Veeder Road.

There are no rock outcroppings visible from the two Napa County designated Viewshed roads, Dry Creek Road or Mount Veeder Road, or other designated scenic resources on the property. The scenic vista impacts to Mount Veeder Road would be a less than significant with implementation of BIO Mitigation Measure No. 1 (below) which would ensure the access road is adequately screened from Mount Veeder Road. The proposed project would not create a new source of substantial light or glare because no lighting is proposed as part of the project. The previously approved single-family home would be adequately screened per the associated conditions of approval requiring that all retaining walls and reflective materials are screened from view.

Mitigation Measure:

A total of 41 Trees are proposed for removal. Tree species to be removed consist of Live Oak, Cypress, and Bay Laurel. The applicant will replant on a 3:1 ratio, replanting a total of 36 Live Oak trees each 5 gallons in size as described in MM BIO-3.

**Monitoring:** Prior to issuance of any grading or building permits pursuant to this approval, the measure listed above shall be identified on the project plans to the satisfaction of the Planning Division.

| <b>II. AGRICULTURE AND FOREST RESOURCES.<sup>1</sup></b><br>Would the project:   | <b>Potentially Significant Impact</b> | <b>Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporation</b> | <b>Less Than Significant Impact</b> | <b>No Impact</b>                    |
|--|---------------------------------------|--|-------------------------------------|-------------------------------------|
| 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-e. The project site is designated "Other Land" and would not result in the conversion of Prime Farmland, Unique Farmland or Farmland of Statewide Important as shown on the Napa County Important Farmland Map 2002 prepared by the California Department of Conservation District, Division of Land Resource Protection, pursuant to the Farmland Mapping and Monitoring Program of the California Resources Agency. The proposed project would not conflict with existing zoning for agricultural use, or a Williamson Act contract. The project is zoned Agricultural Watershed (AW); the proposed project would not conflict with existing zoning for, or cause rezoning of, forest land, timberland, or timberland zoned Timberland Production. There are no changes included in this proposal that would result in the loss or conversion of forest land or farmland.

Mitigation Measure:

None Required.

---

<sup>1</sup> "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.

| <b>III. AIR QUALITY.</b> 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: | <b>Potentially Significant Impact</b> | <b>Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporation</b> | <b>Less Than Significant Impact</b> | <b>No Impact</b>         |
|--|---------------------------------------|--|-------------------------------------|--------------------------|
| a) Conflict with or obstruct implementation of the applicable air quality plan?  | <input type="checkbox"/>              | <input type="checkbox"/>                                   | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> |
| b) Result in a cumulatively considerable net increase of any criteria pollutant for which the project region is non-attainment under an applicable federal or state ambient air quality standard?                                      | <input type="checkbox"/>              | <input type="checkbox"/>                                   | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> |
| c) Expose sensitive receptors to substantial pollutant concentrations?   | <input type="checkbox"/>              | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/>                        | <input 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 checked="" type="checkbox"/>                        | <input type="checkbox"/>            | <input type="checkbox"/> |

Discussion:

On June 2, 2010, the Bay Area Air Quality Management District's (BAAQMD) Board of Directors unanimously adopted thresholds of significance to assist in the review of projects under the California Environmental Quality Act. These Thresholds are designed to establish the level at which the District believed air pollution emissions would cause significant environmental impacts under CEQA and were posted on the Air District's website and included in the Air District'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-b. The mountains bordering Napa Valley block much of the prevailing northwesterly winds throughout the year. Sunshine is plentiful in Napa County, and summertime can be very warm in the valley, particularly in the northern end. Winters are usually mild, with cool temperatures overnight and mild-to-moderate temperatures during the day. Wintertime temperatures tend to be slightly cooler in the northern end of the valley. Winds are generally calm throughout the county. Annual precipitation averages range from about 24 inches in low elevations to more than 40 inches in the mountains.

Ozone and fine particle pollution, or PM<sub>2.5</sub>, 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 PM<sub>2.5</sub> occasionally does reach unhealthy concentrations. There are multiple reasons for PM<sub>2.5</sub> exceedances in Napa County. First, much of the county is wind-sheltered, which tends to trap PM<sub>2.5</sub> 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 PM<sub>2.5</sub> 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 (NO<sub>x</sub> and ROG), carbon monoxide (CO), nitrogen dioxide (NO<sub>2</sub>), and suspended particulate matter (PM<sub>10</sub> and PM<sub>2.5</sub>). Other criteria pollutants, such as lead and sulfur dioxide (SO<sub>2</sub>), would not be substantially emitted by the proposed development or traffic, and air quality standards for them are being met throughout the Bay Area.

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

As mentioned above, in 2010, the BAAQMD adopted and later incorporated into its 2011 CEQA Guidelines project screening criteria (Table 3-1 – Operational-Related Criteria Air Pollutant and Precursors Screening Level Sizes) and thresholds of significance for air pollutants, which have now been updated by BAAQMD through May 2017. The Air District's threshold of significance provided in Table 3-1 has determined that 325 single family dwelling units will not significantly impact air quality and do not require further study (BAAQMD CEQA Guidelines, May 2017, pages 3-2 and 3-3). Given the size of the proposed project, which includes construction of an approximately 2,400-foot long driveway to serve a previously approved but unbuilt single-family home, garage, barn and ADU in comparison to the BAAQMD's screening criterion of 325 single-family dwelling units for NO<sub>x</sub> (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.

- c-d. In the short term, potential air quality impacts are most likely to result from earthmoving and construction activities required for project construction. Earthmoving and construction emissions would have a temporary effect; consisting mainly of dust generated during grading and other construction activities, exhaust emissions from construction related equipment and vehicles, and relatively minor emissions from paints and other architectural coatings. The Air District recommends incorporating feasible control measures as a means of addressing construction impacts. If the proposed project adhere to these relevant best management practices identified by the Air District and mitigation measure AIR-1 below, construction-related impacts are considered less than significant:

While the Air District defines public exposure to offensive odors as a potentially significant impact, grading for driveways are not known as operational producers of pollutants capable of causing substantial negative impacts to sensitive receptors. The closest residence is approximately 700 feet from the closest point of the proposed project site. Construction-phase pollutants would be reduced to a less than significant level by the above-noted standard condition of approval. The project would not create pollutant concentrations or objectionable odors affecting a substantial number of people. Impacts would be less than significant.

Mitigation Measure:

**MM AIR-1:** During all construction activities the permittee shall comply with the most current version of the Bay Area Air Quality Management District Basic Construction Best Management Practices including, but not limited to:

- a. Post a publicly visible sign with the telephone number and person to contact at the lead agency regarding dust complaints. The Air District's phone number shall also be visible.
- b. All exposed surfaces (e.g., parking areas, staging areas, soil piles, grading areas, and unpaved access roads) shall be watered two times per day or maintained via chemical dust suppressant or equivalent dust suppressant that achieves similar control on the unpaved road surfaces, as described in the manufacturer's specifications. Materials used for chemical dust suppressant shall include any non-toxic chemical or organic dust suppressant or stabilizer and shall not violate State Water Quality Control Board standards. Materials accepted by the California Air Resources Board and the U.S. EPA, and which meet State water quality standards shall be considered acceptable. The Permittee shall maintain records on dust suppressant use and any other supporting documentation to verify compliance with this mitigation measure. Such records shall include type of control measure(s) used, location and extent of coverage, date of use, amount, and frequency of application, including product information sheets that identify the name of the dust suppressant(s) and application instructions. Records shall be maintained for five (5) years, and shall be submitted to the PBES Department upon request.
- c. All haul trucks transporting soil, sand, or other loose material off-site shall be covered.
- d. All visible mud or dirt tracked out onto adjacent public roads shall be removed using wet power vacuum street sweepers at least once per day. The use of dry power sweeping is prohibited.
- e. All vehicle speeds on unpaved roads shall be limited to 15 mph.
- f. 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.
- g. Idling times shall be minimized either by shutting equipment off when not in use or reducing the maximum idling time to five (5) minutes (as required by the California airborne toxics control measure Title 13, Section 2485 of California Code of Regulations (CCR). Clear signage shall be provided for construction workers at all access points.
- h. 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.

Furthermore, while earthmoving and construction on the site will generate dust particulates in the short-term, the impact would be less than significant with dust control measures as specified below relating to dust:

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 miles per hour.

**Monitoring:** Prior to issuance of any grading or building permits pursuant to this approval, the measures listed above shall be identified on the project plans to the satisfaction of the Planning Division. These measures shall be implemented to the satisfaction of the BAAQMD during any project construction.

| IV. <b>BIOLOGICAL RESOURCES.</b> 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 checked="" type="checkbox"/>                 | <input type="checkbox"/>     | <input type="checkbox"/>            |
| c) Have a substantial adverse effect on state or federally protected wetlands (including, but not limited to, marsh, vernal pool, Coastal, etc.) through direct removal, filling, hydrological interruption, or other means?   | <input type="checkbox"/>       | <input type="checkbox"/>                            | <input type="checkbox"/>     | <input checked="" 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 checked="" type="checkbox"/>                 | <input type="checkbox"/>     | <input type="checkbox"/>            |
| e) Conflict with any local policies or ordinances protecting biological resources, such as a tree preservation policy or ordinance?  | <input type="checkbox"/>       | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/>                 | <input type="checkbox"/>     | <input type="checkbox"/>            |
| f) Conflict with the provisions of an adopted Habitat Conservation Plan, Natural Community Conservation Plan, or other approved local, regional, or state habitat conservation plan?   | <input type="checkbox"/>       | <input type="checkbox"/>                            | <input type="checkbox"/>     | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> |

Discussion:

a-b. Native vegetation of the general area consists of oak woodlands and open grassland areas populated with primarily non-native annual and perennial forbs. The project site is currently undeveloped, other than where an undeveloped, unpaved path begins at Dry Creek Road and continues for 2,400 feet to the site of the proposed residence. Of the 41 trees are proposed for removal, only 12 are Live Oak trees. Per Mitigation Measures BIO 1-4 below, the property owner shall replant a total of 36 Live Oak trees each 5 gallons in size.

The project area was surveyed for special status animals, communities, and their habitats. The project area and approximately 100 feet surrounding the project area was surveyed for nesting bird habitat and habitats for special status animals. No rare, threatened, endangered, or sensitive species were located during the survey and no sensitive or critical habitat was encountered during the survey.

The following animal species were identified to be known to be in the project area during biological surveys of the subject site (Botanical Survey and Biological Assessment, Jacobson Associates, Inc. and Alicia Ives Ringstad Consulting Wildlife Biologist for the Kateley Project APNs 034-370-040 and 034-030-061, Napa County, 2018 and revised March 16, 2021):

- Burrowing owl (*Athene Cunicularia*)
- White-Tailed Kite (*Elanus Leucurus*)
- Golden eagle (*Aquila Chrysaetos*)
- Ferruginous Hawk (*Buteo Regalis*)

- Cooper's hawk (*Accipiter Cooperii*)
- Swainson's hawk (*Buteo swainsoni*)
- Sharp-shinned hawk (*Accipiter striatus*)
- Bank swallow (*Riparia riparia*)
- Yellow Warbler (*Dendroica petechia*)
- Grasshopper sparrow (*Ammodramus savannarum*)
- Lawrence's goldfinch (*Spinus lawrencei*)
- Oak titmouse (*Baeolophus inornatus*)
- Bryant's savannah sparrow (*Passerculus sandwichensis alaudinus*)
- Rufous hummingbird (*Selasphorus rufus*)
- California horned lark (*Eremophila alpestris actia*)

The removal of woody vegetation during breeding season (March 1 to August 30) has the potential to impact the nesting birds listed above. To avoid disruption to foraging and nesting habitat, if woody vegetation removal will occur between March 1 and August 30, it is recommended that that pre-construction surveys for nesting birds conducted within 7 days of the commencement of woody vegetation removal.

Implementation of mitigation measure BIO-1 below would reduce potential impacts to nesting birds to a less than significant level.

- c. Napa County Environmental Sensitivity Maps and the Baseline Data Report (Chapter 15. Surface Water Hydrology, Map 15-6, Land Cover) do not indicate the presence of any wetlands or potential wetlands within the project boundary. The project would not result in substantial impacts to federally protected or potentially sensitive wetlands as these resources are not present at the site. No impacts would occur.
- d. The proposed project would not interfere 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. No wildlife corridors are present at the subject site. There is no watercourse located within the project area. Dry Creek is approximately 0.4 miles southwest of the project area that runs to the Napa River.
- e. According to the application materials, approximately 41 trees would be removed for the proposed access road improvements. However, granting of the road exception request would require horizontal and vertical vegetation management to be implemented along the entire length of the private lane and around proposed structures to create defensible space. As illustrated on the submitted plans, up to 12 oak trees may be removed as part of the proposed project. Impacts would be less than significant with the implementation of mitigation measures BIO-3 and BIO-4 consistent with the County Conservation Regulations (Chapter 18.108) which require the provision of replacement of lost oak woodlands or preservation of like habitat at a 3:1 ratio in the AW zoning district when retention of existing vegetation is found to be infeasible. 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 because there are no plans applicable to the subject site. No impacts would occur.

Mitigation Measures:

**MM BIO-1:** Prior to working on the Project, the project sponsor shall hire a qualified biologist to conduct pre-construction surveys for special status bird species, nesting birds, and raptors. The pre-construction surveys shall include the following:

- a.) Conduct clearing and tree and shrub removal operations between March 1 and August 30 to minimize potential impacts to nesting birds
- b.) Conduct pre-construction survey for active migratory bird and raptor nests within 14 days to 72 hours prior to commencement of constructions activities or tree removal, if anticipated to commence during the nesting season (March 1 – August 30).
  - i. If an active nest is found, the area around the tree with the active nest will be marked with high visibility fencing or flagging and the qualified biologist shall determine a suitable buffer distance to avoid nest disturbance during Project activities.

- ii. The qualified biologist should supervise nest activity during the first couple of days of construction to ensure construction activities are not disturbing the nest.
- iii. Alternatively, construction can wait until September 1 or until the young have fledged, or a qualified biologist has determined the nest is no longer active, whichever comes first.

**Monitoring:** Results of pre-construction surveys shall be submitted to the Planning Division and CDFW prior to issuance of the grading permit.

**MM BIO-2:** Prior to issuance of a grading permit, a final tree removal plan which identifies trees to be retained or removed shall be prepared by a certified arborist and submitted to the Planning Division for review. See MM BIO-3 and Monitoring.

**Monitoring:** The final tree removal plan shall be submitted for review and approval to Planning Division staff with recommendations regarding trees to be retained or removed prior to issuance of the grading permit.

**MM BIO-3:** Prior to issuance of a final certificate of occupancy, an oak replacement and preservation plan shall be implemented in consultation with a certified arborist. The oak replacement and preservation plan shall include the planting of 3 times the number of oak trees removed within an appropriate location on the property as determined in consultation with a certified arborist with the replanting schedule to match the oak species to be removed. The oaks shall be a minimum of five gallons in size and planted at approximately 20 feet on center or as otherwise advised by a certified arborist. The oaks shall be watered by hand, as necessary, during the first three years to promote survival. Successful planting shall be considered an 80 percent survival rate at five years. If less than 80 percent of the trees are surviving, replanting shall be necessary. The monitoring for the project is 10 years. Replacement trees shall be located near the south east section of the new road, near Dry Creek Road.

**Monitoring:** A letter from a certified arborist certifying that the replanting plan has been fully implemented shall be submitted to Planning Division staff.

| 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 checked="" type="checkbox"/>                 | <input 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 checked="" type="checkbox"/>                 | <input type="checkbox"/>     | <input type="checkbox"/> |
| c) Disturb any human remains, including those interred outside of dedicated cemeteries?                                       | <input type="checkbox"/>       | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/>                 | <input type="checkbox"/>     | <input type="checkbox"/> |

Discussion:

- a/b According to the Napa County Environmental Resource Maps (based on the following layers – Historical sites points & lines, Archaeology surveys, sites, sensitive areas, and flags) no historic sites have been identified on the property. However, if resources are found during any earth disturbing activities associated with the project, construction of the project is required to cease, and a qualified archaeologist would be retained to investigate the site in accordance with mitigation measure CUL-1.
- c. No human remains have been encountered on the property and no information has been encountered that would indicate that this project would encounter human remains. Most construction activities would occur on portions of the site previously graded without approval. The County formally opened a code enforcement case in 2014 due to illegal grading between 2009 and 2011. However, if resources are found during project grading, construction of the project is required to cease, and a qualified archaeologist would be retained to investigate the site in accordance with the mitigation measure noted above. Impacts would be less than significant.

Mitigation Measure:

**MM CUL-1:** In the event that archeological artifacts or human remains are discovered during construction, work shall cease in a 100-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 the development, all work in the vicinity must be, by law, 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 nearest tribal relatives as determined by the State Native American Heritage Commission shall be contacted by the permittee to obtain recommendations for treating or removal of such remains, including grave goods, with appropriate dignity, as required under Public Resources Code Section 5097.98.

**Monitoring:** Prior to issuance of any grading or building permits pursuant to this approval, the measure listed above shall be identified on the project plans to the satisfaction of the Planning Division.

| 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 type="checkbox"/>            | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> |
| f) Directly or indirectly destroy a unique paleontological resource or site or unique geologic feature?  | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/>            | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> |

Discussion:

- a.
- i.) There are no known faults on the project site as shown on the most recent Alquist-Priolo Earthquake Fault Zoning Map. As such, the proposed project would result in a less than significant impact with regards to rupturing a known fault.
  - ii.) All areas of the Bay Area are subject to strong seismic ground shaking. Construction of the project would be required to comply with the current California Building Code which 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 current California Building Code for seismic stability would result in less than significant impacts.
  - iv.) According to the Napa County Environmental Resource Maps (Landslides line, polygon, and geology layers) there is a small landslide deposit along the southeastern boundary of the project site. However, as no grading or development is proposed for this area impacts would be less than significant.
- b. The proposed improvements would occur on slopes of zero percent to twenty percent. The project would require incorporation of best management practices and would be subject to the Napa County Stormwater Ordinance which addresses sediment and erosion control measures and dust control, as applicable. Impacts would be less than significant.

- c/d. The following soil type is present at the subject site: Lodo-Maymen-Felton association. Based on the Napa County Environmental Sensitivity Maps (liquefaction layer) the improvements are proposed for an area which has a very low susceptibility for liquefaction. Impacts would be less than significant.
- e. The project consists of grading for a driveway. There are no wastewater systems proposed as part of the project.
- f. There are no known paleontological resources or unique geologic features at the project site.

Mitigation Measure:

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:

a/b. 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 <https://www.countyofnapa.org/2876/Current-Projects-Explorer>.

- 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 (CO<sub>2</sub>e)]. 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.) For the purposes of this analysis potential GHG emissions associated with road ‘construction’ and ‘development’ and with ‘ongoing’ construction operations have been discussed.

GHGs are the atmospheric gases whose absorption of solar radiation is responsible for the greenhouse effect, including carbon dioxide, methane, ozone, and the fluorocarbons, that contribute to climate change (a widely accepted theory/science explain human effects on the atmosphere). Carbon Dioxide (CO<sub>2</sub>) gas, the principal greenhouse gas (GHG) being emitted by human activities, and whose concentration in the atmosphere is most affected by human activity, also serves as the reference gas to compare other greenhouse gases. Agricultural sources of carbon emissions include forest clearing, land-use changes, biomass burning, and farm equipment and management activity emissions ([http://www.climatechange.ca.gov/glossary/letter\\_c.html](http://www.climatechange.ca.gov/glossary/letter_c.html)). Equivalent Carbon Dioxide (CO<sub>2</sub>e) is the most commonly reported type of GHG emission and a way to get one number that approximates total emissions from all the different gasses that contribute to GHG (BAAMD CEQA Air Quality Guidelines, May 2017). In this case, carbon dioxide (CO<sub>2</sub>) is used as the reference atom/compound to obtain atmospheric carbon CO<sub>2</sub> effects of GHG. Carbon stocks are converted to carbon dioxide equivalents (CO<sub>2</sub>e) by multiplying the carbon total by 44/12 (or 3.67), which is the ratio of the atomic mass of a carbon dioxide molecule to the atomic mass of a carbon atom (<http://www.nciasi2.org/COLE/index.html>)

One time “Construction Emissions” associated with the project include: emissions associated with the energy used to develop and prepare the project area, construction, and construction equipment and worker vehicle trips (hereinafter referred to as Equipment Emissions). These emissions also include underground carbon stocks (or Soil carbon) associated with any existing vegetation that is proposed to be removed. As previously stated, this project includes the construction of a new driveway access road.

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 CO<sub>2</sub>e. 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 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 Measure:

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 public or the environment?  | <input type="checkbox"/>       | <input type="checkbox"/>                            | <input type="checkbox"/>            | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> |
|     | e) For a project located within an airport land use plan or, where such a plan has not been adopted, within two miles of a public airport or public use airport, would the project result in a safety hazard or excessive noise for people residing or working in the project area? | <input type="checkbox"/>       | <input type="checkbox"/>                            | <input 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 type="checkbox"/>            | <input checked="" 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 grading a driveway. 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 driveway to serve a previously approved but unbuilt 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 environments. Impacts would be less than significant.
- c. There are no schools located within one-quarter mile from the proposed project site. According to Google Earth, the nearest schools, Justin-Siena, Browns Valley Elementary, and Salvador Elementary, are located more than six miles to the southeast. 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. Based upon the Napa County Planning General Maps (Angwin Airport and Napa Airport layers), the project site is not located within an airport land use plan or within two miles of a public airport. No impacts would occur.
- f. No impact would occur as the project site is not located within the vicinity of any private airports.
- 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 project would comply with current California Department of Forestry and California Building Code requirements for fire safety. Impacts would be less than significant.

Mitigation Measure:

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

Discussion:

On April 21, 2021, the Governor of the State of California proclaimed a State of Emergency for the Counties of Sonoma and Mendocino due to extremely low reservoir levels and drought conditions. On May 11, 2021, the Governor expanded the drought emergency to an additional 39 counties, including the County of Napa. This potentially historic drought in

Napa County may result in broad impacts and considerations that extend beyond drinking water and conservation efforts. The local agricultural system, general county operational practices, tourism, fire services and prevention, maintenance of environmental health, protection of vulnerable ecosystems, and consideration of the public's health are all important aspects. On June 8, 2021, the Napa County Board of Supervisors adopted a resolution declaring a Proclamation of Local Emergency due to drought conditions which are occurring in Napa County. On October 19, 2021, the Governor issued a proclamation extending the drought emergency statewide.

Napa County requires all discretionary permit applicants to complete necessary water analysis 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, as well as 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 Groundwater Resources Advisory Committee (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, providing a definition, and explaining the shared responsibility for Groundwater Sustainability and the important role of monitoring as a means to achieving groundwater sustainability.

In 2009, Napa County began a comprehensive study of its groundwater resources to meet identified action items in the County's 2008 General Plan update. The study, by Luhdorff and Scalmanini Consulting Engineers (LSCE), emphasized developing a sound understanding of groundwater conditions and implementing an expanded groundwater monitoring and data management program as a foundation for integrated water resources planning and dissemination of water resources information. The 2011 baseline study by LSCE, which included over 600 wells and data going back over 50 years, concluded that "the groundwater levels in Napa County are stable, except for portions of the MST district". Most wells elsewhere within the Napa Valley floor with a sufficient record indicate that groundwater levels are more affected by climatic conditions, are within historical levels, and seem to recover from dry periods during subsequent wet or normal periods. The LSCE Study also concluded that, on a regional scale, there 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.

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 "all other areas" based upon current County Water Availability Analysis policies. Permeability of the Lodo-Maymen-Felton soil is moderate with an available water capacity of one to 3.5 inches (Soil Survey of Napa County, California, 1978). Based on the parcel's size and soil characteristics, the estimated groundwater recharge rate for the site is anticipated to far exceed the project's proposed water demand associated with grading for the driveway and the previously approved but unbuilt single-family residence.

- a/b. The project would not violate any water quality standards or waste discharge requirements nor substantially deplete local groundwater supplies. The project consists of grading for a driveway. Future additional residential development would be subject to review by the Environmental Health Division concerning wastewater system consistency with County standards.

One well is located on the project parcel. The site is currently undeveloped with no existing project water demand.

The estimated total water estimate of water usage for the driveway construction is as follows:  
Begin Project - April 2022 - Road Grading & Building Pad Work (4 months)

- 1 each 3600 gallon water truck per day at 5 days per week for two months = 144k gallons
  - 2 each 3600 gallon water trucks per day at 5 days per week for two months = 288k gallons
- Below is a table that details each source of proposed groundwater use:

| Projected Water Demand                         | Water Use (ac-ft/yr) |
|--|----------------------|
| Single-Family Residence (Includes Landscaping) | 1.00                 |
| Second-Living Unit                             | 0.5                  |
| Swimming Pool                                  | 0.05                 |
| Driveway Construction                          | 1.33                 |
| <b>TOTAL</b>                                   | <b>2.88</b>          |

In response to regional drought and the general Statewide need to protect groundwater resources, the Governor enacted new legislation requiring local governments to monitor and manage groundwater resources. Napa County's prior work on the Napa Valley Groundwater Management Plan provides a strong foundation for Napa County to comply with this State mandated monitoring and management objective. As a direct result, the project site is now subject to this new legislation requiring local agencies 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 project proposes 1.33 af/yr of groundwater over a four month period and even when combined with the residence and ADU on the property, the total 2.88 af/yr would not result in a substantial increase the demand of ground water supplies or interfere with groundwater recharge or lowering of the local groundwater level given the large parcel size. There are no known offsite wells located within 500 feet of the project well. According to Napa County environmental resource mapping (*Water Deficient Areas/Storage Areas*), the project site is not located within a water deficient area and the County is not aware of, nor has it received any reports of groundwater deficiencies in the area. Impacts would be less than significant.

- c. 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. The grading and drainage plan and stormwater control plan have been reviewed and approved 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. No portion of the project site is located within the FEMA-designated 100-year floodplain. The parcel is not located in an area that is subject to inundation by tsunamis, seiches, or mudflows. No impact 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.

| 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?   | <input type="checkbox"/>       | <input type="checkbox"/>                            | <input type="checkbox"/>            | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> |
|     | b) Cause a significant environmental impact due to a conflict with any land use plan, policy, or regulation adopted for the purpose of avoiding or mitigating an environmental effect? | <input type="checkbox"/>       | <input type="checkbox"/>                            | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/>            |

Discussion:

- a. The project would not occur within an established community, nor would it result in the division of an established community.
- b. The project complies with the Napa County Code and all other applicable regulations with the exception to a RSS Exception requested to the maximum length requirements for a driveway having 18-20 percent grade. The code specifies a maximum slope length of 300 feet for roadway segments with 18 to 20 percent slopes. The plan proposes 20 percent grade for approximately 545 feet in length. The required 100-foot preceding and ensuing sections, having no more than 10 percent grade would be installed. The proposed design provides the same overall practical effect by the clearing and maintaining of existing vegetation. The driveway width would also be expanded to 20 feet for the first 300 feet, which includes the section where the exception is being requested.

The subject parcel is located in the AW (Agricultural Watershed) zoning district which allows single family residences and associated access roads. 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 Measure:

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

- b) Result in the loss of availability of a locally-important mineral resource recovery site delineated on a local general plan, specific plan or other land use plan?

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 Measure:

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?   | <input type="checkbox"/>       | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/>                 | <input type="checkbox"/>     | <input type="checkbox"/>            |
|       | b) Generation of excessive groundborne vibration or groundborne noise levels?   | <input type="checkbox"/>       | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/>                 | <input type="checkbox"/>     | <input type="checkbox"/>            |
|       | c) For a project located within the vicinity of a private airstrip or an airport land use plan or, where such a plan has not been adopted, within two miles of a public airport or public use airport, would the project expose people residing or working in the project area to excessive noise levels? | <input type="checkbox"/>       | <input type="checkbox"/>                            | <input type="checkbox"/>     | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> |

Discussion:

- a/b. The project would result in a temporary increase in noise levels during grading and construction of the proposed road 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 nearest residence to the project site is approximately 700 feet to the southeast of the subject site, 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 8am-5pm 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) as required by mitigation measure MM NOI-1 below. Impacts would be less than significant with the implementation of MM NOI-1.
- c. The project site is not located within an airport land use plan or the vicinity of a private airstrip. No impacts would occur.

Mitigation Measure:

**MM NOI-1:** 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.

**Monitoring:** Prior to issuance of any grading or building permits pursuant to this approval, the measure listed above shall be identified on the project plans to the satisfaction of the Planning Division.

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

Discussion:

a. The proposed project includes the construction of an access road. 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.

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 Measure:

None required.

| XV. | <b>PUBLIC SERVICES.</b> 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 surrounding 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 no residences are proposed beyond the previously approved residence under Administrative Viewshed Permit No. P19-00196. Impacts to public services would be less than significant.

Mitigation Measure:

None required.

| XVI. | <b>RECREATION.</b> 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?

Discussion:

- a. The project would not significantly increase use of existing park or recreational facilities based on its limited scope. Impacts would be less than significant.
- b. No recreational facilities are proposed as part of the project. No impact would occur.

Mitigation Measure:

None required.

| XVII. TRANSPORTATION. Would the project:   | Potentially Significant Impact | Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporation | Less Than Significant Impact        | No Impact                |
|--|--------------------------------|---|-------------------------------------|--------------------------|
| a) Cause an increase in traffic which is substantial in relation to the existing traffic load and capacity of the street system and/or conflict with General Plan Policy CIR-38, which seeks to maintain an adequate Level of Service (LOS) at signalized and unsignalized intersections, or reduce the effectiveness of existing transit services or pedestrian/bicycle facilities? | <input type="checkbox"/>       | <input type="checkbox"/>                            | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> |
| b) Conflict with a program, plan, ordinance or policy addressing the circulation system, including transit, roadway, bicycle and pedestrian facilities?  | <input type="checkbox"/>       | <input type="checkbox"/>                            | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> |
| c) Would the project conflict or be inconsistent with CEQA Guidelines section 15064.3, subdivision (b)?  | <input type="checkbox"/>       | <input type="checkbox"/>                            | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> |
| d) Substantially increase hazards due to a geometric design feature, (e.g., sharp curves or dangerous intersections) or incompatible uses (e.g., farm equipment)?  | <input type="checkbox"/>       | <input type="checkbox"/>                            | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> |
| e) Result in inadequate emergency access?  | <input type="checkbox"/>       | <input type="checkbox"/>                            | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> |
| f) Conflict with General Plan Policy CIR-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 is located on the east side of Dry Creek Road approximately 1.4 miles southeast of its intersection with Oakville Grade Road. Dry Creek Road is a regional route that runs on the east side of the Napa Valley and becomes Oakville Grade and also connects to Mount Veeder road. It serves as a connector between Napa and Sonoma Counties.

The project includes the construction of a new access road to serve the previously approved residence, and Road Exception request for a section of the proposed roadway.

Traffic conditions on roads and at intersections are generally characterized by their "level of service" or LOS. LOS is a convenient way to express the ratio between volume and capacity on a given link or at a given intersection, and is expressed as a letter grade ranging from LOS A through LOS F. Each level of service is generally described as follows:

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

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

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

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

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

**LOS F-** Forced or breakdown conditions. This condition exists wherever the volume of traffic exceeds the capacity of the roadway. Long queues can form behind these bottleneck points with queued traffic traveling in a stop-and-go fashion. (2000 Highway Capacity Manual, Transportation Research Board)

The proposed project is anticipated to generate the following amount of daily trips per day for the duration of construction:

- 1 each 3600 gallon water truck per day at 5 days per week for two months = 144k gallons & 40 truck trips at 10 miles round trip each truck trip.
- 2 each 3600 gallon water trucks per day at 5 days per week for two months = 288k gallons & 80 truck trips at 10 miles round trip each truck trip.
- Truck hauling of earth spoils to adjacent parcel (APN 034-370-038) is estimated to be 1000 truck trips at 2 miles round trip each truck.

- c. The Circulation Element includes new policies that reflect the new VMT reduction regulatory framework for transportation impact assessment, along with a draft threshold of significance that is based on reduction of VMT compared to the unmitigated project rather than the regional average VMT (Policies CIR-7 through CIR-9). Staff believes this alternative approach to determining the significance of a project's transportation impacts would be better suited to Napa County's rural context, while still supporting the efforts of the County to achieve the greenhouse gas emissions goals of its pending Climate Action Plan. The reduction in VMT and, correspondingly, GHG emissions from the transportation sector, is also necessary for Napa County, the region, and the state to achieve long-term, statewide mandates targeted toward reducing GHG emissions. Such mandates include, but are not limited to Executive Orders S-3-05 and B-16-12, which respectively, set a general statewide GHG emissions reduction target of 80 percent below 1990 levels by 2050, and an 80 percent GHG emissions reduction below 1990 levels (also by 2050) specifically for the transportation sector.

The project would not conflict or be inconsistent with CEQA Guidelines section 15064.3, subdivision (b). The proposed project is estimated to generate 9.57 net new daily trips for four months, which is well below the 110 daily trip threshold in the Office of Planning and Research guidelines.

- d-f. After implementation of the proposed project, the site would be accessed via a driveway from Dry Creek Road. The project would result in no significant off-site circulation system operational impacts nor any sight line impacts at the project driveway. The project also includes a request for an exception to the Napa County Road and Street Standards (NCRSS). The request proposes an exception to the roads and street standards to accommodate steep terrain and ground slopes to allow for a short segment of non-compliant slope at a single location. Proposed site access and the RSS Exception was reviewed and approved by the Napa County Fire Department and Engineering Services Division.

Mitigation Measure:

None required.

| <b>XVIII. TRIBAL CULTURAL RESOURCES.</b> 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: | <b>Potentially Significant Impact</b> | <b>Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporation</b> | <b>Less Than Significant Impact</b> | <b>No Impact</b>                    |
|--|---------------------------------------|--|-------------------------------------|-------------------------------------|
| 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 type="checkbox"/>                                   | <input type="checkbox"/>            | <input checked="" 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 type="checkbox"/>                                   | <input type="checkbox"/>            | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> |

Discussion:

a/b. According to the Napa County Environmental Resource Maps (based on the following layers – Historical sites points & lines, Archaeology surveys, sites, sensitive areas, and flags) no historic sites or tribal resources have been identified on the property. Invitation for tribal consultation was completed on October 1, 2021, pursuant to AB 52 and no request to initiate consultation was received. No impact would occur.

Mitigation Measure:

| <b>XIX. UTILITIES AND SERVICE SYSTEMS.</b> Would the project:   | <b>Potentially Significant Impact</b> | <b>Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporation</b> | <b>Less Than Significant Impact</b> | <b>No Impact</b>         |
|---|---------------------------------------|--|-------------------------------------|--------------------------|
| 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?
- 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?
- e) Comply with federal, state, and local management and reduction statutes and regulations related to solid waste?

Discussion:

- a. The project does not propose wastewater facilities. One well is located on the project parcel. The well on site is 210 feet deep and yield is estimated at 30gpm. Based on this information, adequate water would be available to serve the project. Impacts would be less than significant. The grading and drainage plan and storm water control plan have been reviewed and approved by the Engineering Division. Impacts would be less than significant.
- b. The project will not 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.
- c. The project would comply with federal, state, and local statutes and regulations related to solid waste. Therefore, impacts would be less than significant.

Mitigation Measure:

None required.

| XX. <b>WILDFIRE.</b> 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-d. The proposed project is located within the local responsibility area. There are no project features that would substantially impair an adopted emergency response plan or emergency evacuation plan. Although the project site is on steep slopes, the Napa County Engineering division and Napa County Fire division are in support of the project. The project site possesses moderate slopes ranging from 0-20 percent and is accessed from Dry Creek Road, a County maintained road. There are existing overhead power lines along Dry Creek Road. The project would comply with current California Department of Forestry and California Building Code requirements for fire safety. Impacts would be less than significant.

Mitigation Measure:

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 checked="" type="checkbox"/>                 | <input type="checkbox"/>     | <input type="checkbox"/>            |
|      | b) Does the project have impacts that are individually limited, but cumulatively considerable? (“Cumulatively considerable” means that the incremental effects of a project are considerable when viewed in connection with the effects of past projects, the effects of other current projects, and the effects of probable future projects)?   | <input type="checkbox"/>       | <input type="checkbox"/>                            | <input type="checkbox"/>     | <input checked="" 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 type="checkbox"/>     | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> |

Discussion:

- a. As discussed in **Section IV** above, the project site contains vegetation suitable for nesting birds and oak woodlands protected by County regulations. Mitigation is proposed for those biological topics that would reduce potentially significant impacts to a level of less than significant. As identified in **Section V** above, no known historically sensitive sites or structures, archaeological or paleontological resources, sites or unique geological features have been identified within the project site. In the event archaeological artifacts are found, mitigation measure MM CUL-1 would be implemented. 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 pollutions, 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.

The project's trip generation was calculated based upon the ITE Trip Generation Manual, 9<sup>th</sup> Edition. Under the Napa County General Plan, traffic volumes are projected to increase and will be caused by a combination of locally generated traffic as well as general regional growth. The General Plan EIR indicates that much of the forecasted increase in traffic on the arterial roadway network will result from traffic generated outside of the county, however the project will contribute a small amount toward the general overall increase.

General Plan Policy CIR-16 states that "The County will seek to maintain an arterial Level of Service D or better on all County roadways, except where the level of Service already exceeds this standard and where increased intersection capacity is not feasible without substantial additional right of way." As discussed above under **Section XVI**, Transportation, the proposed project would not lead to a deterioration of the level of service on Dry Creek Road because it would add less than one percent to the existing volume. Potential cumulative impacts would be less than significant.

- c. All impacts identified in this MND 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 Measure:

None required.