

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:** 1228 Hagen Vineyard Track I Agricultural Erosion Control Plan Application (ECPA) #P21-00274-ECPA
2. **Property Owner:** 1228 Hagen LLC Trust c/o Rudy Zuidema
3. **County Contact Person, Phone Number and email:** Dana Morrison, Planner III, (707) 253-4437, dana.morrison@countyofnapa.org
4. **Project Location and Assessor's Parcel Number (APN):**

1228 Hagen Road, Napa, CA 94559
APN: 049-200-003-000
Section 13, Township 7 North, Range 4 West, Mt. Diablo Principal Meridian
Longitude - 122°15'40.788"W; Latitude 38°19'32.556"N
5. **Project sponsor's name and address:** Drew Aspegren, Napa Valley Vineyard Engineering, Inc
176 Main Street, St Helena, CA 94574
707-963-4927
6. **General Plan description:** Rural Residential (RR)
7. **Zoning:** Residential County (RC)

Background/Project History: The project parcel (APN 049-200-003), referred to as the Subject Property, is owned by the 1228 Hagen LLC Trust, purchased in October 2019. The residence was constructed in approximately 1950. In addition to the residence, the site contains accessory structures including a garage, barn, pool, workshop, shed, a well, water tanks, driveway, fencing and associated residential landscaping. Approximately 1.47 acres of vineyard were installed without an ECPA between 2007 and 2009, when the parcel was under different ownership. An approximately 0.79-acre (Block A1) section of the existing vineyard is located on slopes of less than 5% and as such did not require an ECPA and is not under consideration as part of this ECPA, an additional 0.29 acres (Block A2) was planted on slopes greater than 5% and would require approval of an erosion control plan to approve. Additionally, 0.35 acres of the existing 1.47-acre vineyard were planted within the required Sarco Creek setback (not permitted per code) and is proposed for removal and restoration, along with 0.04 acres along the eastern property line (Abandon Vineyard). In addition to these corrective actions, the applicant is also proposing the installation of an additional 0.96 gross (0.68 net) acres of vineyards on slopes ranging between 2-15%, designated as Block B for a total of 1.25 acres (Block B + legalization of Block A2) of new vineyard. If approved, this would result in a final total of 2.04 (1.25 proposed in this ECPA +0.79 existing less than 5%) acres of vineyard on the subject parcel. According to County's 1940's aerial photo images, nearly the entire parcel was planted with orchard at this time. According to the 1993, aerial photo image there was no longer an orchard on site, and instead the site contained a single-family residence and associated accessory structures.

To clarify, project intends to:

- 1) Legalize 0.29 acres [Block A2]
- 2) Maintain 0.79 acres (located on slopes less than 5% and does not require an ECPA) [Block A1]
- 3) Install 0.96 acres of new vineyard with an ECPA [Block B]
- 4) Remove 0.35 (within creek setback) and 0.04 acres along eastern property line [Abandon vineyard]

The Biological Resources Resource Survey (Kjeldsen, June 2021 – **Exhibit B**) found the whole proposed vineyard area to consist of ruderal grassland; therefore, no sensitive native grasslands or woodlands would be affected by the project, so no canopy retention analyses are needed for the project. The project does propose to remove eight (8) black walnut trees, remnants from the time the

property was a walnut orchard. Beyond these eight (8) trees, no other trees are proposed for removal and any perimeter trees along property lines or vineyard avenues would only be trimmed and maintained, but not removed. The project proposes to replant 24 trees (an even mix of black oak and coast live oak) within the 0.35 acres area proposed for vineyard removal and restoration (Kjeldsen, August 2022 – **Exhibit B-1**). This will offset the carbon loss that would occur by the removal of the eight (8) walnut trees, and result in a no net loss in sequestration capabilities of the subject parcel to achieve consistency with the Bay Area Air Quality Management District (BAAQMD) CEQA GHG thresholds.

8. **Description of Project:**

The proposed project involves the clearing of 0.96 acre of ruderal grasses and eight (8) walnut trees within the proposed clearing limits (or project area), earthmoving, and the installation and maintenance of erosion control measures in connection with the development of 0.96 gross acres (0.68 net acres) of new vineyard, removal of 0.39 acres of unpermitted vineyard located within the Sarco Creek setback, and legalization of 0.29 acres of unpermitted vineyard (**Figure 2**). The project would result in a total of 2.04 acres of vineyard (1.08 acres of which is already existing (0.79 acres less than 5% and 0.29 acres unpermitted and seeking approval)). Typical slopes within the project area range from 2-15%, with no slopes over 30. The parcel is located within the RC zoning district and is not subject to the 70% retention requirement and the 3:1 tree preservation ratio required per Section 18.108 of the Napa County Code. However, the project proposes to retain all of the existing oak woodland on site and is proposing to replace the eight (8) walnut trees with 24 trees, an even mix of black and coast live oak. Block A2 is located along a blue line stream on the north edge of the property and along the stream setback; trees located here may be trimmed and maintained, but will not be removed. Rock generated because of site preparation would be used to construct erosion control features such as the rock apron, and in on-site landscaping. Rock may be crushed and used on the existing avenues where needed; rock not used immediately will be stockpiled for future use inside the proposed clearing limits, in stockpiles that are expected to be less than 20 feet in height, however based on parent material not much rock is anticipated. Staging areas are proposed to be located in the main driveway, as called out on the ECPA plan set and chemical mixing would occur offsite. No grading activities, ground disturbance or rock storage would occur outside of the proposed clearing limits.

The vineyard would be irrigated with recycled water from the Napa Sanitation District (NSD), which would be trucked onto the site and stored in two (2) existing 5,000-gallon water tanks. The existing house and drought-tolerant landscaping water is sourced from the existing groundwater well on the parcel; groundwater from the residential well will not be used to irrigate the new or existing vineyard. If NSD is unable to provide recycled water, planting of new vines will be delayed until recycled water can be obtained. If after the vineyard is established NSD is unable to provide recycled water, then the vines will be dry farmed. The frequency of truck trips is expected to be two (2) trips per week for five (5) months. Currently the vines are watered using trucked-in recycled water that is stored in two (2) existing 5,000-gallon water tanks. These two (2) water tanks are designated solely for vineyard irrigation. No landscaping will be irrigated from this system, and no well water will be added to this system. All vineyards will be irrigated from this system. The irrigation system for Block A1 and A2 will not change; a new irrigation system will be constructed to irrigate Block B. The new recycled water irrigation pipeline, which will be purple to indicate it is recycled water and not potable, would be trenched to the vineyard within the proposed clearing limits. Monitoring of the existing groundwater well, which services the residence and residential landscaping, will be required to ensure that groundwater is not utilized for the existing or proposed vineyard. One mitigation measure (Cultural Resources Mitigation Measure -1) is proposed for the project which is in compliance with the signed Tribal Monitoring Agreement that the applicant/owner has entered into with the Yocha Dehe Wintun Nation.

The property is currently enclosed by wildlife exclusion fencing that encloses most of the parcel (barring the southern grassland portion proposed for 0.68 net acres of vines, Block B). New wildlife exclusion fencing is proposed for installation to enclose said vineyard block, which will tie into the existing wildlife exclusion fence surrounding the existing vineyard and residential development. No fencing will be located within the stream setback and an open corridor will be maintained along the southern property line, along the existing ephemeral stream, so that wildlife movement can continue to and from Sarco Creek.

Erosion Control Measures: Temporary erosion control measures include the installation of fiber rolls and straw wattles, along with the application of straw mulch at a rate of 2 tons per acre prior to October 15 of the year of construction and as necessary thereafter.

Permanent erosion control measures include optional rock-filled avenues, and diversion ditches which would directly runoff to a grassy drainage way. A permanent no-till cover crop would be maintained at a minimum vegetation cover density of 80%. Details of the proposed erosion control measures are provided in the 1228 Hagen LLC Vineyard ECP #P21-00274-ECPA, revised February 16, 2022 and August 22, 2022, prepared by Drew Aspegren (Registered Professional Engineer No. 31418) of Napa Valley Vineyard Engineering, Napa, California (**Exhibit A**).

Earthmoving: Earthmoving and grading activities associated with the installation of erosion control measures and subsequent vineyard operation including, but are not limited to vegetation and tree removal, soil ripping (maximum depth of 4 feet), rock removal, disking, and the development of erosion control measures.

Other Activities and Features: Other activities and features of the proposed project and subsequent vineyard development and operation include:

- a. Installation of vineyard trellis and drip irrigation systems, and planting rootstock on a 4-foot by 7-foot spacing pattern within Block B, and a 4-foot by 6-foot spacing for Block A2.
- b. Ongoing inspection and maintenance of temporary and permanent erosion and runoff control measures.
- c. Ongoing operation and maintenance of the vineyard, which includes vine management (pruning, fertilization, pest, and disease control, and frost protection), weed control, cover crop mowing, irrigation and trellis system maintenance, and fruit harvesting. Herbicide used to control weeds within the vineyard would be limited to contact or systemic herbicides. Spot spraying would be allowed in the spring (no earlier than February 15th to ensure adequate vegetative cover for the remainder of the rainy season). No pre-emergent herbicides would be used for weed management, and no strip spraying would be performed.

Table 1 lists a general schedule for the construction of the proposed project as identified in #P21-00274-ECPA and **Table 2** outlines typical general ongoing vineyard operations. The final implementation schedule is pending action on #P21-00274-ECPA.

Table 1 – Implementation Schedule

April 1:	Commence clearing and tillage operations.
October 1:	All tillage and erosion control completed.
October 15 ¹ :	All winterization complete, including seeding, straw mulching, and straw wattle installation.

¹ During the winter months (October 15 to April 1 of the succeeding year), no earthmoving work is allowed by the Napa County Code (NCC) Section 18.108.070(L).

Table 2 – Annual Operations Schedule

January to April	a. Prune vines. b. Weed control.
April to August	a. Sulfur application to protect against mildew. b. Mow cover crop. c. Weed control.
September to October	a. Harvest. b. Winterize vineyard and vineyard avenues.
November to April	a. Monitor and maintain erosion control measures and repair as necessary during rain events.

Implementation of the proposed project would be in accordance with the 1228 Hagen LLC Vineyard ECPA prepared by Napa Valley Vineyard Engineering, Napa (Revised August 22, 2022 - **Exhibit A**). The proposed project is further described in the application materials including the Supplemental Project Information sheets. All documents are incorporated herein by reference and available for review in the Napa County Department of Planning, Building and Environmental Services (PBES).

9. **Describe the environmental setting and surrounding land uses.**

The proposed project would occur on a single parcel totaling approximately 6.1 acres, located at 1228 Hagen Road, Napa. The site is located at the end of a shared private driveway located approximately 0.7 miles northwest of the intersection of Silverado Trail and Hagen Road, and approximately 2.25 miles west of the City of Napa Downtown. General topography of the area consists of flat to gentle slopes of the Napa Valley Floor along the western-facing East Napa range. Elevations within the project area range from approximately 40 to 83 feet above mean sea level. Development on the project parcel includes a single-family residence, shed, garage, workshop, barn, pool, existing well, water tanks, driveway, fencing and associated residential landscaping, as well as existing vineyard. The existing paved driveway provides access to the project area from Hagen Road, said driveway (on the subject property) will serve as the staging area and two (2) existing gates will be used to access the existing and proposed vineyard blocks.

The project parcel is located within the Sarco Creek watershed. Sarco Creek is a blue-line stream that lies approximately 55-160 feet to the west and north of the proposed vineyard blocks. There is one mapped ephemeral stream located along the southern property line, which drains into Sarco Creek. Sarco Creek converges with Milliken Creek and eventually drains to the Napa River. This ephemeral stream is avoided by the project with 35' setbacks consistent with NCC 18.108.025 (**Exhibit A**). The project will remove 0.39 acres of vineyard from within the Sarco Creek setback and will maintain setbacks from the creek consistent with NCC Section 18.108.025.

The surrounding area consists of rural residential, vineyards and undeveloped land. The nearest winery is Beaucanon Estate on Monticello Road (approximately 3,000 feet northwest of the project site). There are nine (9) other wineries located within 1.5 miles of the parcel: Eleven Wines, HDV, Alta Napa Valley, Madorom Winery, Judd's Hill Winery, Del Dotto, Italics Winery, Chateau 15 Winery, and Shadybrook Winery. No other wineries are within a half-mile of the parcel. The nearest known schools (Vichy Elementary and Harvest

Christian Academy) are approximately 0.65-miles north and 1.5-miles southwest, respectively. Skyline State Park is approximately 3.2 miles south of the project site.

No potentially active faults have been mapped on the project site; the nearest active faults are an unnamed fault and West Napa Fault, approximately 0.8 miles northwest of the project site and approximately 3.5 miles west of the project site, respectively (Napa County GIS: Faults and Earthquake Layers). Soils on the project site have been classified according to the Soil Survey of Napa County (USDA, 1978) as Coombs gravelly loam 2 to 5% slopes. Landslides, landslide deposits, and areas of instability have not been identified within the project parcel or immediately adjacent areas (Napa County GIS: Landslide Polygon and Landslide Lines layers).

Vegetation types of the area generally consist of non-native grassland, woodland, and vineyards and other developed lands. Vegetation types occurring within the project site consist of approximately 2.6 acres of live oak woodlands, 1.0 acres of developed land (hardscape, residence and accessory structures) and 2.5 acres of annual grassland. None of the existing live oak woodland is proposed for removal. The project does propose the removal of 2.06 acres of the annual grassland vegetation type. (**Exhibit B-1**).

10. **Other agencies whose approval is required** (e.g., permits, financing approval, or participation agreement). Napa Sanitation District have provided letter detailing their potential ability to provide water to the site, utilizing a trucked water service coordinated by the property owner and/or project applicant.

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

Other Agencies Contacted
The Middletown Rancheria
The Mishewal Wappo Tribe of Alexander Valley
The Yocha Dehe Wintun Nation

11. **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.?

Notice of the proposed project was sent to Middletown Rancheria, Mishewal Wappo Tribe of Alexander Valley, and Yocha Dehe Wintun Nation on January 19, 2022. The Yocha Dehe Wintun Nation responded to the consultation invitation on February 25, 2022, requesting a site visit to assess the proposed project area. On April 14, 2022, the County and NVVE met with the Yocha Dehe Wintun Nation representative to conduct a site visit. The site visits determined that tribal monitoring would be required during vineyard development. This has been included as a Condition of Approval and Mitigation Measure, furthermore the project applicant has entered into a Tribal Monitoring Agreement with the Yocha Dehe Wintun Nation. The Mishewal Wappo Tribe of Alexander Valley and Middletown Rancheria did not request consultation within the 30-day notification period, and because no response to the consultation invitation was received, the consultation time period elapsed.

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.

Other sources of information used in the preparation of this Initial Study include site-specific studies conducted by the applicant and filed by the applicant in conjunction with ECP #P21-00274-ECPA as listed below, and the environmental background information contained in the permanent file on this project. These documents and information sources are incorporated herein by reference and available for review at the Napa County Department of Planning, Building and Environmental Services located at 1195 Third Street, Suite 210, Napa, CA 94559 or at www.countyofnapa.org/2876/Current-Projects-Explorer:

- Napa Valley Vineyard Engineering, Inc., April 30, 2021 (Revised August 22, 2022) Erosion Control Plan and Plan Narrative #P21-0274, Hagen Vineyard (**Exhibit A**)
- Kjeldsen Biological Survey, June 2021, Biological Resource Survey, 1228 Hagen Road (**Exhibit B**)
- Kjeldsen Biological Survey, August 2022, Tree Replanting and Carbon Sequestration Plan, 1228 Hagen Road (**Exhibit B-1**)
- Tom Origer & Associates, December 16, 2020, Cultural Resource Study for 1228 Hagen Road, Napa County, California
- Napa Valley Vineyard Engineering, Inc., September 2, 2021 (Revised November 22, 2021), Revised Soil Loss Analysis, Hagen Vineyard ECP (**Exhibit C**).
- Napa Valley Vineyard Engineering, Inc., September 2, 2021 (Revised November 22, 2021), Revised Hydrologic Analysis, Hagen Vineyard ECP (**Exhibit D**).
- Recycled Water Letter from Napa Sanitation District, January 7, 2022, (referenced APN 049-200-003) (**Exhibit E**).
- Trucked Recycled Water Use Permit. 1784 Monticello Road, Napa (same owner as APN 049-200-003) (**Exhibit F**).
- Water System Plans (**Exhibit G**)
- Project Revision Statement (**Exhibit H**)
- Application Submittal Materials and Correspondence (**Exhibit I**)
- Site inspections conducted by Napa County Planning Division staff on November 4, 2021 and April 14, 2022.
- Napa County Geographic Information System (GIS) sensitivity maps/layers.

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 (*SUBSEQUENT*) MITIGATED NEGATIVE DECLARATION will be prepared. Attached as **Exhibit H** is the signed Project Revision Statement.
- I find that the proposed project MAY have a significant effect on the environment, and an ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACT REPORT is required.
- I find that the proposed project MAY have a "potentially significant impact" or "potentially significant unless mitigated" impact on the environment, but at least one effect 1) has been adequately analyzed in an earlier document pursuant to applicable legal standards, and 2) has been addressed by mitigation measures based on the earlier analysis as described on attached sheets. An ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACT REPORT is required, but it must analyze only the effects that remain to be addressed.
- I find that although the proposed project could have a significant effect on the environment, because all potentially significant effects (a) have been analyzed adequately in an earlier EIR or NEGATIVE DECLARATION pursuant to applicable standards, and (b) have been avoided or mitigated pursuant to that earlier EIR or NEGATIVE DECLARATION, including revisions or mitigation measures that are imposed upon the proposed project, nothing further is required.

Signature

Date

Dana Morrison, Planner III
Napa County
Planning, Building and Environmental Services Department

I.	AESTHETICS. Except as provided in Public Resources Code Section 21099, would the project:	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporation	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
	a) Have a substantial adverse effect on a scenic vista?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
	b) Substantially damage scenic resources, including, but not limited to, trees, rock outcroppings, and historic buildings within a state scenic highway?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
	c) In non-urbanized areas, substantially degrade the existing visual character or quality of public views of the site and its surroundings? (Public views are those that are experienced from a publicly accessible vantage point.) If the project is in an urbanized area, would the project conflict with applicable zoning and other regulations governing scenic quality?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
	d) Create a new source of substantial light or glare which would adversely affect day or nighttime views in the area?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>

Discussion:

- a-b. The project site is approximately 0.7 miles northeast from the Silverado Trail, the closest County viewshed road. The site is not located on a prominent hillside, a major or minor ridgeline (Napa County GIS, Ridgelines Layer), or within a scenic corridor (Napa County GIS, Scenic Corridors Layer) and the closest minor ridgeline is located one mile to the south. There are no significant rock outcroppings or geologic features on the project site that would be impacted by the proposed project. The project site is not visible from a state scenic highway, as there are no scenic highways in the area (Caltrans 2018 - http://www.dot.ca.gov/hq/LandArch/16_livability/scenic_highways/index.htm). Therefore, the proposed project would have a less than significant impact on a scenic vista, scenic highway, historic buildings, scenic trees, or rock outcrops for the reasons described above.
- c. The proposed project would result in the removal of existing grasses and eight (8) remnant orchard walnut trees within the proposed development area for the development of vineyard. The proposed project is consistent with the Napa County Rural Residential land use designation and with adjacent land uses, which include other vineyards, wooded areas and residences. Therefore, the proposed project would not substantially degrade the existing visual character or quality of public views of the site or its surroundings, in that it would be consistent with the surrounding character of vineyards and rural residential uses, resulting in a less than significant impact.
- d. Earthmoving activities, erosion control plan installation and maintenance, and vineyard installation would not involve the introduction of nighttime lighting. Subsequent vineyard operation and maintenance may require seasonal operation of equipment using small downward directional lights during harvest and the application of sulfur for mildew control, and pesticides/herbicides for pest and weed control. The proposed project would include nighttime harvest (typically from 12:00 am to 6:00 am) occurring approximately three (3) to five (5) days per year, and sulfur and pesticides/herbicides applications (typically from 12:00 am to 6:00 am) occurring approximately five (5) to ten (10) days per year. While some nighttime activities may occur for limited periods, the project would not introduce a new source of substantial light or glare, and the type of nighttime lighting would be consistent with surrounding land uses; therefore, resulting in a less than significant impact.

II.	AGRICULTURE AND FOREST RESOURCES. ¹ Would the project:	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporation	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
	a) Convert Prime Farmland, Unique Farmland, or Farmland of	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>

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

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?

- | | | | | |
|--|--------------------------|--------------------------|--------------------------|-------------------------------------|
| 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. The Napa County Important Farmland 2016 map prepared by the California Department of Conservation, Division of Land Resource Protection identifies the development area as Other Lands. The project is agriculture. Therefore, the proposed project would not convert Prime Farmland, Unique Farmland, or Farmland of Statewide Importance, resulting in no impact.
- b. The project site has a General Plan land use designation of Rural Residential (RR) and is zoned Residential Country (RC). Therefore, the establishment and operation of vineyard totaling approximately 1.25 gross acres is consistent with the property's land use and zoning designations. The subject property does not have a Williamson Act contract associated with it. Therefore, the project would not conflict with its land use designation or a Williamson Act contract, resulting in no impact.
- c-d. "Forest Land" is defined in California Public Resource Code Section 12220(g) as "land that can support 10% 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." The project site does not contain forest land or coniferous forest (Napa County GIS; WRA June 2021). The project site is not zoned forest land as defined in Public Resource Code Section 12220(g), timberland as defined in Public Resource Code Section 4526, or a Timberland Production Zone (TPZ) as defined in Government Code Section 51104(g). Therefore, no impact would occur.
- e. The proposed project does not include the construction of roadways or other infrastructure that would result in the conversion of existing farmland or forestland in the area to non-agricultural or non-forestland uses. As such, the proposed project would not have an impact on agricultural or forest resources of Napa County.

III. AIR QUALITY. Where available, the significance criteria established by the applicable air quality management or air pollution control district may be relied upon to make the following determinations. Would the project:	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporation	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
a) Conflict with or obstruct implementation of the applicable air quality plan?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
b) Result in a cumulatively considerable net increase of any criteria pollutant for which the project region is non-attainment under an applicable federal or state ambient air quality standard?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
c) Expose sensitive receptors to substantial pollutant concentrations?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>

or other environmental resources addressed in this checklist.

- d) Result in other emissions (such as those leading to odors adversely affecting a substantial number of people)?

Discussion:

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

The Thresholds were challenged in court. Following litigation in the trial court, the court of appeal, and the California Supreme Court, all of the Thresholds were upheld. However, in an opinion issued on December 17, 2015, the California Supreme Court held that CEQA does not generally require an analysis of the impacts of locating development in areas subject to environmental hazards unless the project would exacerbate existing environmental hazards. The Supreme Court also found that CEQA requires the analysis of exposing people to environmental hazards in specific circumstances, including the location of development near airports, schools near sources of toxic contamination, and certain exemptions for infill and workforce housing. The Supreme Court also held that public agencies remain free to conduct this analysis regardless of whether it is required by CEQA.

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

The Guidelines for implementation of the thresholds are for information purposes only to assist local agencies. Recommendations in the Guidelines are advisory and should be followed by local governments at their own discretion. These Guidelines may inform environmental review for development projects in the Bay Area, but do not commit local governments or the Air District to any specific course of regulatory action.

The Air District published a new version of the Guidelines dated May 2017, which includes revisions made to address the Supreme Court's 2015 opinion in Cal. Bkdg. Indus. Ass'n vs. Bay Area Air Quality Mgmt. Dist., 62 Ca 4th 369.

- a-b. The project site is generally located on the eastern edge of the Napa Valley Floor at the base of the hills bordering the eastern side of the valley, east of the City of Napa, which is within the Napa County climatological subregion of the San Francisco Bay Area Air Basin, which is under the jurisdiction of BAAQMD. The topographical and meteorological features of the Napa Valley subregion create the potential for air pollution. In the short term, potential air quality impacts are most likely to result from construction activities. Construction-related emissions, which are temporary in nature, mainly consist of particulate matter (PM) generated from fugitive dust during grading or other earthmoving activities and other criteria pollutants generated through the exhaust from construction equipment, and vehicular haul and worker trips. In the long term, potential air quality impacts would likely result from ongoing activities associated with the operation and maintenance of the proposed vineyard. Operational-related emissions, which are seasonal in nature, are primarily generated from vehicular trips associated with workers going to and from the site and equipment necessary for ongoing vineyard maintenance. Refer to **Section XVII (Transportation)** for the anticipated number of construction- and operation-related trips.

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 (O₃), ozone precursors oxides of nitrogen and reactive organic gases (NO_x and ROG), carbon monoxide (CO), nitrogen dioxide (NO₂), and suspended particulate matter of ten micrometers or less and two and a half micrometers or less (PM₁₀ and PM_{2.5}). Other criteria pollutants, such as lead (Pb) and sulfur dioxide (SO₂), would not be substantially emitted by the proposed development or associated 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 gives 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 Guidelines described above. These Guidelines outline substantial evidence supporting a variety of thresholds of significance.

The thresholds of significance identified in **Table 3** are consistent with the BAAQMD 2017 CEQA Air Quality Guidelines and are used to determine if an air quality impact would be significant.

In order to assess potential air quality and GHG emissions, a review was completed of the emissions analysis associated with vineyard development/construction and operations performed for three certified Environmental Impact Reports (EIR) in Napa County: Suscol Mountain Vineyards² for an approximately 560-acre vineyard development, Walt Ranch Vineyard³ for an approximately 507-acre vineyard development, and Circle-S Ranch Vineyards⁴ for an approximately 400-acre vineyard development.⁵

The analysis within the Circle-S EIR anticipated construction in phases of approximately 150 acres, which would generate approximately 100 15-mile one-way trips per day (75 worker trips and 25 truck trips). The analysis anticipated that maximum operational emissions, occurring during harvest, of an approximately 400-acre vineyard would generate approximately 170 15-mile one-way trips per day (approximately 160 worker trips and eight grape haul truck trips). The Walt Ranch EIR analysis anticipated vineyard development in phases of approximately 127 acres, which would generate approximately 160 15-mile one-way trips per day, and annual vineyard operations generating up to approximately 160 one-way trips of approximately 15 miles per day occurring during harvest. The Suscol Mountain EIR analysis anticipated vineyard development in phases of either approximately 150 or 250 acres, which would generate approximately 50 to 60 15-mile one-way trips per day, and annual vineyard operations generating up to approximately 116 15-mile one-way trips occurring during harvest.

Table 3 shows the approximate anticipated construction emissions associated with the development of vineyards of the sizes described above. Also shown in **Table 3** are the BAAQMD CEQA Guidelines draft thresholds of significance for emission of the following criteria pollutants: ROG, NO_x, PM₁₀, and PM_{2.5}.

Variations or similarities in emissions modeling results between the three projects can be attributed to the modeling platform and version used, and differences in modeling assumptions and inputs such as quantities and types of vegetation to be removed, construction trips, construction equipment and duration of use/operation, and operational equipment operation and trips.

Table 3 – Emissions from Vineyard Development and Operation

Emissions and Thresholds	Criteria Pollutants – Constituents			
	ROG	NO _x	PM _{2.5}	PM ₁₀
	Construction Emissions			
Pounds per day: 150-acre vineyard development ¹	8.43 to 11.39	34.39 to 52.16	3.93 to 4.47	13.93 to 14.53
Pounds per day: 150- to 250-acre vineyard development ²	9.43 to 11.03	43.85 to 53.16	3.91 to 4.62	12.87 to 17.22
Pounds per day: 127-acre vineyard development ^{3, 4}	4.6	42.3	5.21 ⁴	24.21 ⁴
Construction threshold	54	54	54	82
	Operational Emissions			
Pounds per day: 400-acre vineyard operation ¹	7.78	2.85	0.80	4.22
Pounds per day: 560-acre vineyard operation ²	6.58	1.84	0.75	3.91
Pounds per day: 507-acre vineyard operation ³	4.3	22.3	1.4	2.3
Operational threshold (lbs/day)	54	54	54	82
Tons per year (Metric) ^{1,5}	0.78	0.35	0.11	0.58
Operational threshold (tons per year)	10	10	10	15

¹ As identified in Circle-S EIR; ² As identified in Suscol Mountain EIR; ³ As identified in Walt Ranch EIR; ⁴ Includes dust and exhaust emissions; ⁵ Calculation based on 365 days of operation. Project emissions are anticipated to be less than identified as vineyard operations are seasonal in nature.

Sources: Circle-S Ranch Vineyard EIR 2011; Suscol Mountain Vineyard EIR 2013; Walt Ranch Vineyard EIR 2016; BAAQMD CEQA Guidelines May 2017.

Because this project's proposed approximate 1.25-acre vineyard is smaller than any of the projects presented above, construction and operational emissions from the proposed project that could negatively affect air quality are expected to be less than those identified in **Table 3**, and therefore below identified thresholds. Additionally, project approval, if granted, would be subject to the standard Air Quality condition described below, which includes standard air quality and construction best management practices (BMPs) consistent with BAAQMD measures identified in Table 8-1 of the CEQA Guidelines that would further reduce potential air quality impacts associated with construction

² #P09-00176-ECPA, Analytical Environmental Services (AES) March 2012, SCH #2009102079 certified February 3, 2013

³ #P11-00205-ECPA, AES March 2016, SCH #2008052075 certified August 1, 2016

⁴ #P06-01508-ECPA, AES April 2011, SCH #2007062069 certified December 22, 2011

⁵ These EIRs are incorporated herein by reference and available for review in the Napa County Department of Planning, Building and Environmental Services permanent files.

and ongoing operation of the proposed project. These BMPs would be incorporated into the proposed project, should the proposed project be approved.

Air Quality 1 – Conditions of Approval: The owner/permittee shall implement the following air quality BMPs during construction activities and vineyard maintenance and operations:

- Post a publicly visible sign with the telephone number and person to contact at the lead agency regarding dust complaints. The BAAQMD's phone number shall also be visible.
- Water all exposed surfaces (e.g., parking areas, staging areas, soil piles, grading areas, and unpaved access roads) two times per day.
- Cover all haul trucks transporting soil, sand, or other loose material offsite.
- Remove all visible mud or dirt tracked onto adjacent public roads by using wet power vacuum street sweepers at least once per day. The use of dry power sweeping is prohibited.
- All vehicle speeds on unpaved roads shall be limited to 15 mph.
- Idling times shall be minimized either by shutting off equipment when not in use or reducing the maximum idling time to five (5) minutes (as required by state regulations). Clear signage shall be provided for construction workers at all access points.
- Water and/or dust palliatives shall be applied in sufficient quantities during grading and other ground disturbing activities onsite to minimize the amount of dust produced. Outdoor construction activities shall not occur when average wind speeds exceed 20 mph.
- All construction equipment shall be maintained and properly tuned in accordance with manufacturer's specifications. All equipment shall be checked by a certified visible emissions evaluator. Any portable engines greater than 50 horsepower or associated equipment operated within the BAAQMD's jurisdiction shall have either a California Air Resources Board (ARB) registration Portable Equipment Registration Program (PERP) or a BAAQMD permit. For general information regarding the certified visible emissions evaluator or the registration program, visit the ARB FAQ⁶ or the PERP website⁷.

Installation of the proposed project is expected to generate emissions that are below the thresholds presented in **Table 3**, would contain other features that minimize fugitive dust (such as vineyard cover crop), and would introduce fewer new vehicle trips than the projects shown in **Table 3** during both installation and operation (see **Section XVII [Transportation]** for anticipated project trips). Therefore, implementation of the proposed project would result in less than significant air quality impacts, and it would not conflict with or obstruct implementation of an air quality plan or result in cumulatively considerable effects.

- c-d. Land uses such as schools, playgrounds, childcare centers, hospitals, and convalescent homes are considered sensitive to poor air quality, because infants and children, the elderly, and people with health afflictions, especially respiratory ailments, are more susceptible to respiratory infections and other air quality related health problems than the general public. Residential areas are also considered to be sensitive to air pollution because residents, which include children and the elderly, tend to be at home for extended periods of time.

Land uses in the vicinity of project parcel include rural residential, agriculture (primarily vineyard), and undeveloped lands. The nearest known schools (Vichy Elementary, and Harvest Christian Academy) are approximately 0.65-miles north and 1.5-miles southwest, respectively. The closest offsite residence is located approximately 228 feet to the south of vineyard Block B, and approximately 19 residences are within 500 feet of the development area; the majority of which are located across Sarco Creek to the west and northwest of the proposed vineyard block developments. The closest residential area (Napa) is approximately 2.0 miles west of the project.

During installation of the ECPA, vineyard planting, and subsequent vineyard operations, airborne pollutants and odors would be created through the use of grading and farm equipment (e.g., tractors, trucks, and ATV's). These sources would be temporary and/or seasonal in nature and would occur at least 0.65 miles from the closest school and residential neighborhood, providing dilution of pollutants and odors. For the reasons identified above, the proposed project would not expose sensitive receptors or a substantial number of people to pollutants or objectionable odors, resulting in a less than significant impact.

⁶ http://www.arb.ca.gov/portable/perp/perpfaq_04-16-15.pdf

⁷ <http://www.arb.ca.gov/portable/portable.htm>

IV.	BIOLOGICAL RESOURCES. Would the project:	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporation	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
	a) Have a substantial adverse effect, either directly or through habitat modifications, on any species identified as a candidate, sensitive, or special status species in local or regional plans, policies, or regulations, or by the California Department of Fish and Wildlife or the U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
	b) Have a substantial adverse effect on any riparian habitat or other sensitive natural community identified in local or regional plans, policies, regulations or by the California Department of Fish and Wildlife or U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
	c) Have a substantial adverse effect on state or federally protected wetlands (including, but not limited to, marsh, vernal pool, Coastal, etc.) through direct removal, filling, hydrological interruption, or other means?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
	d) Interfere substantially with the movement of any native resident or migratory fish or wildlife species or with established native resident or migratory wildlife corridors, or impede the use of native wildlife nursery sites?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input 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:

The following were utilized in this analysis and are incorporated herein by reference and available in the project file for review.

- Kjeldsen Biological Survey, June 2021, Biological Resource Survey, 1228 Hagen Road (**Exhibit B**).
- Kjeldsen Biological Survey, August 2022, Tree Replanting and Carbon Sequestration Plan, 1228 Hagen Road (**Exhibit B-1**)

Additionally, the following Napa County Geographic Information System (GIS) Sensitivity Maps/layers were utilized in this biological resource assessment: Sensitive biotic vegetation groups, U.S. Fish and Wildlife (USFWS) Critical Habitat, California Natural Diversity Database (CNDDB), Owl Habitat, Wetlands and Vernal Pools, Vegetation, Soil types, U.S. Geological Survey Quadrangle (DRG), and Aerial Photos.

a. Kjeldsen Biological Survey conducted an assessment of biological resources on the subject parcel in March, April, May, and June 2021. The surveys were completed to determine: the presence of sensitive biological communities; the potential for biological communities on site to support special-status plant or wildlife species; and the presence of sensitive natural resources protected by local, state, or federal laws and regulations. The field surveys were conducted by botanists familiar with the flora of Napa County and surrounding counties.

The project area is to be conducted within an area that was entirely a former orchard, converted to grassland and a residence by the prior property owners. As such, no native special status plants are expected to be located within the project site. The present site conditions of the project site and historic use of the land are such that there is little reason to expect the occurrence of any special-status animal species within the footprint of the project. All perimeter oak trees are proposed to be retained and trimmed only.

A list of special-status plant and animal species that have the potential to occur within the vicinity of the project area was compiled based on data in the CNDDB (CDFW, 2021), California Native Plant Society (CNPS) Inventory of Rare and Endangered Plants (CNPS, 2021), and the USFWS List of Federal Endangered and Threatened Species that may be affected by projects in the Mark West Springs and Calistoga Quadrangles.

The project area (i.e., clearing limits) consists of only two biological communities (or Land Cover Types), Ruderal –Grassland Semi-Natural Stands (Annual Grasslands) and Hardscape/Landscaping Plantings; 2.5 acres and 1.0 acres respectively. As indicated in the

Background/Project History and Environmental Setting Sections of this initial study (pages 1-2), the project parcel was an orchard in 1940. Approximately, 2.06 acres of the annual grassland is proposed for removal and none of the hardscape/landscape plantings community is proposed for removal. On the property, but not located within the project area, there are 2.6 acres of live oak woodlands. This plant community is not proposed for removal and will be maintained in its current condition. There are eight (8) remnant walnut tress located within Block B, which are proposed for removal; however, these were assessed as part of the grassland community and no replacement trees are proposed. To meet BAAQMD no net loss in GHG requirements the applicant is proposing to plant 24 trees. As this property is not located within the AW zoning district (parcel is zoned RC), vegetation canopy replacement (NCC Section 18.108.020.D) is not required.

Special-Status Plants and Animals : A list of special-status plant and animal species that have the potential to occur within the vicinity of the project site was compiled based on data in the CNDDDB (CDFW, 2021), California Native Plant Society (CNPS) Inventory of Rare and Endangered Plants (CNPS, 2021), and the USFWS List of Federal Endangered and Threatened Species (USFWS, 2021) that may be affected by projects in the Fairfield North, Cuttings Wharf, Cordelia, Fairfield South, Mount Vaca, Yountville, Capell Valley, Napa, and Mt. George quadrangles. Kjeldsen Biological Survey concluded that the plant species could not be present due to the pre-existing land use; while some habitat was present on site for eight (8) of the 21 identified potential species to occur, the report determined that the historic use of the parcel precludes the presence of these species. Furthermore, no indication for presence of these species were noted during the fieldwork conducted by Kjeldsen. A total of 16 special-status animals were identified as having the potential to occur on-site. However, as with the special-status plants, the occurrence of said special-status wildlife species on the parcel was determined to be unlikely as requisite habitat is absent from the project site. Furthermore, no species were observed during the field study period impacts to species would be unlikely.

The proposed project does not include the removal of special-status plant species or their habitat and would be consistent with the following Napa County General Plan Conservation Element Goals and Policies and Zoning Ordinance: General Plan Goal CON-28 because it would assist in maintaining the existing level of biodiversity in the County, as well as contribute to minimization of potential cumulative impacts associated with the loss of special-status plant species and associated habitat due to agricultural conversion projects; Goal CON-3⁹ as it protects the continued presence of special-status plant species or its habitat; Policy CON-13¹⁰ in that impacts to special-status habitat can be avoided while allowing for up to approximately 2 acres of agriculture on the project site; Policy CON-17¹¹ because the removal and disturbance of a sensitive natural plant community that contains special-status plant species is prevented; and, the purpose and intent of the Conservation Regulations (NCC Chapter 18.108) in that it preserves natural habitat or existing vegetation, and does not adversely affects sensitive, rare, threatened or endangered plants. Additionally, Sarco and the unnamed ephemeral stream would have appropriate setbacks pursuant to NCC Section 18.108.025.

b-c. The project site contains coast live oak woodland and aquatic resources only within the stream setback area along Sarco Creek and the unnamed ephemeral stream. All of the oak woodland and stream areas would be avoided. No wetlands were observed in the project site. (Exhibit B).

The project site contains one unnamed intermittent blue line stream, a tributary to Tulucay Creek and Sarco Creek runs parallel to the western property line. The ECPA includes appropriate setbacks (ranging from 35 to 160 feet), determined by slope as outlined in County Code Section 18.108.025 from the blue-line streams.

d. The site/parcel includes deer fencing around much of the existing developed area and existing vineyard. Additional wildlife fencing is proposed around the new vineyard blocks (with some existing fencing being removed from the area of vines that is being restored to riparian habitat. The new fencing will tie into the existing fence and gates will be installed as noted in the ECPA plan set.

Because wildlife nursery sites were not identified in the project site, there would be no impacts to wildlife nursery sites. While the proposed fencing would not result in significant impacts to wildlife movement and use, in order to ensure that deer fencing is installed in a manner that is consistent with CDFW recommendations to minimize impacts to wildlife movement, the following condition of approval would be incorporated should the proposed project be approved.

⁸ Goal CON-2: Maintain and enhance the existing level of biodiversity.

⁹ Goal CON-3: Protect the continued presence of special-status species, including special-status plants, special-status wildlife, and their habitats, and comply with all applicable state, federal, or local laws or regulations.

¹⁰ Policy CON-13: The County shall require that all discretionary residential, commercial, industrial, recreational, agricultural, and water development projects consider and address impacts to wildlife habitat and avoid impacts to fisheries and habitat supporting special-status species to the extent feasible. Where impacts to wildlife and special-status species cannot be avoided, projects shall include effective mitigation measures and management plans including provisions to: Provide protection for habitat supporting special-status species through buffering or other means.

¹¹ Policy CON 17: Preserve and protect native grasslands, serpentine grasslands, mixed serpentine chaparral, and other sensitive biotic communities and habitats of limited distribution. The County, in its discretion, shall require mitigation that results in the following standards: Prevent removal or disturbance of sensitive natural plant communities that contain special-status plant species or provide critical habitat to special-status animal species.

Bio. 1- Fencing – Condition of Approval: The owner/permittee shall implement changes to the fencing as shown on the ECPA, and include the following components:

1. New fencing shall use a design that has 6-inch square gaps at the base (instead of the typical 3-inch by 6-inch rectangular openings) to allow small mammals to move through the fence.
2. Fencing or flagging should be installed along the edge of the 35-ft drainage setback (Block B) prior to ground disturbing activities to ensure the drainage are not impacted during construction activities.
3. The applicant has the option to use only a temporary fencing strategy that only uses fencing during the growing season and is removed in winter months, which allows wildlife movement through the stream setback area. The improved wildlife movement fencing strategy must be implemented within 18 months of the project approval date.
4. Exit gates shall be installed at the corners of wildlife exclusion fencing to allow trapped wildlife to escape. Smooth wire instead of barbed wire shall be utilized to top wildlife exclusion fencing to prevent entanglement.
5. Any modifications to the location of deer fencing as specified the associated with Erosion Control Plan #P21-00274-ECPA as required by this condition shall be strictly prohibited and would require County review and approval to ensure the modified deer fencing location/plan would not result in potential impacts to wildlife movement.

The proposed project has been designed to include minimum stream setbacks from Sarco Creek and the ephemeral stream located on the subject property, in conformance with County Code Section 18.108.025 (General provisions – Intermittent/perennial streams). Therefore, the project has been designed to provide setbacks from aquatic features (i.e., ephemeral streams and wetlands) creek setbacks consistent with code requirements. Furthermore, project approval, if granted, would be subject to the following standard conditions to prevent the potential encroachment into stream and wetland setbacks required pursuant to Section 18.108.025 and Section 18.108.026, further protecting these aquatic resources during project implementation and operation resulting in a less than significant impact.

Bio. 2- Stream Protection – Standard Conditions: The applicant/owner shall implement the following measures to prevent the inadvertent encroachment into specified stream setbacks during construction and subsequent vineyard operations:

1. The location of creek setbacks shall be clearly demarcated in the field with temporary construction fencing, which shall be placed at the outermost edge of required setbacks shown on the project plans. Prior to any earthmoving activities, temporary fencing shall be installed: the precise locations of said fences shall be inspected and approved by the Planning Division prior to any earthmoving and/or development activities. No disturbance, including grading, placement of fill material, storage of equipment, etc. shall occur within the designated areas for the duration of erosion control plan installation and vineyard installation. The protection fencing shall remain in place for the duration of project implementation and until wildlife exclusion fencing is installed as shown on the plans.
2. All construction and related traffic will remain on the inside (vineyard block side) of the protective fencing to ensure that the creek, buffer zones, and associated riparian habitat and/or woodland remains undisturbed.
3. In accordance with County Code Section 18.108.100 (Erosion hazard areas – Vegetation preservation and replacement) trees that are inadvertently removed that are not within the boundary of the project and/or not identified for removal as part of #P21-00274-ECPA shall be replaced on-site with fifteen-gallon trees at a ratio of 2:1 at locations approved by the planning director. A replacement plan shall be prepared for County review and approval, which includes, at a minimum, the locations where replacement trees will be planted, success criteria of at least 80% and monitoring activities for the replacement trees. The replacement plan shall be implemented before vineyard planting activities. Any replaced trees shall be monitored for at least three years to ensure an 80% survival rate.

- e. The proposed project would occur in areas previously used as orchard and more recently maintained as non-native grassland.

Napa County General Plan Conservation Element Policy CON-24 requires that oak woodland be maintained and/or improved to the extent feasible to provide for oak woodland and wildlife habitat, slope stabilization and soil protection, and species diversity. More specifically, this Conservation Policy strives to: preserve oak trees and other significant vegetation that occurs near the heads of drainages to maintain diversity of vegetation types and wildlife habitat (CON-24a); achieve comply with the Oak Woodlands Preservation Act (PRC Section 21083.4) regarding oak woodland preservation to conserve the integrity and diversity of oak woodlands, and retain existing oak woodland (CON-24b); and provide replacement of lost oak woodlands or preservation of like habitat (on an acreage basis) at a 2:1 ratio, and avoid removal of oak species that are limited in distribution (CON-24c). As proposed, no oak woodland would be removed; therefore, the proposed project would be in compliance with Policy CON-24 and impact would be less than significant.

To ensure that oak trees outside the development area are not inadvertently removed as part of the proposed project, and because the proposed project would also be subject to the provisions of Section 18.108.100 (Erosion hazard areas – Vegetation preservation and

replacement), the following provisions would be incorporated as conditions of approval should the proposed project be approved:

Bio. 3- Tree/Woodland Protection – Conditions of Approval:

1. Prior to any earthmoving activities temporary fencing shall be placed at the edge of the dripline of trees to be retained that are located adjacent to the project site (typically within approximately 50-feet of the project site). The precise locations of said fences shall be inspected and approved by the Planning Division prior to the commencement of any earthmoving activities. No disturbance, including grading, placement of fill material, storage of equipment, etc. shall occur within the designated protection areas for the duration of erosion control plan and vineyard installation.
2. Trees removed that are not within the boundary of the project and/or not identified for removal as part of #P21-00274-ECPA shall be replaced onsite with fifteen-gallon trees at a ratio of 2:1 at locations approved by the director.
3. The owner/permittee shall refrain from severely trimming the trees and vegetation to be retained adjacent to the vineyard conversion area.

Additionally, as discussed in subsections (a) through (c) above, the proposed project is designed to incorporate conditions of approval, impacts to sensitive natural communities and special-status species would be less than significant. Therefore, the proposed project with conditions incorporated is consistent with applicable Napa County General Plan Policies and NCC Chapter 18.108.

The project will remove 0.35 acres of existing vines located within the required Sarco Creek setback. This area will be restored to a natural riparian state through the planting of 12 coast live oaks and 12 black oaks. The area will be watered during establishment from the recycled water trucked in and used to water the vineyard. Plants will be sourced from local native plant nurseries and be protected using 3' x 3' woven polypropylene weed mats which will serve as mulch for soil moisture retention and weed suppression. The area will be maintained and kept free of invasive species per the Tree Planting and Carbon Sequestration Plan submitted by Kjeldsen (**Exhibit B-1**). This restoration area will also be used to meet the Greenhouse Gas no net loss in carbon sequestration requirements adopted by BAAQMD.

- f. There are no Habitat Conservation Plans, Natural Community Conservation Plans, or other similar plans applicable to the project site. Therefore, no impact would occur.

V.	CULTURAL RESOURCES. Would the project:	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporation	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
	a) Cause a substantial adverse change in the significance of a historical resource pursuant to CEQA Guidelines §15064.5?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
	b) Cause a substantial adverse change in the significance of an archaeological resource pursuant to CEQA Guidelines §15064.5?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input 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 type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>

Discussion:

See **Section XVIII (Tribal Cultural Resources)** for disclosures and the impact assessment pursuant to Pursuant to Public Resources Code 21080.3.1 (Assembly Bill 52 - Gatto).

The following was utilized in this analysis and is incorporated herein by reference, in addition to Napa County GIS Archeological sensitive areas and Archeological sites layers:

- Tom Origer & Associates, December 11, 2020 (Revised December 16, 2020), Cultural Resource Study for 1228 Hagen Road, Napa County, California

Tom Origer & Associates conducted an archeological evaluation of the project site which included a review of information on file with the California

Historical Resources Information System Northwest Information Center to determine presence or absence of previously recorded historic or prehistoric cultural resources; a review of relevant historic references to determine the potential for historic era archaeological deposits or structure; and a surface reconnaissance survey of the all accessible parts of approximately 6.1-acre parcel, including the approximate 1.25-acre project site to locate any visible signs of potentially significant historic or prehistoric cultural deposits.

A site visit was conducted with a representative of the Yocha Dehe on April 14, 2022, to assess the site for potential cultural resources. Based on the information provided during the site visit, as well as supporting documents; the Tribe expressed concerns that the project could affect known cultural resources. As such, the Yocha Dehe Wintun Nation recommended including cultural monitors during development and ground disturbance of the new vineyard blocks, including backhoe trenching and excavations. In addition, they recommended cultural sensitivity training for all project personnel. The applicant has reached out the Director of Cultural Resources of the Yocha Dehe Wintun Nation to setup a monitoring agreement, per the Cultural Resources Mitigation Measure 1 the project will be required comply with the requirements of said agreement. Per the agreement, the project will require Cultural Monitors to be on site during development and disturbance activities and cultural sensitivity training will be provided to all project personnel prior to commencing construction activities.

a-b. The cultural resource reconnaissance (Tom Origer & Associates, December 16, 2020) identified no cultural resources within the project site.

Furthermore, project approval, if granted, would be subject to the standard conditions identified below to protect cultural resources that may be discovered accidentally. As discussed in **Section XVII, Tribal Cultural Resources**, incorporation of the following Cultural Resources Conditions of Approval would provide protection for and avoidance of potential impacts on Tribal Cultural Resources. Therefore, with incorporation of the Condition of Approval, below, the proposed project would result in less than significant impacts to historic or archaeological resources.

- c. The cultural resource reconnaissance did not locate any human remains in the proposed development area and does not anticipate the discovery of human remains due to the proposed project. Therefore, impacts on human remains are anticipated to be less than significant. Furthermore, the following conditions of approval would be incorporated should the proposed project be approved, which would ensure that potential impacts on human remains would be less than significant.

Cult 1 – Tribal Monitoring - Cultural Resources Mitigation Measure: Compliance with Tribal Monitoring Agreement.

1. Project shall comply with the Tribal Monitoring Agreement which requires tribal monitors on site during project development and ground disturbance activities and additionally requires cultural sensitivity training for all project personnel.

Cult. 1 – Cultural Resources– Conditions of Approval: Discovery of cultural, historical or archaeological resources, or human remains during construction, grading, or other earth moving activities:

1. In accordance with CEQA Subsection 15064.5(f), should any previously unknown historic or prehistoric resources, including but not limited to charcoal, obsidian or chert flakes, grinding bowls, shell fragments, bone, pockets of dark, friable solids, glass, metal, ceramics, wood or similar debris, be discovered during grading, trenching or other onsite excavation(s), earth work within 100-feet of these materials shall be stopped until a professional archaeologist certified by the Registry of Professional Archaeologists (RPA) and a Yocha Dehe Wintun Nation Tribal Cultural Monitor have had an opportunity to evaluate the significance of the find and suggest appropriate mitigation(s), as determined necessary.
2. If human remains are encountered the Napa County Coroner shall be informed to determine if an investigation of the cause of death is required and/or if the remains are of Native American origin. Pursuant to Public Resources Code Section 5097.98, if such remains are of Native American origin the nearest tribal relatives as determined by the State Native American Heritage Commission shall be contacted to obtain recommendations for treating or removal of such remains, including grave goods, with appropriate dignity.
3. All persons working onsite shall be bound by contract and instructed in the field to adhere to these provisions and restrictions.

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

Discussion:

Consistent with Public Resources Code Section 21100(b)(3), this impact analysis evaluates the potential for the proposed project to result in a substantial increase in energy demand and wasteful use of energy during project construction, operation, and maintenance. The impact analysis is informed by Appendix G of the CEQA Guidelines. The potential impacts are analyzed based on an evaluation of whether construction and operation energy use estimates for the proposed project would be considered excessive, wasteful, or inefficient.

- a. During construction of the proposed project, the use of construction equipment, truck trips for hauling materials, and construction workers' commutes to and from the project site would consume fuel. Project construction is anticipated to occur over six months. Construction activities and corresponding fuel energy consumption would be temporary and localized. In addition, there are no unusual project characteristics that would cause the use of construction equipment or haul vehicles that would be less energy efficient compared with other similar agricultural construction sites within Napa County.

Once construction is complete, equipment and energy use would be slightly higher than existing levels and the proposed project would not include any unusual maintenance activities that would cause a significant difference in energy efficiency compared to the surrounding developed land uses. Thus, the proposed project would not result in wasteful, inefficient, or unnecessary energy use. This impact would be less than significant.

- d. The transportation sector is a major end-user of energy in California, accounting for approximately 39 percent of total statewide energy consumption in 2019 (U.S. Energy Information Administration 2020). In addition, energy is consumed in connection with construction and maintenance of transportation infrastructure, such as streets, highways, freeways, rail lines, and airport runways. California's 30 million vehicles consume more than 16 billion gallons of gasoline and more than 3 billion gallons of diesel each year, making California the second largest consumer of gasoline in the world (CEC 2016). In Napa County, farm equipment (not including irrigation pumps) accounted for approximately 60% of agricultural emissions in Napa County in 2014, with the percentage anticipated to increase through 2050 (Napa County 2018 - <https://www.countyofnapa.org/DocumentCenter/View/9247/Revised-Draft-Climate-Action-Plan>).

With respect to transportation energy, existing energy standards are promulgated through the regulation of fuel refineries and products such as the Low Carbon Fuel Standard (LCFS), which mandates a 10% reduction in the non-biogenic carbon content of vehicle fuels by 2020. Additionally, there are other regulatory programs with emissions and fuel efficiency standards established by USEPA and the California ARB such as Pavley II/LEV III from California's Advanced Clean Cars Program and the Heavy-Duty (Tractor-Trailer) GHG Regulation. Further, construction sites will need to comply with State requirements designed to minimize idling and associated emissions, which also minimizes use of fuel. Specifically, idling of commercial vehicles and off-road equipment would be limited to five minutes in accordance with the Commercial Motor Vehicle Idling Regulation and the Off-Road Regulation¹³. The proposed project would comply with these State requirements; see the Air Quality conditions of approval. Napa County has not implemented an energy action plan. Therefore, the proposed project would not conflict with or obstruct a state or local plan for renewable energy or energy efficiency or impede progress towards achieving goals and targets, and impacts would be less than significant.

¹³ California Code of Regulations (CCR), 2005. Title 13, Chapter 10, 2485, updated through 2014.

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

Discussion:

- a. The project site could experience potentially strong ground shaking and other seismic related hazards based on the number of active faults in the San Francisco Bay region. The proposed project consists of earthmoving activities associated with the installation of erosion control measures for agricultural development, but does not include the construction of new residences or other facilities (i.e., enclosed areas where people can congregate) that would be subject to seismic forces. Additionally, the proposed project would not result in a substantial increase in the number of people to the site. Therefore, the proposed project would not directly or indirectly cause potential substantial adverse effects, including the risk of loss, injury, or death involving fault rupture, ground shaking, liquefaction, and landslides and less than significant impact would occur. Additional information supporting this conclusion is identified below.
- i) No faults have been mapped on the project site, and the project site is not located on an active fault or within an "Earthquake Fault Hazard Rupture Zone" designated by the Alquist-Priolo Earthquake Zoning Act. The nearest active faults are an unnamed fault and West Napa Fault, 0.8 miles northwest of the project site and approximately 3.5 miles west of the project site, respectively. No landslides or areas of instability have been identified within the project site. Soils on the project site have been classified according to the Soil Survey of Napa County (USDA, 1978) (Napa County GIS faults and earthquakes layers). Therefore, no impact would occur.
- ii) Although the project site is located in an area that may be subject to strong or very strong seismic ground shaking potential during an earthquake (California Geological Society, 2016), the proposed project does not include construction of any new residences or enclosed areas where people would congregate. Therefore, this impact would be less than significant.

- iii) The project site is not in an area subject to high liquefaction potential. The Napa County General Plan identifies the project site as having very low liquefaction potential (Napa County, 2009). Further, as noted above, the proposed project would not result in a substantial increase in the number of people or add structures onsite. Therefore, this impact would be less than significant.
 - iv) Landslides, landslide deposits, and areas of instability have not been identified within the project site (Napa County GIS landslide layer). Therefore, no impact would occur.
- b. The project site's soils have been classified according to the Soil Survey of Napa County (USDA, 1978) as Coombs Gravelly Loam 2 to 5% slopes (NVVE Engineering).

Installation and implementation of the ECPA would involve vegetation removal and earthmoving activities within the proposed vineyard areas. Pursuant to NCC Section 18.108.070(L) (Erosion Hazard Areas), earthmoving activities cannot be performed between October 15 and April 1. These activities would take place during the dry season when rainstorms are less likely, resulting in negligible erosion and sedimentation during project installation.

Soil loss calculations were prepared using the Universal Soil Loss Equation (USLE) in order to evaluate potential effects of erosion as a result of the proposed project. The USLE model evaluates the environmental conditions and physical forces that lead to the detachment and potential movement of soil particles through surface erosion. The USLE model does not describe travel distances of soil particles once dislodged. Potential soil loss and sedimentation associated with the proposed agricultural development and operations would primarily be controlled through a variety of drainage systems, including diversion ditches, level spreaders, grassy swales, and rock energy dissipaters, as well as a no-till cover crop with vegetative cover densities of at least 80%. Vineyard avenues would also include vegetative cover densities of at least 80%. The cover crop provides the ability to trap eroded soils onsite, thereby reducing soil loss and sedimentation potential.

Based on USLE modeling calculations prepared by NVVE Engineering (Exhibit C), the proposed conversion of approximately 1.25 acres of ruderal grassland and orchard to vineyard and vineyard avenues is anticipated to reduce soil loss, or surface erosion, within the project site as compared to existing conditions (Table 4). Under existing conditions, the annual soil loss is anticipated to average 2.46 tons per year across the development area depending on soil type, slope length, and gradient. Under proposed project conditions, annual soil loss is anticipated to average 1.74 tons per year, or a reduction of approximately 0.72 acres (29%) as compared to existing conditions.

Table 4 – USLE Soil Loss Analysis

Vineyard Block	Pre-project Soil Loss (tons/year)	Post-project Soil Loss (tons/year)	Difference	Percent Change (approximate)
A2	0.69	0.45	-0.24	-35%
B1	1.04	0.76	-0.28	-27%
B2	0.73	0.53	-0.20	27%
Total	2.46	1.74	-0.72	-29%

Source: NVVE Engineering, September 2, 2021; Revised November 1, 2021

Other proposed erosion control features that are anticipated to further reduce potential soil loss as a result of the proposed project, including soil loss experienced during vineyard and cover crop establishment, consist of permanent no-till cover, straw mulching, straw wattles, and other practices as needed.

It is not expected that land preparation activities associated with the proposed vineyard, such as removal of rocks from the soil profile, would substantially affect the USLE modeling results. The USLE model evaluates the environmental conditions and physical forces that lead to the detachment and movement of soil particles. The primary goal of cultivating the soils within the development area during implementation is to prepare the site for planting, including fracturing and mixing layers of compressed soil and rock to facilitate root growth and improve permeability, rather than to remove all the rock within the development area soils. Soil cultivation may result in a greater number of smaller rocks at the soil surface. Smaller rocks that emerge through development would be left within the vineyard, and only larger rocks that surface would be removed. Because the larger rocks that may be removed from the site are generally underneath the soil surface, the removal of larger rocks that emerge during development would not significantly alter the composition of soil. Therefore, the soil type classification utilized in the USLE calculations would remain unchanged (Oster, 2008).

For these reasons the proposed project, with incorporation of specified erosion control measures and conditions of approval, would not increase soil erosion and the loss of topsoil as compared to existing conditions, and maximize the potential for containment of detached soil particles to the project site, resulting in no impact with regard to soil erosion, soil loss, and sedimentation. Also, see **Section IX (Hazards and Hazardous Materials)** and **Section X (Hydrology and Water Quality)** for additional disclosures related to water quality. Additionally, as shown in the soil loss modeling following development, overall soil loss is anticipated to be less than pre-development conditions. This is consistent with General Plan Conservation Element Policy CON-48, which requires post-development sediment erosion conditions (i.e., soil loss) be less than or equal to pre-development conditions. Therefore, less than significant impacts would result from project implementation, if approved.

- c. As discussed above, the project site is not located in an area prone to landslides, ground failure or liquefaction. The proposed project identifies the soil types in the project site and addresses any potential soil instability. Therefore, impacts from offsite landslides, lateral spreading, subsidence, liquefaction or collapse would be less than significant.
- d. Soils of the project site consist of Coombs Gravelly Loam 2 to 5% slopes (USDA Soil Survey of Napa County, 1978). In addition, no structures are proposed as part of the project and expansive soils pose little risk to vineyards and related agricultural improvements. Therefore, there would be no impacts associated with expansive soils.
- e. The proposed project involves the development of vineyard. No septic tanks or alternative wastewater disposal systems are needed or proposed at the project site. Therefore, no impact would occur with regard to soils supporting septic tanks or alternative wastewater disposal systems.
- f. There are no unique geologic features on the project site. Due to the nature of the soils in the project site and the nature of the proposed project (which would involve relatively shallow vineyard), the probability of encountering paleontological resources within the project site is minimal. Furthermore, project approval, if granted, would be subject to the standard conditions described below that would avoid and reduce potential paleontological resource impacts. Therefore, impacts to geologic features and paleontological resources are anticipated to be less than significant.

Geo. 1- Paleontological Resources – Conditions of Approval: Discovery of paleontological resources during construction, grading, or other earth moving activities:

1. In the event that a discovery of a breas, true, and/or trace fossils are discovered during ground disturbing activities, all work within 100 feet of the fined shall be temporarily halted or diverted until the discovery is examined by a qualified paleontologist. The paleontologist shall notify the appropriate agencies to determine procedures that should be followed before ground disturbing activities are allowed to resume at the location of the find.
2. All persons working onsite shall be bound by contract and instructed in the field to adhere to these provisions and restrictions.

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:

See **Section III (Air Quality)** for other air quality emissions disclosures and impact assessments.

On April 20, 2022, the BAAQMD adopted updated thresholds of significance for climate impacts (CEQA Thresholds for Evaluating the Significance of Climate Impacts, BAAQMD April 2022).¹² The updated thresholds to evaluate GHG and climate impacts from land use projects are qualitative and geared toward building and transportation projects. Per the BAAQMD, all other projects should be analyzed against either an adopted local Greenhouse Gas Reduction Strategy (i.e., Climate Action Plan (CAP)) or other threshold determined on a case-by-case basis by the Lead Agency. If a project is consistent with the State’s long-term climate goals of being carbon neutral by 2045, then a project would have a less-than-significant impact as endorsed by the California Supreme Court in *Center for Biological Diversity v. Department of Fish & Wildlife* (2015) *62 Cal. 4th 204).

¹² <https://www.baaqmd.gov/plans-and-climate/california-environmental-quality-act-ceqa/updated-ceqa-guidelines>, April 2022

There is no proposed construction-related climate impact threshold at this time. Greenhouse gas (GHG) emissions from construction represent a very small portion of a project's lifetime GHG emissions. The proposed thresholds for land use projects are designed to address operational GHG emissions which represent the vast majority of project GHG emissions.

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 BOS 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 addition, the BOS recommended utilizing the emissions checklist and associated carbon stock and sequestration factors in the Draft CAP to assess and disclose potential GHG emissions associated with project development and operation pursuant to CEQA.

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. On July 24, 2018, the County prepared a Notice of Preparation of a Draft Focused EIR for the Climate Action Plan. The review period was from July 24, 2018, through August 22, 2018. The Draft Focused EIR for the CAP was published May 9, 2019. Additional information on the County CAP can be obtained at the Napa County Department of Planning, Building and Environmental Services or online at <https://www.countyofnapa.org/589/Planning-Building-Environmental-Services>. The County's draft CAP was placed on hold when the Climate Action Committee (CAC) began meeting on regional GHG reduction strategies in 2019. The County is currently preparing an updated CAP to provide a clear framework to determine what land use actions will be necessary to meet the State's adopted GHG reduction goals, including a quantitative and measurable strategy for achieving net zero emissions by 2045.

For the purposes of this assessment the carbon stock and sequestration factors identified within the 2012 Draft CAP are utilized to calculate and disclose potential GHG emissions associated with agricultural "construction" and development and with "ongoing" agricultural maintenance and operation, as further described below. The 2012 Draft CAP carbon stock and sequestration factors are utilized in this assessment because they provide the most generous estimate of potential emissions. As such, the County considers that the anticipated potential emissions resulting from the proposed project that are disclosed in this Initial Study reasonably reflect proposed conditions and therefore are considered appropriate and adequate for project impact assessment.

Regarding operational emissions, as part of the statewide implementation of Senate Bill (SB) 743, the Governor's Office of Planning and Research (OPR) settled upon automobile vehicle miles of travel (VMT) as the preferred metric for assessing passenger vehicle-related impacts under CEQA and issued revised CEQA Guidelines in December 2018, along with a Technical Advisory on Evaluating Transportation Impacts in CEQA to assist practitioners in implementing the CEQA *Guidelines* revisions. The CEQA *Guidelines* and the OPR Technical Advisory concluded that, absent substantial evidence otherwise, the addition of 110 or fewer daily trips could be presumed to have a less than significant VMT impact.

The County maintains a set of Transportation Impact Study Guidelines (TIS Guidelines) that define situations and project characteristics that trigger the need to prepare a TIS. The purpose of a TIS is to identify whether the project is likely to cause adverse physical or operational changes on a County roadway, bridge, bikeway, or other transportation facility, to determine whether the project should be required to implement or contribute to improvement measures to address those changes, and to ensure that the project is developed consistent with the County's transportation plans and policies. Per the County's current TIS Guidelines, a project is required to prepare a TIS if it generates 110 or more net new daily vehicle trips.

The TIS Guidelines also include VMT analysis requirements for projects based on trip generation, which includes a screening approach that provides a structure to determine what level of VMT analysis may be required for a given project. For a new project that would generate less than 110 net new daily vehicle and truck trips, not only is the project not required to prepare a TIS, it is also presumed to have a less than significant impact for VMT. However, applicants are encouraged to describe the measures they are taking and/or plan to take that would reduce the project's trip generation and/or VMT. Projects that generate more than 110 net new passenger vehicle trips must conduct a VMT analysis and identify feasible strategies to reduce the project's vehicular travel; if the feasible strategies would not reduce the project's VMT by at least 15%, the conclusion would be that the project would cause a significant environmental impact.

a-b.

Overall increases in GHG emissions in Napa County were assessed in the EIR prepared for the Napa County General Plan Update 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.

The County requires project applicants to consider methods to reduce GHG emissions consistent with Napa County General Conservation Element Plan Policy CON-65e. Pursuant to State CEQA Guidelines Section 15183, this assessment focuses on impacts that are "peculiar to the project," rather than the cumulative impacts previously assessed, because this Initial Study assesses a project that is consistent with an adopted General Plan for which an EIR was prepared.

GHGs are the atmospheric gases whose absorption of solar radiation is responsible for the greenhouse effect, including carbon dioxide (CO₂), methane, ozone, and the fluorocarbons, which contribute to climate change. CO₂ is the principal GHG emitted by human activities, and its concentration in the atmosphere is most affected by human activity. It also serves as the reference gas to which to compare other GHGs. Agricultural sources of carbon emissions include forest clearing, land-use changes, biomass burning, and farm equipment and management activity emissions. Equivalent Carbon Dioxide (CO_{2e}) 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, as described in BAAQMD's CEQA Guidelines. In this case CO₂ is used as the reference atom/compound to obtain atmospheric carbon CO₂ effects of GHG. Carbon stocks are converted to CO_{2e} 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://ncasi2.org/COLE/faq.html>).¹³

One-time "Construction Emissions" associated with vineyard development projects include: i) the carbon stocks that are lost or released when site vegetation is removed, including any woody debris and downed wood; ii) underground carbon stocks, or soil carbon, released when soil is ripped in preparation for vineyard development and planting (referred to as Project Site Emissions below); and iii) emissions associated with the energy used to develop and prepare the development area and plant vineyard, including construction equipment and worker vehicle trips (referred to as Equipment Emissions below).

As stated above, the April 2022 update to BAAQMD thresholds of significance do not include construction-related impact thresholds, as GHG emissions associated with the energy used to develop, prepare and plant the project area represent a very small portion of a project's lifetime GHG emissions. The construction emissions analysis below is for disclosure purposes only, as there is no threshold against which to analyze the potential significance of impact.

"Operational Emissions" of the vineyard are quantified and include: i) any reduction in the amount of carbon sequestered by existing vegetation that is removed as part of the project (referred to as Operational Sequestration Emissions below); and ii) ongoing emissions from the energy used to maintain and farm the vineyard, including vehicles (such as haul trucks, pick-up trucks) and worker vehicle trips (referred to as Operational Equipment Emissions below).

Construction Emissions:

Equipment Emissions: As discussed in **Section III (Air Quality)**, three County Certified EIRs assessed and analyzed potential air quality and GHG emissions associated with vineyard development. Within those EIRs potential GHG emissions associated with construction equipment were calculated and disclosed. An estimation of potential construction equipment emissions per acre of vineyard development was derived using the most generous emissions results from these EIRs. The Circle-S Ranch EIR anticipated approximately 4,293 metric tons (MT) CO_{2e} of construction equipment emissions for a 459-acre vineyard development, resulting in approximately 9.4 MT CO_{2e} of construction equipment emissions per acre of vineyard development.¹⁴ Using this emission factor it is anticipated that Construction Equipment Emissions associated with the proposed 1.25 gross acres of vineyard development would be approximately 11.75 MT CO_{2e} (1.25 acres multiplied by 9.4 MT CO_{2e}).

¹³ "Carbon stock" refers to the total amount of carbon stored in the existing plant material including trunks, stems, branches, leaves, fruits, roots, dead plant material, downed trees, understory, and soil organic material. Carbon stock is expressed in units of metric tons of carbon per acre. When land is cleared, some percentage of the carbon stored is released back to the atmosphere as CO₂. Land clearing or the loss of carbon stock is thus a type of GHG emission (County of Napa, March 2012, Napa County Draft Climate Action Plan).

¹⁴ As discussed in Section III (Air Quality) variations or similarities in emissions modeling results between the three projects can be attributed to modeling platform and version utilized, variations in modeling assumptions and inputs (such as project acreage and vegetation types removed), and anticipated construction and equipment and duration of use.

Project Site Emissions: Project site emissions are emissions resulting from vegetation removal and soil preparation associated with the conversion of approximately 1.25 acres of existing vegetation to vineyard. Because there is not yet a universally accepted scientific methodology or modeling method to calculate GHG emissions due to vegetation conversion and soil disturbance, the Greenhouse Gas Emissions Checklist and associated carbon stock factors developed as part of the 2012 CAP efforts are utilized to determine potential project site carbon stocks and emissions. Utilizing the 2012 Draft CAP carbon stocks and the acreages of vegetation types within the project site, total carbon stocks for the project site are estimated to be approximately 1.75 MT C or approximately 6.42 MT CO_{2e} (Table 5).

Table 5 – Estimated Development Area Carbon Stocks/Storage

Vegetation Type/Carbon Storage	Project Acreage	Carbon Storage/Stock per Acre (MT C/acre) ¹	Total Carbon Storage (MT)	Total Carbon Storage in MT CO _{2e}
Developed/Grasslands/ Existing Vineyard	1.25	1.4	1.75	6.42
Total			1.75	6.42

Sources: Napa County Draft Climate Action Plan, March 2012; Napa County Conservation Division, January 2021

There is currently no scientific agreement about the percentage of carbon that would be lost (or emitted) from soils through grading. Some analyses have suggested 20-25% while others have suggested 50%.¹⁵ Using 50% as a more conservative estimate, the proposed project could result in one-time project site construction emissions from vegetation removal and soil preparation (i.e., grading and soil ripping) of approximately 1,024.6 MT CO_{2e} (Table 6).

Table 6 – Estimated Project Carbon Emissions Due to Vegetation Removal

Vegetation Type/Carbon Storage	Project Acreage	Carbon Loss/Emission per Acre (MT C/acre) ¹	Total Carbon Loss/Emission (MT)	Total Carbon Loss/Emission in MT CO _{2e}
Grasslands	1.25	0.8	1.0	3.67
Total			1.0	3.67

Sources: Napa County Draft Climate Action Plan, March 2012; Napa County Conservation Division, March 2022

Operational Emissions:

Operational Equipment Emissions: The referenced vineyard development EIRs also assessed ongoing vineyard operation emissions associated with vehicles and equipment. Estimated potential construction equipment emissions per acre of vineyard development were derived using the most generous emissions results from these EIRs. The Suscol Mountain Vineyard EIR anticipated approximately 373 MT CO_{2e} of operational emissions for a 560-acre vineyard, resulting in approximately 0.67 MT CO_{2e} of operational emissions per acre of vineyard per year. Using this emission factor, it is anticipated that Operational Equipment Emissions associated with the proposed 1.25-acre agricultural development would be approximately 0.84 MT CO_{2e} (1.25 multiplied by 0.67 MT CO_{2e}).

Operational Sequestration Emissions: Emissions associated with loss of sequestration due to land use change (i.e., the conversions of existing vegetation to vineyard) have been calculated based on the Annual Carbon Sequestration Factors within the 2012 Draft CAP, which indicates that coniferous forest sequester 0.67 CO₂ acre per year. The developed land use is not identified by the 2012 Draft CAP and is considered similar to grasslands (essentially zero). Utilizing these factors, it is anticipated that the annual emissions associated with changes in carbon sequestration as a result of land use changes would be approximately 0.07 MT C per year or 0.26 MT CO_{2e} per year¹⁶.

Grapevines are photosynthetic plants and therefore have value in terms of carbon capture. Additionally, the use of cover crops, which are also photosynthetic plants, tends to result in less soil CO₂ loss from vineyard soils. Carbon sequestration loss would be further offset by the proposed vineyard, which would likely act as a sink for atmospheric CO₂, depending on the longevity of grapevine roots and the quantity of carbon stored in deep roots. In addition to vines, the sequestration of atmospheric carbon is also achieved by the soil between vine rows through cover-cropping.

¹⁵ Napa County, July 12, 2010, Green House Gas Emissions Associated with Vineyard Development & Vineyard Operations, A Compilation of Quantitative Data from Three Recent Projects.

¹⁶ 1.25 acres of grassland times 0.057 MT C = 0.07 MT C

Project Emissions:

Based on the above estimates, the proposed project could result in one-time construction emissions of up to 15.42MT CO_{2e} and annual ongoing emissions associated with vineyard operations (including loss of sequestration) estimated to be approximately 1.1 MT CO_{2e} per year (Table 7).

Table 7 – Estimated Overall Project-Related GHG Emissions

Construction Emissions in Metric Tons of CO _{2e}		Annual Ongoing Emissions in Metric Tons of CO _{2e}	
Source	Quantity	Source	Quantity
Vehicles and Equipment	11.75	Vehicles and Equipment	0.84
Vegetation and Soil	3.67	Loss of Sequestration	0.26
Total	15.42	Total	1.1

Source: Napa County Conservation Division, March 2022

There is no adopted CEQA significance threshold at the state, regional, or local level for construction-related GHG emissions, and the County has therefore evaluated the significance of one-time project-generated emissions of up to approximately 1,393.39 MT CO_{2e} by considering the size of the proposed vineyard in relation to projected vineyard development in the County. The program level EIR for the 2008 Napa County General Plan Update (SCH#2005102088 certified June 3, 2008) projected 12,500 acres of new vineyard development in the County between 2005 and 2030. The County concluded in the General Plan EIR that emissions from all sources over the planning period would result in significant and unavoidable GHG emissions despite measures adopted to address the impact. Because this determination was based on emissions from all sources, not just agriculture, the General Plan did not determine that emissions solely from projected agricultural development would result in significant unavoidable impacts. Pursuant to Section 15183(a) of the California Code of Regulation (CCR), projects that are consistent with the general plan policies for which an EIR was certified shall not require additional environmental review, except as might be necessary to examine whether there are project-specific effects which are peculiar to the proposed project or its site.

In the context of 12,500 acres of projected vineyard development, the proposed project would constitute less than approximately 0.01% of the vineyard development anticipated in the General Plan EIR. The proposed project also contains measures to reduce and/or offset emissions from vineyard development and vineyard operations such as maintaining a permanent no-till cover crop density of a minimum 80%, vegetated vineyard avenues, and the maintenance and establishment of grape vines. These measures in conjunction with the Air Quality conditions of approval (detailed in **Section III [Air Quality]**) would further reduce potential GHG air quality impacts associated with construction and ongoing operation of the proposed project. For these reasons, the County does not consider one-time GHG emissions from the proposed vineyard development to be a significant impact on a project level basis or to be a “considerable” contribution to significant unavoidable cumulative impacts identified in the General Plan EIR.

As described above, total annual GHG emissions from ongoing operations are anticipated to be approximately 9.47 MT CO_{2e} per year. As stated above, the updated BAAQMD thresholds of significance for land use projects are qualitative, with no “bright-line” (quantitative) level below which to mitigate. Projects should be analyzed against either an adopted local Greenhouse Gas Reduction Strategy (i.e., Climate Action Plan (CAP)) or other threshold determined on a case-by-case basis by the Lead Agency. If a project is consistent with the State’s long-term climate goals of being carbon neutral by 2045, then a project would have a less-than-significant impact as endorsed by the California Supreme Court in *Center for Biological Diversity v. Department of Fish & Wildlife* (2015) (62 Cal. 4th 204). As stated in **Section IV, Biological Resources**, the proposed project would result in the removal of approximately 8 walnut trees and would retain approximately 83% of the tree canopy on the parcel. The project proposes to replant 24 tree (even mix of black and live oaks) in the stream setback, where vineyard blocks are being removed, which would result in the permanent preservation of said replacement trees and comply with the 1:1 canopy cover preservation requirements identified by the PBES Department to meet the no net loss in GHG. Therefore, the loss in carbon sequestration from the proposed removal of trees is more than offset after incorporation of **Permanent Preservation Condition of Approval**, by permanently protecting from development 1:1 time the amount of lost carbon sequestration due to tree removal.

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-b. Installation of the proposed ECP and subsequent vineyard operation and maintenance would require a variety of equipment and vehicles that use fuel and other petroleum-based products such as oil and transmission fluids, which are considered hazardous materials. Ongoing vineyard operations would also involve the transport and use of chemicals such as herbicides, mildewcides, and fertilizers to the site that are considered hazardous materials. Herbicide applicators must be licensed by the state, and the Napa County Agricultural Commissioner enforces application of pesticides and regulates applicators.

A detailed listing of fertilizers and other chemicals, application methods, application amounts, number of annual applications, and annual amounts of chemicals that are anticipated to be utilized for ongoing vineyard maintenance and operation of the existing and proposed vineyard is provided within Supplemental Project Information forms on file at the Planning Department.

The National Resource Conservation Service (NRCS) recommends a minimum 50-foot wide vegetated buffer from aquatic resources (such as streams, ephemeral drainages, and wetlands) because under most conditions it is generally an adequate buffer width to provide enough vegetation to effectively entrap and filter chemicals, nutrients, and sediment thereby, facilitating degradation within buffer soils and vegetation (USDA 2000).

Chemicals for vineyard operation would be mixed off-site and staged on the existing driveway, as noted on the ECPA Plans. Chemical will be stored/cleaned at an off-site location; the nearest water source (i.e., Sarco Creek and unnamed tributary to Sarco Creek) on the project site are located more than 100 feet from the proposed staging area. Fertilizers would be applied as necessary to the vineyard and to ensure the specified percent vegetative cover crop is achieved. No pre-emergent herbicides would be strip sprayed in the vinerows for weed management. Project storage and staging areas would be located within proposed clearing limits.

Sarco Creek meets the Napa County definition of a stream, and the project proposes appropriate setbacks (ranging from 55 feet to 160 feet), determined by slope as outlined in County Code Section 18.108.025. The unnamed ephemeral stream does not meet the definition of a stream; project proposes to maintain a 35-foot setback from vineyard Block B development to the unnamed stream, consistent with Section 18.108.025.

The risk of potentially hazardous materials reaching or affecting adjacent water courses or other aquatic resources is significantly reduced because: i) the proposed project would maintain buffers greater than 50 feet from the blue-line streams; ii) project staging and storage areas would be a minimum of 100 feet from aquatic resources; and iii) only federal and/or California approved chemicals would be applied to the vineyard in strict compliance with applicable state and federal law. Project approval, if granted, would also be subject to the following standard conditions that would further avoid and/or reduce potential impacts associated with routine transport and use of hazardous materials during project implementation and ongoing vineyard operations and maintenance.

Haz 1- Hazardous Materials – Conditions of Approval: The owner/operator shall implement the following BMPs during construction activities and vineyard maintenance and operations:

1. Workers shall follow manufacturer's recommendations on use, storage and disposal of chemical products.
2. Workers shall avoid overtopping fuel gas tanks and use automatic shutoff nozzles where available.
3. During routine maintenance of equipment, properly contain and remove grease and oils.
4. Discarded containers of fuel and other chemicals shall be properly disposed of.
5. Spill containment features shall be installed at the project site wherever chemicals are stored overnight.
6. All refueling, maintenance of vehicles and other equipment, handling of hazardous materials, and staging areas shall occur at least 100 feet from watercourses, existing groundwater well(s), and any other water resource to avoid the potential for risk of surface and groundwater contamination.
7. To prevent the accidental discharge of fuel or other fluids associated with vehicles and other equipment, all workers shall be informed of the importance of preventing spills and of the appropriate measures to take should a spill occur.

For these reasons, and with incorporation of the conditions of approval described above, impacts associated with the use and transport of hazardous materials would be less than significant.

- c. The closest schools (Vichy Elementary, and Harvest Christian Academy) are approximately 0.65-miles north and 1.5-miles southwest, respectively. There are no schools proposed within 0.25 mile of the project site. Therefore, no impact would occur.
- d. The project site is not on any of the lists of hazardous waste sites enumerated under Government Code Section 65962.5 (Napa County GIS hazardous facility layer). Therefore, no impact would occur.
- e. The closest public airport to the project site is the Napa County Airport, located approximately 7 miles south of the project site. No portion of the proposed project is within an airport compatibility zone identified in the Airport Compatibility Plan (Napa County Airport Land Use Compatibility Plan, and Napa County GIS Airport layer). Therefore, no impact would occur.
- f. There would be negligible numbers of workers visiting the project site on a temporary basis for ECP and vineyard installation and on a seasonal basis for subsequent vineyard operations, resulting in no permanent substantial increase in the number of people working or residing at the project site. Therefore, the proposed project would not impair implementation of or physically interfere with any adopted emergency response plan or emergency evacuation plan, and no impact would occur.
- g. No structures are proposed as part of the project. The project site is not located in an area identified as having a moderate, high or very high fire severity and is located in the Local Responsibility Area (CALFIRE 2007 - <https://egis.fire.ca.gov/FHSZ/>). The risk of fire in vineyards is low due to limited amount of fuel, combustibles, and ignition sources that are present. Vineyards are irrigated and cover crops are typically mowed in May and August, thereby reducing the fuel loads within the vineyard. The removal of vegetation and the management of vineyard results in an overall reduction of fuel loads within the project site as compared with existing conditions. Therefore, the proposed project would not increase the exposure of people or structures to wildland fires and impacts would be less than significant.

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

The County requires all discretionary permit applications (such as use permits and ECPAs) to complete necessary water analyses in order to document that sufficient water supplies are available for the proposed project and to implement water saving measures to prepare for periods of limited water supply and to conserve limited groundwater resources.

The project site is located in the Tulucay Creek watershed and within the Napa River sub-watershed. The Napa River is designated as critical habitat for steelhead (Napa County GIS USFWS critical habitat layer). The Napa River is currently listed as an impaired waterbody for nutrients, pathogens, and sediment under Section 303(d) of the Clean Water Act. Historically, the construction of large dams and other impoundment structures between 1924 and 1959 on major tributaries in the eastern Napa River watershed and northern headwater areas of the Napa River has affected sediment transport processes into the mainstem of the Napa River by reducing the delivery of coarse load sediments to the river (Stillwater Science and W. Dietrich, 2002). However, the finer sediments that are not trapped by dams negatively affect salmonid habitat by reducing gravel permeability potentially affecting special-status fish species (Stillwater Science and W. Dietrich, 2002).

In response, the San Francisco Bay Regional Water Board has implemented the following programs. In 2009 the San Francisco Bay Regional Water Board adopted total maximum daily load (TMDL) for the Napa River (Order #R2-2009-0064), which calls for reductions in the amount of fine sediment deposits into the watershed to improve water quality and maintain beneficial uses of the river, including spawning and rearing habitat for salmonid species. Several watershed stewardship groups have developed management plans and are planning or have implemented large-scale projects to enhance water quality and stream-riparian habitat with the watershed (San Francisco Bay Regional Water Board, 2009).

Because vineyard properties may pose threats to water quality by discharging sediment, nutrients, and pesticides and/or by increasing storm runoff, which consequently can cause erosion and sedimentation and otherwise impact aquatic life, in July 2018 the San Francisco Bay Regional Water board adopted a water quality control permit (or General Permit) for vineyard properties in the Napa River and Sonoma Creek watersheds (Order #R2-2017-0033). The General Permit regulates parcels (including contiguous parcels under common ownership) developed with five or more acres of vineyard located in either of these watersheds. The Napa River and Sonoma Creek TMDLs adopted by the San Francisco Bay Regional Water Board have established performance standards for sediment discharge and storm runoff to protect and restore water quality. The General Permit would require actions to control pollutant discharges including sediment and storm runoff from vineyards and unpaved roads, which are located throughout vineyard properties, and pesticides and nutrients from vineyards. The General Permit would require vineyard owners or operators of parcels that meet the enrollment criteria to do the following: develop and certify a "farm plan"¹⁷; implement the farm plan to achieve discharge performance standards; submit an annual report regarding plan implementation and attainment of performance standards; and participate in group or individual water quality monitoring programs.

In the General Permit the San Francisco Bay Regional Water Board identified four significant sediment sources that are associated with vineyard properties: i) vineyard soil erosion; ii) offsite erosion caused by vineyard storm runoff increases; iii) road-related sediment delivery; and iv) channel incision. Napa County ECPA requirements and standards primarily address and control two of these sources, vineyard soil erosion

¹⁷ A farm plan documents a vineyard property's natural features, developed areas, and BMPs. Under the General Permit, a "certified" farm plan would mean that upon its full implementation of the plan, that the vineyard property is expected to achieve the performance standards for discharge. The Water Board's Executive Officer would approve third-party programs or certify a farm plan.

and vineyard storm runoff. The General Permit will fill gaps in local regulation so that all four sediment sources are effectively controlled to reduce fine sediment deposition in stream channels that provide habitat for endangered steelhead populations, locally rare Chinook salmon populations, and exceptionally diverse assemblages of native fish species in these watersheds. Additional details on the Vineyard Properties General Permit can be obtained from the Regional Water Board¹⁸.

Sarco Creek runs along the western property line and one unnamed ephemeral stream run along the southern property line; the former of which is likely jurisdictional under Section 404/401 of the CWA and Section 1602 of the CFGC. The proposed project has been setback from these features per NCC 18.108.025 (General Provisions – Intermittent/Perennial Streams) (discussed further in **Section IV [Biological Resources]**).

- a. Waste discharge is not anticipated as part of the proposed project or ongoing vineyard operations; therefore, the proposed project would not violate waste discharge requirements.

The proposed project has been designed with site-specific temporary and permanent erosion control measures and features to prevent sediment, runoff, and pollutants from leaving the project site. Agricultural Erosion Control Plan #P21-00274-ECPA includes BMPs that are consistent with NCC Section 18.108.080(c), as well as with Regional Water Board guidance from the Stormwater Best Management Practice Handbooks for Construction and for New Development and Redevelopment, and the Erosion and Sediment Control Field Manual. Therefore, the proposed project is not anticipated to violate any water quality standards or otherwise substantially degrade surface or groundwater quality, and this impact would be less than significant.

The proposed vineyard would be irrigated using trucked in recycled water supplied by NSD; the applicant proposes to wait to plant, or if vines are already installed, then they will be dry farmed if NSD is unable to provide water during the life of the vineyard. See **Exhibit F** for the letter from Napa Sanitation District Community Services District noting that recycled water can be provided, when available, if the owner provides the trucking company to deliver. See **Exhibit G** for the water systems plan. Irrigation pipelines would be installed within existing roadways, vineyards, and vineyard avenues, and/or within proposed clearing limits and would be connected to water tanks located in the center of the property. It is anticipated that the proposed vineyards (1.25 net planted acres combined with the existing .79 acres planted), resulting in 2.4 total vine acres on-site may require up to approximately 3.4 acre-feet of recycled water per year, or approximately 0.48 acre-feet of water per planted acre (see the Supplemental Project Information sheets and information request responses). The applicant will be required to annually request from NSD a sufficient water allocation to irrigate the vineyard as further set forth in the Condition of Approval below.

Hydro 1 - Water Allocation Request – Condition of Approval: The applicant shall apply to NSD annually beginning on January 1st of each year for a recycled water allocation in a quantity sufficient to irrigate the vineyard.

1. If recycled water is not available from NSD, vineyard shall be dry farmed (if planted), or if not yet planted, implementation of the proposed ECP shall be delayed until NSD provides the needed water for irrigation.
2. Ground water shall not be used to irrigate the existing or proposed vineyard.

Given that the proposed project would be irrigated exclusively with recycled water supplied by Napa Sanitation District (and dry farmed if NSD water is unavailable) no impacts on groundwater supplies, groundwater recharge, and local groundwater aquifer levels would occur.

To ensure that the proposed vineyard is irrigated only with recycled water, the following condition of approval would be incorporated should the project be approved:

Hydro 2- Vineyard Irrigation – Condition of Approval: The owner/permittee shall implement the following to ensure that the vineyard is irrigated with recycled water:

1. Prior to commencement of any grading, earth-disturbing activities, or vegetation removal associated with #P21-00274-ECPA, the owner/permittee shall provide a site inspection to PBES Department staff demonstrating the purple piping irrigation line for all Blocks have been installed.
2. No new or existing on-site or off-site water sources, other than that evaluated as part of the ECPA (i.e., recycled water) shall be used for vineyard irrigation. Any other proposed irrigation source, including but not limited to wells, imported water, new or existing ponds/reservoir(s) or other surface water impoundments, to serve the vineyard, shall not be allowed without additional environmental review, if necessary, and may be subject to modification to this ECPA.
3. The owner/permittee shall (at the owner/permittee's expense) maintain a record of both recycled water use and groundwater use on the project parcel through monthly monitoring and reporting. Such data shall include total annual recycled trucked in and groundwater used/pumped, water extraction volumes, and static well level(s) of the parcel's well(s). All monitoring shall commence upon commencement of the vineyard development authorized by

¹⁸ https://www.waterboards.ca.gov/sanfranciscobay/water_issues/programs/agriculture/vineyard/

this ECPA, and shall be submitted to the Conservation Division no later than January 31st every calendar year thereafter and available upon the County's request at any other time.

4. If no recycled water is available, the vineyard shall be dry farmed, and no residential or well water shall be used for vineyard irrigation.
5. The permittee shall be required to include the residential well in the County's Groundwater Monitoring program.

Due to the project not proposing to utilize groundwater a WAA was not required. Water for the proposed vineyard will be trucked in to irrigate the vineyards. In the event that recycled water is unavailable, the vineyard will be dry farmed. NSD water is allocated on an annual basis. The permittee/owner will request an allocation of recycled water each year. In years when recycled water may not be available the vineyard will be dry farmed (See **Condition of Approval Hydro 2** above).

Considering the proposed project is not utilizing groundwater the project is anticipated to result in no impact to groundwater supplies, groundwater recharge, and local groundwater aquifer levels.

- c. Earthmoving activities have the potential to alter the natural pattern of surface runoff, which could lead to areas of concentrated runoff and/or increased erosion. The conversion of existing vegetation to vineyard would alter the composition of the existing land cover and infiltration rates, which could affect erosion and runoff. The project does not propose any alteration to a stream, river, or drainage course, or include the creation of impervious surfaces that would concentrate runoff. Erosion control measures and plan features that are not anticipated to affect drainage patterns but would assist in minimizing the potential for increased erosion and water runoff include a no-till cover crop with vegetative cover density of 80% (including vineyard avenues and turnarounds/turn-spaces), and the annual application of straw mulch cover on all disturbed areas at a rate of 2,000 pounds per acre. These features would slow and filter surface runoff water, thereby minimizing sediment, nutrients, and chemicals from leaving the project site and entering nearby aquatic resources. Refer to **Exhibits A, C and D** for details related to the following discussion.

Proposed erosion control and project features that have the potential to alter natural drainage patterns include straw wattles and water bars. Straw wattles would be placed on contour at various locations around the perimeter of the vineyard blocks and within vineyard avenues to slow and maintain surface/sheet flow. Straw wattles are spaced according to the USLE to maintain soil losses below the tolerable levels for the soil types found on the site and to ensure (in conjunction with the cover crop and other runoff control features) that no net increase in erosion sediment conditions occurs beyond pre-development conditions as a result of the project. The design and location of straw wattles and water bars would have a negligible effect on existing drainage patterns in that they would not alter the existing topographic contours of the site.

Proposed diversion ditches and outfalls have a greater potential to alter drainage patterns, in that they are designed to capture sheet flow before reaching erosive velocities and divert it to other locations (including a rock apron) within the project area. While this erosion control measure would have the potential to divert water to other locations within the project area, their limited use (none proposed), and that they do not divert water into different drainage areas or drainage courses, this feature is not anticipated to substantially alter the overall drainage patterns within the project site or the surrounding area.

A Hydrologic Analysis for the project was prepared by the Project Engineer (NVVE, revised September 2021 - **Exhibit D**). The Analysis identifies two (2) watershed basins (or drainage basins) within the project area, and utilizes the HydroCad CA-1 hydrologic analysis method. The Analysis concluded that there would be a very minor reduction in runoff for all watersheds. Pre- and post-project runoff calculations for each watershed, taking into account the detention basin, are summarized in **Table 8**¹⁹.

Table 8 – Hydrologic Modeling Calculations (HydroCad) Results: Runoff Rates

	Peak Discharge Flow (cfs) by 24-hour Storm Event Frequency Return Interval (cubic feet/second)					
	2-year	5-year	10-year	25-year	50-year	100-year
Watershed A						
Pre-project conditions	0.94	1.6	2.18	3.05	3.73	4.43
Post-project conditions	0.94	1.6	2.18	3.05	3.73	4.43
Change	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00
Watershed B						
Pre-project conditions	0.52	0.86	1.16	1.6	1.94	2.29
Post-project conditions	0.49	0.83	1.12	1.56	1.90	2.25
Change	-0.03	-0.03	-0.04	-0.04	-0.04	-0.04

Source: NVVE Engineering, September 2021, Hydrologic Study - **Exhibit D**

¹⁹ In March 16, 2022, the County Engineering Division determined the project's modeling technical adequate.

General Plan Conservation Element Policy CON-50c states that peak runoff following development cannot be greater than predevelopment conditions. As demonstrated above, the proposed project would not increase runoff flow rates, and, therefore, is consistent with Policy CON-50c. Additionally, as discussed in **Section VII (Geology and Soils)**, the proposed project is anticipated to decrease soil loss as compared to existing conditions. Therefore, the proposed project would have a less than significant impact with respect to alterations of existing drainage patterns of the site or area that would result in increased runoff, or considerable on or offsite erosion, siltation, or flooding.

The project site is not located in an area of a planned stormwater drainage system, nor is it not directly served by a stormwater drainage system. As discussed above, no increase in runoff volume or decrease in time of concentration is anticipated under post-project conditions. Furthermore, as discussed in **Section VII (Geology and Soils)**, a reduction in soil loss and sedimentation is anticipated under post-project conditions. Therefore, the proposed project would not contribute a substantial amount of additional runoff to an existing stormwater drainage system or provide substantial additional sources of polluted or sediment laden runoff, resulting in a less than significant impact.

In addition, pursuant to NCC Section 18.108.135 (Oversight and Operation), projects requiring an erosion control plan would be inspected by the County after the first major storm event of each winter until the project has been completed and stable for three years to ensure that the implemented erosion control plan is functioning properly²⁰.

- d. The project site is not located within a Federal Emergency Management Agency (FEMA) 100-year flood zone, in a dam or levee failure inundation area, or in an area subject to seiche or tsunami (Napa County GIS FEMA flood zone and dam levee inundation areas layers; Napa County General Plan - Safety Element. pg. 10-20). Therefore, no impact would occur.
- e. The proposed project would not have an adverse impact on water quality because the ECPA has been designed to keep polluted runoff and sediment from leaving the project area and project site. As discussed in **Section IX (Hazards and Hazardous Materials)**, the project proposes the use of potentially hazardous materials during implementation activities (i.e., oil, gasoline, and transmission fluids associated with construction equipment) and the application of chemicals (i.e., fertilizers) for ongoing vineyard maintenance. Only federal and/or California-approved chemicals would be applied to the vineyard, in strict compliance with applicable state and federal law. As discussed in **Sections IV (Biological Resources)** and **IX (Hazards and Hazardous Materials)**, buffers provided in the ECPA adjacent to drainage courses and watercourses would facilitate increased water infiltration so that chemicals and potentially hazardous materials associated with project implementation and operation can be trapped and degraded in buffer vegetation and soils to protect water quality. The limited application of agricultural chemicals, generally occurring during the non-rainy season, would also minimize the amounts of chemicals that could have an effect on water resources. Because the project as designed is not expected to increase runoff rates or times of concentration in relation to existing conditions (as discussed in response c, above), the proposed cover crop and buffers would be able to effectively trap and filter sediments, thereby minimizing their entry into nearby water resources.

As discussed above and in **Section VII (Geology and Soils)**, the proposed project has been designed with site-specific temporary and permanent erosion and runoff control measures and features to prevent sediment, runoff, and pollutants from leaving the project area. As such, the proposed project is anticipated to reduce soil loss and sedimentation, have no effect on runoff rates, and maintain project site drainage characteristics as compared to existing conditions. The ECPA includes BMPs that are consistent with NCC Section 18.108.080(c), as well as with Regional Water Board guidance from the Storm Water Best Management Practice Handbooks for Construction and for New Development and Redevelopment, and the Erosion and Sediment Control Field Manual.

Furthermore, project approval, if granted, would be subject to the following condition of approval, in addition to the Erosion and Runoff Control (i.e., Hydromodification) Installation and Operation conditions of approval identified in **Section VII (Geology and Soils)**, which would further reduce and avoid potential impacts to water quality as a result of the project and ongoing operations.

Hydro 3 - Water Quality – Condition of Approval: The owner/permittee shall refrain from disposing of debris, storage of materials, or constructing/operating the vineyard, including vineyard avenues, outside the boundaries of the approved plan, or within required setbacks pursuant to Napa County Code Section 18.108.025 (General Provisions – Intermittent/perennial streams).

Furthermore, consistent with the standard conditions identified in the **Hazards and Hazardous Materials Section (Section IX)**, all operational activities that include the use or handling of hazardous materials, such as but not limited to agricultural chemical storage and washing, portable restrooms, vehicular and equipment refueling/maintenance and storage areas, soil amendment storage and the like, shall occur at least 100 feet from groundwater wells, water courses, streams and any other water resource to avoid the potential risk of surface and groundwater contamination, whether or not such activities have occurred within these areas

²⁰ Compliance with Section 18.108.135 is achieved by including their provisions as conditions of approval for a project, if granted.

prior to this ECPA approval.

Therefore, the proposed project as designed, in conjunction with identified conditions of approval (should the proposed project be approved), would not adversely conflict with or obstruct implementation of a water quality control plan or sustainable groundwater management plan; resulting in no impact.

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 proposed site is in a rural area of Napa County and the nearest established community, Napa (downtown), is approximately 2.25 miles east of the project site. Therefore, the proposed vineyard and subsequent vineyard operations would not physically divide an established community and no impact would occur.
- b. Surrounding land uses consist predominantly of undeveloped land and scattered rural residential, and vineyards. Surrounding parcels are zoned Residential Country (RC) and Residential Single (RS) and are designated Rural Residential (RR) in the Napa County General Plan Land Use Element. Vineyards and associated improvements are permitted uses under these designations.

The proposed project has been analyzed for consistency with applicable sections of the NCC and with the Napa County General Plan. With inclusion of the mitigation measures and conditions of approval, the proposed project has been found consistent with applicable code requirements and General Plan Goals and Policies, including but not limited to the following:

- The project as proposed is consistent with NCC Section 18.108.010, which requires that soil loss and runoff as a result of a project be minimized to protect water quality. As discussed in **Sections VII (Geology and Soils)** and **X (Hydrology and Water Quality)**, the proposed project is anticipated to decrease soil loss and potential sedimentation by approximately 29% and maintain, or improve, runoff conditions as compared to existing conditions.
- The proposed project is consistent with Policies CON 48 and CON 50c, which require pre-development sediment erosion conditions and runoff characteristics following development not be greater than predevelopment conditions. As discussed in **Section VII (Geology and Soils)** and **Section X (Hydrology and Water Quality)** the project as proposed would reduce soil loss, sedimentation, and maintain runoff characteristics as compared to existing conditions.
- The proposed project is consistent with Policies CON-13 and CON-16, which require discretionary projects consider and avoid impacts to fisheries, wildlife habitat, and special-status species through evaluation of biological resources. A Biological Resources Reconnaissance Survey was prepared for the proposed project. The project as proposed would avoid potential direct, indirect, and cumulative impacts to special-status plant species and associated habitat occurring on the project site. Furthermore, implementation of these measures would not affect the feasibility of the proposed project in that, impacts to special-status species and their habitat can be avoided while allowing for 2.04 gross acres of agriculture to be developed and operated on the project site.
- With implementation of the project proposals to avoid the oak woodland, restore the creek setback, and tree replacement plan, and the associated **Section IV (Biology)** Conditions of Approval, the proposed project is consistent with Goals CON-2 and CON-3, which require the continued enhancement of existing levels of biodiversity and protection of special-status species and habitat, and the County Conservation Regulations through preservation of natural habitats and existing vegetation. With these measures

and conditions, the proposed project would maintain levels of biodiversity and would avoid impacts to special-status plant and animal species.

- With implementation of project proposals and oak woodland avoidance, creek restoration, and tree replacement, the proposed project is consistent with Policy CON-13, which requires discretionary projects to consider and avoid impacts to fisheries, wildlife habitat, and special-status species, and Policy CON-17, which requires the preservation and protection of native grasslands, sensitive biotic communities, and habitats of limited distribution and no net loss of sensitive biotic communities.
- As proposed, the project is consistent with CON-16, which requires discretionary projects prepare an evaluation of biological resources. A Biological Resources Reconnaissance Survey was prepared for the proposed project (**Exhibit B**) and Tree Planting and Carbon Sequestration Plan was also prepared (**Exhibit B-1**).
- The proposed project is consistent with Policy CON-30 and NCC Section 18.108.026, which encourages the avoidance of wetlands, as there are no identified wetlands near or within the project site.
- The proposed project as proposed is consistent with Policy CON-18, which encourages the reduction of impacts to habitat conservation and connectivity. With incorporation of the fencing conditions of approval, and the proposed project would not impact wildlife movement.
- The proposed project is consistent with Policies CON-48 and CON-50c, which require pre-development sediment erosion conditions and runoff characteristics following development to be no greater than pre-project conditions. As discussed in **Section VII (Geology and Soils)** and **Section X (Hydrology and Water Quality)**, the proposed project would reduce soil loss, and sedimentation, and runoff.
- Tribal and Cultural Resources will be protected through the implementation of Cultural Resources Mitigation Measure 1 which will required the applicant to comply with the Tribal Monitoring Agreement.
- The project as proposed is consistent with Policy CON-65b. Due to the proposed project's scope and scale, its construction and operational GHG emissions, as disclosed in **Section VIII (Greenhouse Gas Emissions)**, are anticipated to be less than significant. Given the proposed replanting plan, proposing the planting of 24 trees (an even mix of coast live and black oaks), the project is anticipated to result in no net decrease in carbon sequestration capabilities.
- The project as proposed is consistent with Policy AG/LU-1, which states that agricultural and related activities are the primary land uses in Napa County, as the proposed project is vineyard development and would increase agriculture uses in the County.
- The project as proposed is consistent with General Plan land use designation of Rural Residential (RR), and is therefore consistent with Policy AG/LU-20.

For these reasons, the proposed project, with the Conditions of Approval incorporated, would not be in conflict with applicable County regulations, policies, or goals and is anticipated to have a less than significant impact with respect to applicable County regulations, policies, or goals.

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

Discussion:

a-b. The project site is not in an area with a known mineral resource of value to the region or state or within a known mineral resource recovery area (Napa County Baseline Date Report, Figure 2-2 and Map 2-1, Version 1, November 2005; Napa County General Plan Map, December 2008; Special Report 205, Update of Mineral Land Classification, Aggregate Materials in the North San Francisco Bay Production-Consumption Region, Sonoma, Napa, Marin and Southwestern Solano Counties, California Geological Survey, 2013). The nearest known mineral resource area in Napa County is located over five (5) miles to the southeast of the project site. Proposed site improvements and development of vineyard on the parcel would not physically preclude future mining activities from occurring. Therefore, no impact would occur.

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 type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
b) Generation of excessive groundborne vibration or groundborne noise levels?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" 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 site is located in a rural setting where surrounding parcels are generally agricultural, undeveloped, planted with vineyards, or developed with rural residences. The closest offsite residence is located approximately 228 feet to the south of vineyard Block B, and approximately 19 residences are within 500 feet of the development area; the majority of which are located across Sarco Creek to the west and northwest of the proposed vineyard block developments. The closest residential area (Napa) is approximately 2.0 miles west of the project. Additionally, properties in the immediate area contain vineyard.

Activities associated with installation of the proposed project, including earthmoving and subsequent vineyard operations, could generate noise levels above existing conditions. Several different types of equipment would be necessary for implementation and operation of the proposed project, including a bulldozer, excavator, dump truck, trencher, backhoe, and small trucks. **Table 9** characterizes typical equipment noise levels at a reference distance of 50 feet. As identified in **Table 9**, equipment used for vineyard development could produce a maximum of 89 (A-weighted decibels) dBA at a distance of 50 feet.

Table 9 – Construction Equipment Noise Emission Levels

Equipment	Typical Noise Level (dBA) 50 feet from Source	Equipment	Typical Noise Level (dBA) 50 feet from Source
Backhoe	80	Roller/Sheep's Foot	74
Bulldozer	85	Scarifier	83
Chainsaw	86	Scraper	89
Compactor	82	Shovel	82
Excavator/Shovel	82	Spike driver	77
Grader	85	Truck	88
Loader	85	Wood Chipper	89

Sources: Cowan 1994, Federal Transit Administration 1995, Nelson 1987, United States Department of Agriculture Forest Service 1980, and Napa County Baseline Data Report Chapter 6 (Noise Resources) November 2005 (Version 1)

Table 10 characterizes the typical reduction in construction equipment noise levels as the distance increases from the source, based on a source noise level of 90 dBA.

Table 10 – Estimated Distance to dBA Contours from Construction Activities ¹

Distance from Construction Source	Calculated Noise Level
50 feet	90 dBA
180 feet	75 dBA
300 feet	70 dBA
450 feet	65 dBA
700 feet	60 dBA
1,100 feet	55 dBA
1,700 feet	50 dBA

¹ Based on a source noise level of 90 dBA

Source: Napa County Baseline Date Report, Noise Section Table 6-13, Version 1, November 2005

Based on distances to existing residences, noise associated with project construction would be approximately 75-60 dBA at the nearest existing offsite residences.

Noise related to farming activities and equipment typically ranges from 75 dBA to 95 dBA, with an average of approximately 84 dBA (Toth 1979 and Napa County Baseline Date Report, Version 1, November 2005). These noise levels should be reasonably representative of noise levels from wheeled and tracked farm equipment. Noise sources associated with ongoing vineyard operation and maintenance include a variety of vehicles and equipment, such as ATV's, tractors, grape haul trucks, passenger cars, and light trucks, which would occur on a temporary and seasonal basis. **Table 11** characterizes the typical reduction of farming activity noise levels as the distance increases from the source using a noise source level of 84 dBA.

Table 11 – Estimated Distance to dBA Contours from Farming Activities ¹

Distance from Farming Source	Calculated Noise Level
50 feet	84 dBA
115 feet	75 dBA
175 feet	70 dBA
275 feet	65 dBA
400 feet	60 dBA
650 feet	55 dBA
1,000 feet	50 dBA

¹ Based on a source noise level of 84 dBA

Source: Napa County Baseline Date Report, Noise Section Table 6-14, Version 1, November 2005.

Based on distances to existing residences, it is anticipated that noise due to operation and maintenance agricultural activities would be below 70 dBA at the closest existing offsite residences.

Napa County considers construction noise levels up to 75 dBA during daytime hours (7 a.m. to 7 p.m.) and 60 dBA during nighttime hours (7 p.m. to 7 a.m.) as compatible with residential uses (NCC Section 8.16.080), and ongoing (or established use) noise levels of approximately 55 dBA as compatible with residential uses (NCC Section 8.16.070). Noise levels from routine operation and maintenance activities at the nearest offsite residence would be less than typical for compatible uses, and the temporary and ongoing noise sources and levels are considered typical and reasonable for agricultural development and operational activities, consistent with the County's "Right to Farm" ordinance (NCC Chapter 2.94 and General Plan Agricultural Preservation and Land Use Policy AG/LU-15), and are therefore exempt from compliance with the noise ordinance. NCC Section 8.16.090.E (Exemptions to Noise Regulations) exempts agricultural operations from noise regulations. Additionally, the proposed project would not result in a permanent increase in ambient noise levels over what currently exists in the project vicinity, resulting in a less than significant impact on ambient noise levels of the area.

During site preparation and vineyard installation, the use of heavy equipment could result in a temporary increase in ambient noise levels in the vicinity of the project site as described above. Compliance with measures identified in the County's noise ordinance for construction-related noise, such as a limitation of hours of construction activity and muffling of equipment, would result in temporary less than significant noise and vibration impacts, and would result in no permanent increase in ambient noise levels in the vicinity of the proposed project in excess of County standards.

- c. The project site is neither located within an area covered by an airport land use plan, nor is it within two (2) miles of a public, public-use, or private airport (Napa County GIS: Napa Airport Compatibility Zones and USGS Quad layers). Therefore, no impact would occur.

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 involves earthmoving activities and the installation and maintenance of erosion control measures in connection with the development and cultivation of vineyard. It does not involve the construction of new homes, businesses, roads, or infrastructure (e.g., water, sewer or utility lines) that would directly or indirectly induce substantial unplanned population growth. Construction and installation activities of the proposed project would generate a minimal number of employees to the project site on a temporary basis, and ongoing vineyard operation and maintenance would generate a minimal number of employees to the project site on an ongoing basis. It is anticipated that these employees would come from the existing labor pool in the region. Therefore, the proposed project would not induce unplanned population growth in the proposed project vicinity or greater region, either directly or indirectly. No impact would occur.
- b. The proposed project would not displace any existing housing or people and it does not involve the construction of new homes. Therefore, no impact would occur.

XV.	PUBLIC SERVICES. Would the project result in:	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporation	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
	a) Substantial adverse physical impacts associated with the provision of new or physically altered governmental facilities, need for new or physically altered governmental facilities, the construction of which could cause significant environmental impacts, in order to maintain acceptable service ratios, response times or other performance objectives for any of the public services:				
	i) Fire protection?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
	ii) Police protection?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
	iii) Schools?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
	iv) Parks?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
	v) Other public facilities?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>

Discussion:

- a. The proposed project does not include the construction of residential or commercial structures, as discussed in **Section XIV (Population and Housing)**, resulting in no substantial population growth in the area. It is anticipated that these temporary employees would come from the existing labor pool in the local region and would not result in an increase in population over existing conditions. As a result, there would be no need to construct any new government facilities. Therefore, there would be no change in the demand for the listed services and amenities. No impact would occur.

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

Discussion:

- a-b. The proposed project does not include any recreational facilities. As discussed in **Sections XIV (Population and Housing)** and **XV (Public Services)**, the proposed project would not result in substantial population growth, resulting in no increase in the use of recreational facilities and requiring no construction or expansion of recreational facilities. Therefore, no impact would occur.

XVII.	TRANSPORTATION. Would the project:	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporation	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
	a) Conflict with a program, plan, ordinance or policy addressing the circulation system, including transit, roadway, bicycle and pedestrian facilities?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
	b) Would the project conflict or be inconsistent with CEQA Guidelines section 15064.3, subdivision (b)?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
	c) Substantially increase hazards due to a geometric design feature, (e.g., sharp curves or dangerous intersections) or incompatible uses (e.g., farm equipment)?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
	d) Result in inadequate emergency access?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>

Discussion:

- a-b. Currently, the project site is developed with one single-family residence, accessory structures, landscaped areas, outbuildings, and an access road.

As part of the statewide implementation of Senate Bill (SB) 743, the Governor's Office of Planning and Research (OPR) settled upon automobile vehicle miles of travel (VMT) as the preferred metric for assessing passenger vehicle-related impacts under CEQA and issued revised CEQA Guidelines in December 2018, along with a Technical Advisory on Evaluating Transportation Impacts in CEQA to assist

practitioners in implementing the CEQA Guidelines revisions.

The County's General Plan Circulation Element contains a policy statement (Policy CIR-7) indicating that the County expects development projects to achieve a 15% reduction in project-generated VMT to avoid triggering a significant environmental impact. Specifically, the policy directs project applicants to identify feasible measures that would reduce their project's VMT and to estimate the amount of VMT reduction that could be expected from each measure. The policy states that "projects for which the specified VMT reduction measures would not reduce unmitigated VMT by 15 or more percent shall be considered to have a significant environmental impact." That policy is followed by an action item (CIR-7.1) directing the County to update its CEQA procedures to develop screening criteria for projects that "would not be considered to have a significant impact to VMT" and that could therefore be exempted from VMT reduction requirements.

The new CEQA Guidelines and the OPR Technical Advisory note that CEQA provides a categorical exemption (Section 15303) for additions to existing structures of up to 10,000 square feet, so long as the project is in an area that is not environmentally sensitive and where public infrastructure is available. OPR determined that "typical project types for which trip generation increases relatively linearly with building footprint (i.e., general office building, single tenant office building, office park, and business park) generate or attract 110-124 trips per 10,000 square feet". They concluded that, absent substantial evidence otherwise, the addition of 110 or fewer daily trips could be presumed to have a less than significant VMT impact.

The County maintains a set of Transportation Impact Study Guidelines (TIS Guidelines) that define situations and project characteristics that trigger the need to prepare a TIS. The purpose of a TIS is to identify whether the project is likely to cause adverse physical or operational changes on a County roadway, bridge, bikeway, or other transportation facility, to determine whether the project should be required to implement or contribute to improvement measures to address those changes, and to ensure that the project is developed consistent with the County's transportation plans and policies. Per the County's current TIS Guidelines, a project is required to prepare a TIS if it generates 110 or more net new daily vehicle trips.

The TIS Guidelines also include VMT analysis requirements for projects based on trip generation, which includes a screening approach that provides a structure to determine what level of VMT analysis may be required for a given project. For a new project that would generate less than 110 net new daily vehicle and truck trips, not only is the project not required to prepare a TIS, it is also presumed to have a less than significant impact for VMT. However, applicants are encouraged to describe the measures they are taking and/or plan to take that would reduce the project's trip generation and/or VMT.

Projects that generate more than 110 net new passenger vehicle trips must conduct a VMT analysis and identify feasible strategies to reduce the project's vehicular travel; if the feasible strategies would not reduce the project's VMT by at least 15%, the conclusion would be that the project would cause a significant environmental impact.

The proposed project is expected to generate approximately three (3) round trips, six (6) one way, per day during construction. Four (4) truck trips would deliver and remove heavy equipment at the start and end of project construction. Typical construction equipment anticipated for project implementation includes a medium excavator, D8 bulldozer, haul trucks, loader, and two (2) farm tractors with trailers. Pruning would occur approximately three (3) days of the year and is anticipated to generate ten (10) daily employees, resulting in approximately five round trips per day during pruning. Weed control would occur between May and July (outside of pruning months) and is anticipated to generate up to six (6) workers. Harvest would occur approximately two (2) days of the year and is anticipated to generate up to ten (10) daily employees, resulting in approximately five (5) round trips per day during harvest. Two (2) grape haul trucks would be used during harvest. Vehicular equipment for ongoing vineyard maintenance is anticipated to include ATVs, tractors, truck and equipment trailers, and passenger cars and/or light trucks. Additionally, 25 annual truck trips are proposed for delivery of recycled water to the site. Some of this traffic already exists onsite due to the operation and maintenance of the existing vineyard. Construction traffic would be intermittent during non-peak hours, generally arriving between 6 a.m. and 7 a.m. and departing between 2 p.m. and 3 p.m. Traffic associated with routine vineyard operation and maintenance, including harvest, would also be intermittent during the non-peak hours, generally arriving around 6 a.m. and departing around 3 p.m.

As indicated above, the TIS Guidelines provide a screening criterion that could be used to determine whether a VMT analysis is warranted for small projects, which are defined as projects that would generate fewer than 110 trips per day and may generally be assumed to cause less-than-significant transportation impacts. As indicated above, construction of the proposed project would generate up to approximately 10 one-way worker trips per day, with an additional four (4) one-way trips for mobilization and demobilization. Harvest would generate up to approximately 10 one-way worker trips, and two one-way truck trips per day (resulting in up to 22 round trips per day) for approximately one (1) to two (2) days per year. Other typical vineyard operations (as outlined above) are anticipated to generate up to 5-10 one-way trips per day during the days these activities occur, plus water delivery which would occur less than one time per week. Therefore, daily trips (including passenger vehicle trips and truck trips) generated by the proposed project would be well below the Governor's Office of Planning and Research's recommended screening criterion threshold for small projects generating fewer than 110 trips per day. Additionally, daily trips associated with the project would be temporary and seasonal in nature, further supporting conformance and observance of this screening criterion.

The project site is accessed from Hagen Road, approximately 0.7 miles north from the intersection of Hagen Road and Silverado Trail. Trucks

and other equipment would use County roads or State highways for very short periods during construction and subsequent vineyard operations.

Traffic generated by construction of the proposed project and subsequent vineyard operation, including harvest, would increase traffic on area roadways and result in additional vehicle miles traveled compared to current conditions. These activities would occur on a temporary and/or seasonal basis, and they would generally occur during non-peak hours. Trips already occur due to the existing vineyard, and it is anticipated that a number of existing employees would be utilized to develop and manage the proposed vineyard. The proposed project would result in a minimal increase in traffic levels along the local roadways compared to existing conditions and would not result in decreased travel times on roads in the vicinity of the proposed project or a substantial increase in vehicle miles traveled given the scale of the proposed project. Further, the proposed project would not conflict with a program, plan, ordinance, or policy addressing the circulation system, including transit, roadway, or designated bicycle and pedestrian facilities or with CEQA Section 15064.3(b). Therefore, the impact would be less than significant.

- c. The project proposes to utilize the existing site access off of Hagen Road for project development (Figures 1-3). The proposed project does not include roadway improvements and/or modifications to Hagen, or include any other design feature that would result in hazardous conditions due to a geometric design feature or incompatible uses. The installation of the vineyard is consistent with the allowed use of the property and other Residential Country and Residential Single Family zoned properties and agricultural uses in the area. Therefore, the potential for the creation, substantial increase in hazards or hazards due to a geometric design feature and incompatible uses would be a less than significant impact.
- d. The existing roads would continue to provide adequate emergency access to the project site, resulting in no impact.

XVIII. TRIBAL CULTURAL RESOURCES. Would the project cause a substantial adverse change in the significance of a tribal cultural resource, defined in Public Resources Code section 21074 as either a site, feature, place, cultural landscape that is geographically defined in terms of the size and scope of the landscape, sacred place, or object with cultural value to a California Native American tribe, and that is:	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporation	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
a) Listed or eligible for listing in the California Register of Historical Resources, or in a local register of historical resources as defined in Public Resources Code section 5020.1(k); or	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
b) A resource determined by the lead agency, in its discretion and supported by substantial evidence, to be significant pursuant to criteria set forth in subdivision (c) of Public Resources Code section 5024.1? In applying the criteria set forth in subdivision (c) of Public Resources Code section 5024.1, the lead agency shall consider the significance of the resource to a California Native American tribe.	<input type="checkbox"/>	X <input type="checkbox"/>		<input type="checkbox"/>

Discussion:

On February 24, 2022, the Yocha Dehe Wintun Nation reached out in response to the AB52 notification and requested a site visit, due to concerns of the project uncovering previously undiscovered tribal resources. A site visit was conducted with the County, the applicant and a Yocha Dehe representative on April 14, 2022 – a follow up letter recommended that the project require tribal monitors during project development and ground disturbance, additional cultural sensitivity training was requested for all project personnel. A Monitoring Agreement was created for the project and signed by both the property owner and Yocha Dehe; the project is required to comply with said agreement per **Section V (Cultural Resources) Mitigation Measure 1**. The Mishewal Wappo Tribe of Alexander Valley and Middletown Rancheria did not request consultation within the 30-day notification period, and because no response to the consultation invitation was received, the consultation time period elapsed.

a-b. As discussed in **Section V (Cultural Resources)**, the proposed project’s Cultural Resource Reconnaissance did not identify any historical or archaeological resources within the project area, although the probability of encountering cultural resources was determined to be high. As noted above, a Yocha Dehe tribal monitor shall be present during vineyard development and require sensitivity training for all personal.

As identified in Section V (Cultural Resources) the standard Condition of Approval has been included including a Mitigation Measure Approval that requires conformance with the Monitoring Agreement. With implementation of these Conditions of Approval adequate protection for and avoidance of potential impacts on Tribal Cultural Resources will be provided. Therefore, the proposed project would result in less than significant impacts to Tribal Cultural Resources, including those that may be eligible for the CHRIS or local register or cultural resources as defined in Public Resources Code Section 5024.1(c).

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

Discussion:

- a. The proposed project would generate a minimal number of employees to the property on a temporary basis, and ongoing vineyard operation and maintenance would generate a minimal number of employees to the property on an ongoing basis. It is anticipated that these employees would come from the existing labor pool in the region and would not generate an increase in the population relative to the existing conditions. Therefore, the proposed project would not create a need to construct new or modified utilities and service systems. Further, implementation of the proposed project would not result in the construction or expansion of a water or wastewater treatment facility; the proposed project would not generate wastewater and no groundwater is proposed to be used as part of this project.

Irrigation pipelines would be located within existing roadways, vineyards and vineyard avenues, and/or within proposed clearing limits. The proposed project would include the installation of onsite storm water drainage features such as straw wattles, a permanent no-till vineyard cover crop, drainage ditches, rolling dips, rock-filled avenue and rock apron at outfalls, and a detention basin, which have been designed to meet project-related storm water drainage needs. The effect of the proposed storm water drainage system is described in **Sections IV (Biological Resources), VII (Geology and Soils), and X (Hydrology and Water Quality)**. As discussed in the referenced sections, the environmental impacts of construction of these features, with incorporation of standard conditions identified in **Sections III (Air Quality), IV (Biological Resources), V (Cultural Resources) and IX (Hazards and Hazardous Materials)**, would result in a less than significant impact.

- b. The approximately 2.04 gross acres of vineyard would be supplied by recycled water trucked to the project parcel supplied by Napa Sanitation District. It is anticipated that after full development over three (3) years, water use for the proposed vineyard is estimated to be approximately 3.4 acre-feet of water per year from NSD. Therefore, the proposed project, in conjunction with existing uses, is anticipated to

have less than significant impact on water supplies. Also, see **Section X (Hydrology and Water Quality)** for additional disclosures and analysis.

- c. Given the small number of employees that the project would generate for construction and operation, wastewater generation by the proposed project would not be substantial enough to affect wastewater treatment capacity. The proposed project would generate no wastewater that would require treatment, resulting in no impact on wastewater treatment providers.
- d-e. Rock generated during vineyard preparation would be utilized onsite primarily in surfacing vineyard avenues. Rock not used immediately would be stockpiled for future use inside the proposed clearing limits. Solid waste generated during construction activities (e.g., broken pipe, fittings, trellis, removed vines end posts, etc.) would be negligible. Implementation of the proposed project would include pruning and harvesting activities, which would generate waste material (cane). This material would generally be disposed of onsite by spreading it back into the vineyard, burning it, or a combination of the two. Therefore, the proposed project would not generate a volume of waste that would need to be disposed of at a landfill that would exceed the permitted capacity of applicable landfills serving the project area. Furthermore, all waste would be disposed of in accordance with federal, State, and local statutes and regulations. Therefore, no impact would occur.

XX.	WILDFIRE. If located in or near state responsibility areas or lands classified as very high fire hazard severity zones, would the project:	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporation	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
	a) Substantially impair an adopted emergency response plan or emergency evacuation plan?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" 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:

The project site is located in a Local Responsibility Area (LRA) that is not designated as a Fire Hazard Severity Zone (CALFIRE, 2007, Napa County GIS Fire Hazard Layer). The project site is flat to gently sloped and located on the Valley Floor with elevations ranging from approximately 45 to 82 feet above msl.

- a. Project construction and operation would not require any road closures and would not substantially increase traffic in the area compared to current conditions. Existing roads would continue to provide adequate emergency access to the project site. Therefore, the proposed project would not affect an adopted emergency response plan or emergency evacuation plan.
- b-c. Project construction would require the use of vehicles and heavy equipment for grading and other activities, and these vehicles and equipment could spark and ignite flammable vegetation. During construction, the risk of igniting a fire would be low because grassland would be cleared prior to developing the vineyard, and the risk would be temporary due to the short duration of construction (approximately six (6) months). Operation and maintenance activities would be similar to activities already occurring on the project site with the existing vineyard. The proposed project does not include any infrastructure that would exacerbate fire risk. The proposed project would not exacerbate wildfire risk and this impact would be less than significant.
- d. Although the proposed project would alter land cover, the proposed project includes temporary and permanent erosion control measures which would reduce the impact of stormwater runoff or drainage changes being discharged on or offsite and there would be a decrease in peak flow in the development area (see **Section X [Hydrology and Water Quality]**). The onsite residence and proposed vineyard are located on relatively flat terrain. Therefore, there are no structures or people that would be exposed to downslope or downstream flooding or landslides

and the impact would be less than significant.

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 checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
	c) Does the project have environmental effects that will cause substantial adverse effects on human beings, either directly or indirectly?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>

Discussion:

Project impacts have been analyzed to determine potential project-specific and cumulatively considerable significant impacts. All areas of impact analysis were found to have a less than significant negative effect on the environment or human beings due to project design with incorporation of identified conditions of approval.

- a. As discussed in this Initial Study, implementation of #P21-00274-ECPA, with the incorporation of identified conditions of approval (should the proposed project be approved), would not have the potential to significantly degrade the quality of the environment.

Implementation of conditions of approval would avoid potential direct and indirect impacts to special-status bat, bird and turtle species and their habitat. Given the small size of the project, agricultural expansion within the project site is in and of itself unlikely to result in any significant impacts to wildlife movement or migration at the landscape linkage scale; access to both the ephemeral drainage and Sarco Creek will be maintained. As such, the proposed deer fencing would not introduce any new movement barriers to wildlife and impacts to wildlife movement are expected to be less than significant, and the range of special-status plant species would not be restricted, cumulative impacts are anticipated to be less than significant. The blue-line stream onsite is avoided with minimum buffers, and an area of vines are proposed to be removed and revegetated with native species and will be maintained for 5 years, increasing the overall health of the streams riparian corridor. With incorporation of standard conditions and a Mitigation Measure (**Cultural Resources 1**) requiring compliance with the Monitoring Agreement will provide protection of any cultural resources that may be discovered accidentally, and, as such, significant impacts to cultural resources are not expected (**Section V [Cultural Resources]**). Therefore, the proposed project as designed with the incorporation of conditions of approval, the proposed vineyard development project would have a less than significant potential to degrade the quality of the environment.

- b. The project site is located within the Sarco Creek Drainage. The Sarco Creek Drainage contains approximately 2,825 acres. In 1993, the vineyard acreage within the drainage was approximately 142 acres, or approximately 5.0% of the drainage. Since 1993, approximately 147 acres of additional vineyard (or 5.2% of the drainage) have been developed to vineyard, resulting in approximately 10.2% of the drainage (289.24 acres) containing vineyard. The current project proposes to legalize existing vineyard (0.29 acres), remove vineyard (0.39 acres) located within a creek setback and approved the addition of 0.96 gross acres of new vineyard. There is one additional Track I ECPA being processed within this drainage (P20-00040) which is proposing a 1.43-acre vineyard development.

It is estimated, based on evaluation of the County's GIS layer identifying Potentially Productive Soils (PPS) within the Sarco Creek Drainage, that there are approximately 710 acres (25% of the drainage) having the potential to be developed to vineyard, this in conjunction with existing and approved vineyard development (approximately 289.24 acres) results in a total potential build out of approximately 999 acres or approximately 35% of the drainage. The PPS layer includes lands with characteristics that have been found to be suitable for potential future

vineyard development; however this total does not take into consideration other site-specific limitations such as water courses requiring setbacks, wetlands, other water features, rare or special-status plants and animal species, or cultural resources, nor does the layer take into account other factors influencing vineyard development, such as sun exposure, soil type, water availability, or economic factors.

While it is not possible to quantify precisely the acreage and location of additional vineyard development that may be proposed by property owners in these drainages in the future, it is possible to make a conservative estimate based on previous trends. To estimate the amount reasonably foreseeable vineyard that may be developed over time, the acreage of vineyard development including approved vineyard projects in the cumulative environment (i.e., Sarco Creek Drainage) over the last 29 years (1993-2022) were used to project an estimation of vineyard development for the next three to five years. Over the past 29 years within the Sarco Creek Drainage, approximately 10 acres of agriculture were developed per year (289.24 divided by 29). Combined with Napa County policies and other site selection factors that limit the amount of land that can be converted to vineyard, the development of approximately 30 to 50 acres over the next three to five years within the Sarco Creek Drainage are considered reasonable estimates. NCC Chapter 18.108 includes policies that require setbacks of 35 to 160 feet from watercourses (depending on slopes), and General Plan Conservation Policy CON 24c that requires the retention of oak woodland at a 2:1 ratio, which limits the amount of potential vineyard acreage that could be converted within the watershed. It has been the County's experience with ECP projects that there are generally site-specific issues, such as oak woodland preservation, wetlands, other water features, special-status plant and animal species, or cultural resources that further reduce areas that can be developed to other land uses. Additionally, the vineyard acreage projections for the next three to five years do not consider environmental factors that influence vineyard site selection, such as sun exposure, soil type, water availability, slopes greater than 30%, or economic factors such as land availability, cost of development or investment returns.

Air Quality and GHG - Sections III and VIII:

The proposed project (#P21-00274-ECPA) includes the removal of vegetation and installation of vineyard and erosion control measures concurrent with other projects in the air basin that would generate emissions of criteria pollutants, including suspended particulate matter (PM) and equipment exhaust emissions. For construction-related dust, impacts the Regional Water Board recommends that significance be based on the consideration of the control measures to be implemented (Regional Water Board, May 2017). As discussed in **Section III (Air Quality)** and shown in **Table 3 (Emissions from Vineyard Development and Operation)** criteria pollutant emissions associated with development and operations are anticipated to be well below identified thresholds, and therefore are not expected to result in project or cumulatively significant impacts. Additionally, the proposed project would be subject to standard air quality conditions of approval (should the proposed project be approved) that requires implementation of Air Quality BMPs to further reduce potential less than significant air quality effects of the proposed project and ongoing operation. Conversion of existing vegetation and disturbance of soil would result in releases of carbon dioxide, one of the gases that contribute to climate change (**Tables 5 and 6**). As discussed in **Section VIII (Greenhouse Gas Emissions)**, the proposed project is not anticipated to result in substantial or significant GHG emissions, and includes the installation of grapevines and a permanent no-till cover crop, which may off-set (in whole or in part) potential impacts related to reductions in carbon sequestration. Furthermore, a total of 24 trees will be planted to mitigate for the 8 walnut trees that will be removed; these trees will be monitored and maintained to ensure an 80% survivability after 5 years. Potential contributions to air quality impacts associated with the proposed project, including GHG emissions and loss of sequestration, would be considered less than cumulatively significant through project design (i.e., scope and scale) and implementation of standard conditions of approval.

Biological Resources - Section IV:

A project specific Biological Resources Reconnaissance Survey was performed for the proposed project to evaluate potential habitat loss and disturbance to plant and wildlife species as a result of the proposed project. The reconnaissance survey included a records search to identify the presence or potential presence of special-status species within the project area. The records search included the USFWS, CNDDDB, and CNPS databases. As discussed in **Section IV (Biological Resources)**, no special-status plant species or wetlands were identified in the project site. Impacts on special status species would be less than significant. By project design, no impacts to waters of the U.S. would occur. Therefore, the proposed project would not contribute to a cumulatively significant impact to special-status plants and animals or habitats.

Cultural and Tribal Resources – Sections V and XVIII:

No cultural resources were identified in the project site. With the incorporation of standard conditions and the Mitigation Measure - Cultural 1 requiring compliance with the approved Tribal Monitoring Agreement will protect cultural and tribal cultural resources that may be discovered accidentally, and, as such, significant impacts to cultural and tribal cultural resources are not expected (see **Section V [Cultural Resources] and Section XVII [Tribal Cultural Resources]**). Therefore, with the incorporation of the identified conditions of approval and mitigation measure, the proposed vineyard development project would have a less than significant project-specific and cumulative impact on cultural and tribal cultural resources.

Geology and Soils - Section VII:

Soil loss and associated sedimentation resulting from implementation of the proposed project is anticipated to be reduced as compared to existing conditions (**Table 4**). The reasons for this reduction is due to the increased vegetative cover conditions within the proposed vineyard development areas and the installation of straw wattles that reduce overland flow velocities and erosive power, and trap eroded soil on-site,

and by drainage ditches, rock apron, and grassy swale, which would capture sediment and slow runoff, thereby reducing soil loss potential. Because the proposed project would reduce soil loss as compared to existing conditions the proposed project is not anticipated to contribute cumulatively to sediment production within the Sarco Creek Drainage; therefore, impacts associated with soil loss and associated sedimentation are not considered cumulatively significant.

Because geologic impacts associated with future agricultural projects would receive the same scrutiny under CEQA, the County's General Plan Goals and Policies, in particular General Plan Conservation Element Policy CON-48 requires development projects to result in no net increase in sediment erosion conditions and soil loss as compared to existing conditions, it is not unreasonable to anticipate that those projects would also have a less than significant project specific and cumulative impact on erosion and associated sedimentation.

Hydrology and Water Quality - Section X:

Water use is anticipated to be approximately 3.4 acre-feet of water per year would be needed to irrigate the 2.04 gross acres of existing and proposed vineyard. Given that the proposed project will be irrigated entirely with recycled water supplied by Napa Sanitation District, no potential impacts associated with groundwater use would occur and the proposed project would result in less than significant impacts to groundwater supplies, groundwater recharge, and local groundwater aquifer levels.

As discussed in **Section X (Hydrology and Water Quality)** a Hydrologic Analysis utilizing the HydroCad Cal-1 Runoff Model has been prepared by NVVE Engineering (February 2020). The project does not include the creation of concentrated flows, or materially alter site drainage patterns, or materially alter site slopes no change in runoff volumes or time of concentrations are expected as compared to pre-project conditions, therefore no significant impacts due to changes in hydrology are expected.

The project is consistent with General Plan Conservation Element Policy CON-50c that requires that peak runoff following development is not greater than predevelopment conditions. Additionally, as discussed in **Section VII (Geology and Soils)** the proposed project is anticipated to decrease soil loss as compared to existing conditions. Therefore, the proposed project would have a less than significant impact with respect to alterations of existing drainage patterns of the site or area that would result in increased runoff, considerable on or off-site erosion, siltation or flooding.

Furthermore, because hydrologic impacts associated with future agricultural projects would receive the same scrutiny under CEQA and County General Plan Policy CON-50(c), which requires development projects be designed so that peak runoff following development is not greater than predevelopment conditions, it is reasonable to anticipate that those projects would also have a less than significant project specific and cumulative impact on hydrologic conditions.

Land Use and Planning - Section XI:

As discussed in **Section XI (Land Use and Planning)**, the proposed project, with implementation of identified conditions of approval identified in this Initial Study, achieves compliance with applicable NCC requirements and General Plan Goals and Policies (also see **Section VIII [Greenhouse Gas Emissions]**).

Proposed Project Impacts found to be Less Than Significant

In addition to the impact categories identified above, the following discussion summarizes those impacts considered to be less than significant with development of the proposed project: Aesthetics, Agriculture and Forestry Resources, Energy, Hazards and Hazardous Materials, Mineral Resources, Noise, Population and Housing, Public Services, Recreation, Transportation, Utilities and Service Systems, and Wildfire. Periodic use of lighting at the site would not create a substantial source of light and lighting would be in the form of heat lights or downward directional lights on equipment being used during nighttime harvest. The potential contribution to aesthetic impacts associated with the proposed project is considered to be less than cumulatively considerable. The proposed project does not conflict with any current zoning for agricultural or forestry use, nor does the proposed project conflict with the any applicable land use plan, policies, or regulation as mitigated and conditioned. There are no known mineral resource areas within the proposed project site or immediate vicinity. This project would generate noise levels that are considered normal and reasonable for agricultural activities and consistent with the County's "Right to Farm" Ordinance. The potential contribution to noise or vibration impacts is considered less than cumulatively considerable. Traffic related to construction and farm worker trips would not increase by a discernible amount and the relatively low and off-peak vehicle trips associated with the proposed project are considered less than cumulative considerable. The proposed project does not include the construction of structures that would result in population growth or displacement of people, the proposed project would not adversely affect current or future public services, or require the need for utilities and service systems. For these reasons, impacts associated with the proposed project that may be individually limited, but cumulatively considerable, would be less than significant.

Considering the project site's characteristics, surrounding environment, and the scope and scale of the proposed project, the proposed project with incorporation of conditions of approval, as discussed throughout this Initial Study, is not anticipated to result in either project specific or cumulatively considerable negative impacts; therefore, impacts associated with this proposed project that may be individually limited, but cumulatively considerable, would be less than significant.

- c. Implementation of the proposed project would not have any potentially significant negative effects on human beings (see discussions under

Sections III [Air Quality], IX [Hazards and Hazardous Materials], X [Hydrology and Water Quality], XIII [Noise], XIV ([Population and Housing], XVII [Transportation], and XX [Wildfire]). The proposed project, the use of the property, and reasonably foreseeable projects would be activities at a level of intensity considered normal and reasonable for a property within Residential Country zoning district. Therefore, less than significant impacts on human beings are anticipated.

LIST OF FIGURES:

- Figure 1 Site Location Map (USGS)
- Figure 2 Site Location Map (2018 Aerial)
- Figure 3 Project Area

LIST OF TABLES:

- Table 1 Implementation Schedule
- Table 2 Annual Operations Schedule
- Table 3 Emissions from Vineyard Development and Operation
- Table 4 USLE Soil Loss Analysis
- Table 5 Estimated Development Area Carbon Stocks/Storage
- Table 6 Estimated Project Carbon Emissions Due to Vegetation Removal
- Table 7 Estimated Overall Project-Related GHG Emissions
- Table 8 Hydrologic Modeling Calculations (TR-20) Results: Runoff Rates
- Table 9 Construction Equipment Noise Emission Levels
- Table 10 Estimated Distance to dBA Contours from Construction Activities
- Table 11 Estimated Distance to dBA Contours from Farming Activities

LIST OF EXHIBITS:

- Exhibit A Napa Valley Vineyard Engineering, Inc., April 30, 2021 (Revised August 22, 2022) Erosion Control Plan and Plan Narrative #P21-0274, Hagen Vineyard
- Exhibit B Kjeldsen Biological Survey, June 2021, Biological Resource Survey, 1228 Hagen Road
- Exhibit B-1 Kjeldsen Biological Survey, August 2022, Tree Replanting and Carbon Sequestration Plan, 1228 Hagen Road
- Exhibit C Napa Valley Vineyard Engineering, Inc., September 2, 2021 (Revised November 22, 2021), Revised Soil Loss Analysis, Hagen Vineyard ECP
- Exhibit D Napa Valley Vineyard Engineering, Inc., September 2, 2021 (Revised November 22, 2021), Revised Hydrologic Analysis, Hagen Vineyard ECP
- Exhibit E Recycled Water Letter from Napa Sanitation District, January 7, 2022, (referenced APN 049-200-003)
- Exhibit F Trucked Recycle Water Use Permit. 1784 Monticello Road, Napa (same owner as APN 049-200-003)
- Exhibit G Water System Plans
- Exhibit H Project Revision Statement
- Exhibit I Application Submittal Materials and Correspondence