

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:** Wildfoote Tentative Parcel Map (P23-00076-TPM)
2. **Property Owner:** Shafer Vineyards Inc.
3. **County Contact Person, Phone Number and email:** Curtis Sawyer, Planner II; Phone: (707) 299-1361, Email: curtis.sawyer@countyofnapa.org
4. **Project Location and Assessor's Parcel Number (APN):** 6110 Silverado Trail, Napa, CA. 94558; APN # 032-530-019. The parcel is located on the east side of Silverado Trail approximately six (6) miles north of the City of Napa and 2 miles south of Yountville Cross Road.
5. **Project sponsor's name and address:** Jon Webb, New Albion California Inc., 1113 Hunt Ave, St. Helena, CA. 94574; Phone: 707-963-1217, Email: jwebb@albionsurveys.com. Located on the east side of Silverado Trail, approximately 2 miles south of Yountville Cross Road.
6. **General Plan description:** Agricultural Resource (AR)
7. **Zoning:** Agricultural Preserve and Agricultural Watershed (AP & AW)
8. **Background/Project History:** The property is owned by Shafer Vineyards LLC, and is 126.8-acres. The parcel to be subdivided includes both zoning designations of Agricultural Preserve and Agricultural Watershed. The General Plan Designation for the property is Agricultural Resource and per the Napa County General Plan Land Use Element, Policy AG/LU-21, the minimum parcel size for the parcel is 40 acres. The property is currently developed with a residence, guest house, septic system, swimming pool, water holding tank, several wells, a 5-acre-foot reservoir for frost protection and 22-acres of vineyards. Additionally, there is an approved Winery Use Permit (02285-UP, Pillar Rock Winery) for the property. The subject property is under a Conservation Easement with the Napa County Land Trust, Deed 1995-013125, NCR. The conservation easement allows for subdivision of the property into two (2) parcels as proposed here and dictates, among other things, the location of the building site for Proposed Parcel One, limitations on development of the property, limits removal of woodland outside of proposed residential building site (limited to no more than five (5) acres).
9. **Description of Project:** Request for approval of a Tentative Parcel Map, proposing to subdivide a 126.8-acre parcel into two (2) parcels, (Parcel one (1)) 85.8-acres and (Parcel two (2)) 41-acres. There is no immediate development proposed on the resulting new parcel. Any foreseeable future development on the resulting new undeveloped parcel is expected to be single-family residential structures, associated accessory buildings, access road, and infrastructure. The layout of the Tentative Parcel Map includes proposed private road alignments and residential building envelopes for the resulting new parcel.
10. **Describe the environmental setting and surrounding land uses:** The property to be subdivided measures 126.8-acres in area and is located on the east side of Silverado Trail approximately six (6) miles north of the City of Napa and two (2) miles south of Yountville Cross Road. Natural lands in the study area include oak woodland, annual grassland, and waterways such as ephemeral streams. Valleys surrounding the study area have been developed with approximately 22-acres of vineyards. Portions of the property have been developed including a residence and guest house, barns and associated agricultural infrastructure, and paved and graded roads. Soils within the property consist of the Boomer, Bale, Bressa-Dibble, Boomer-Forward-Felta, Clear Lake and Perkins soil associations. The topography consists of flat to steep hills and elevation ranges from 120 to 480 feet above sea level. Oak woodland is the predominant vegetation type within the study area. Vegetation alliances associated with this natural community include: California bay-madrone-coast live oak- (black oak big-leaf maple) alliance, coast live oak alliance, coast live oak-blue oak-(foothill pine) alliance, coast live oak alliance, mixed oak alliance, and valley oak-(California bay-coast live oak-walnut-ash) riparian forest alliance. Uses surrounding the property are those compatible with allowable uses found within the AW and AP zoning districts, such as vineyards, wineries, and single-family homes.

11. **Other agencies whose approval is required** (e.g., permits, financing approval, or participation agreement)
None identified at this time.

Responsible (R) and Trustee (T) Agencies
None.

Other Agencies Contacted
None.

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

On December 5, 2024, County Staff sent invitations to consult on the proposed project to Native American Tribes who had a cultural interest in the area and who as of that date had requested to be invited to consult on projects, in accordance with the requirements of Public Resources Code Section 21080.3.1.

County staff received two (2) replies. The first reply was received on December 9, 2024, from Lena Murphy of Middletown Rancheria Tribal Historic Preservation Department in which comment or consult on the project was declined. The second reply was received on February 6, 2025, from Scott Gadaldon of the Mishewal Wappo Tribe of Alexander Valley in which comment or consult on the project was declined.

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

ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACTS AND BASIS OF CONCLUSIONS:

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

On the basis of this initial evaluation:

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

Curtis Sawyer
Signature

April 25, 2025
Date

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

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

Discussion:

a-c. Visual resources are those physical features that make up the environment, including landforms, geological features, water, trees and other plants, and elements of the human cultural landscape. A scenic vista, then, would be a publicly accessible vantage point such as a road, park, trail, or scenic overlook from which distant or landscape-scale views of a beautiful or otherwise important assembly of visual resources can be taken-in. As generally described in the Environmental Setting and Surrounding Land Uses section, above, the area is predominately surrounded by agriculture and vineyards. The subject parcel is composed of oak woodland, annual grassland, and waterways such as ephemeral streams. Valleys surrounding the study area have been developed with approximately 22-acres of vineyards. Oak woodland is the predominant vegetation within the study area. Vegetation alliances associated with this natural community include: California bay-madrone-coast live oak-(black oak big-leaf maple) alliance, coast live oak alliance, coast live oak-blue oak-(foothill pine) alliance, coast live oak alliance, mixed oak alliance, and valley oak-(California bay-coast live oak-walnut-ash) riparian forest alliance.

The subject parcel is currently developed with an existing single-family home, guest house, septic system, swimming pool, water holding tank, several wells, a 5-acre-foot reservoir for frost protection and 22-acres of vineyards. Additionally, there is an approved Winery Use Permit (02285-UP, Pillar Rock Winery) for the property. However, the subject project is a land division and includes no development that would damage or cause an adverse effect on a scenic vista or resources, nor would it substantially degrade the existing visual character. The proposed land division has no proposed physical improvements as a part of this project. The application does include a hypothetical future proposed homesite, which is approximately 830 feet as the crow flies from the nearest public road, Silverado Trail. Following the subdivision both parcels will be accessed by existing road alignments, which minimizes potential impacts to the hillsides on the parcel. The land division will increase the number of legal parcels from one (1) to two (2), thereby increasing the number of single-family residential dwellings that can be developed. The proposed parcels that would be created from the land division are 85.8-acres and 41-acres in size and have an AW & AP zoning designations. Historically, the development pattern within this vicinity as described tends to be interlaced with low-density residential uses and wine related ag use. Furthermore, future structures, grading, or earthmoving will likely be subject to the county's Viewshed Protection Ordinance, which acts to ensure that the visual impacts of hillside development are less than significant. Seen as a whole, this project will not substantially alter a scenic vista or substantially degrade the existing visual character of the site or its immediate surroundings.

d. The proposed project is a land division and does not include any development that would result in the creation of any new sources of light or glare. The project will increase the number of legal parcels on which future ministerial residential development is possible. There is currently one (1) single-family residential dwelling on the subject property and a previously approved winery facility with associated physical improvements. The conclusion of this project could allow up to one (1) additional single-family residence on the new parcel as well as associated accessory structures such as accessory dwelling units and guest cottage. While potential future residential dwellings will be near Silverado Trail, a combination of several factors will prevent impacts associated with light and glare from being significant including; the size of the parcels relative to the number of structures, the distribution of the building envelopes in the parcel map and the county's Viewshed Protection Ordinance

Mitigation Measures: No mitigation measures are required.

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

Discussion:

- a. Based on a review of Napa County environmental resource mapping (Department of Conservation Farmlands, 2016), existing vineyards on the property are designated as Unique Farmland. A small portion of the existing vineyard at both the south-western and the south-eastern portion of vineyard is designated as Prime Farmland. The remainder of the property outside of these areas is designated as Other Land. No physical development is proposed as a function of this land division. Future development, to the extent it conforms to the Zoning Code, would be limited in scope and consistent with the property's agricultural use. Any future development of a single-family home would likely be developed on a portion of the property designated as other lands, rather than unique or prime farmland.
- b. The property is not subject to Williamson Act Contract and, as noted above, the project is consistent with the area's AW & AP zoning district requirements. Furthermore, the proposed division of land is consistent with the Napa County General Plan Policy AG/LU-114. No development is proposed as a part of this project and any future development must be consistent with the parcel's AW or AP zoning requirements. The project will not conflict with existing zoning for agricultural use.
- c-d. The subject property is not subject to timberland or forestland zoning. The project will not 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). The proposed project includes only a land division; no development is actually proposed at this time and no trees are proposed to be removed.
- e. The project will not cause changes to the existing environment which could result in the conversion of farmland to non-agricultural use.

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

The approval of the land division will increase the amount of single-family residential structures and associated accessory structures from one (1) to two (2), however, this type of low-density residential land use is commonly interlaced with agricultural land uses.

Mitigation Measures: No mitigation measures are required.

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

Discussion:

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

The Thresholds were challenged in court. Following litigation in the trial court, the court of appeal, and the California Supreme Court, all of the Thresholds were upheld. However, in an opinion issued on December 17, 2015, the California Supreme Court held that CEQA does not generally require an analysis of the impacts of locating development in areas subject to environmental hazards unless the project would exacerbate existing environmental hazards. The Supreme Court also found that CEQA requires the analysis of exposing people to environmental hazards in specific circumstances, including the location of development near airports, schools near sources of toxic 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 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. Bldg. Indus. Ass'n vs. Bay Area Air Quality Mgmt. Dist., 62 Ca 4th 369.

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

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

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

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

As mentioned above, in 2010, the BAAQMD adopted and later incorporated into its 2011 CEQA Guidelines project screening criteria (Table 3-1 – Operational-Related Criteria Air Pollutant and Precursors Screening Level Sizes) and thresholds of significance for air pollutants, which have now been updated by BAAQMD through May 2017. Given that the project is a division of land with no physical development proposed, the project would not contribute a significant amount of air pollution and would not result in a conflict or obstruction of an air quality plan. Any future development of a single-family home and associated physical improvements will not significantly affect air quality individually or contribute considerably to any cumulative air quality impacts.

- c-d. The land division itself will not result in the exposure of sensitive receptors to any pollutant concentrations or emissions. Potential air quality impacts are most likely to result from any future development of single-family residential dwellings on the resulting two (2) parcels. Any minor earthmoving and construction emissions to complete the construction would have a temporary effect; consisting mainly of dust generated during grading and other construction activities, exhaust emissions from construction-related equipment and vehicles, and relatively minor emissions from paints and other architectural coatings. Future project's will be required to implement best management practices to address construction impacts. .

While the Air District defines public exposure to offensive odors as a potentially significant impact, single-family residential dwellings are not known operational producers of pollutants capable of causing substantial negative impacts to sensitive receptors. The parcels that will result as a product of this land division are (Parcel one (1)) 85.8-acres and (Parcel two (2)) 41-acres. The existing single-family home and any future proposed development on the new parcels post lot split will likely be well over 500 feet from each other. The project is a division of land and thus would not create pollutant concentrations or objectionable odors affecting a substantial number of people. Impacts would be less than significant.

Mitigation Measures: No mitigation measures are required.

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

Discussion:

As part of the application for this Tentative Parcel Map which includes the identification of future residential building envelopes, and due to the generally undisturbed nature of major portions of the subject property, the applicant completed a Biological Resource Assessment in compliance with Napa County Guidelines (ESA, "Biological Resources Reconnaissance Report, Shafer Vineyards, Napa County, California", February 2024). To determine which special-status plant and animal species could potentially occur on or in the vicinity of the property, a search of the California Natural Diversity Database (CNDDDB) and the California Native Plant Society's database was conducted. The report concludes that none of the 10 potentially occurring special-status plant species identified in Appendix E of the biological assessment were observed in the study area during the January 2024 reconnaissance survey. The report further concludes that no special-status wildlife species were observed during its assessment.

a-b. According to the biological resource assessment prepared by ESA in February, 2024, none of the ten potentially occurring special-status plants identified in Appendix E were observed in the study area during the January 2024 survey. Appendix E of this assessment does identify the following species to have the potential for occurrence: Franciscan Onion, Napa False Indigo, Bent-Flowered Fiddleneck, Rincon Ridge Manzanita, Big-Scale Balsam Root, Colusa Layia, Jepson's Leptosiphon, Cobb Mountain Lupine, Black Navarretia, and Napa Bluecurls. The report further concludes that a floristic study was not conducted during blooming season, and the recommendation of additional surveys during blooming season is encouraged. The addition of MM BIO-1 would reduce impacts to special-status plant species to less than significant.

According to the biological resources assessment, the CNDDDB lists extant occurrence records for several special-status wildlife species within 5 miles of the study area. However, no special-status species were observed during the January 2024 reconnaissance survey. The following special-status animal species were identified within this assessment by the CNDDDB:

- There is one CNDDDB record of the Western Pond Turtle within 5 miles of the study area (Figure 4). Occurrence 458 is from 2002 where two turtles were observed in stagnant pools at the confluence of Skellenger Creek and Conn Creek. The irrigation ditch that runs along the eastern border of the study area provides potential aquatic habitat for this species. The nearby oak woodland

provides suitable terrestrial and potential nesting habitat for western pond turtle.

- There is one CNDDDB record of Swainson's Hawk within 5 miles of the study area. Occurrence number 2668 is from 2012, and states that an active nest was observed along the east bank of the Napa River. The trees within the annual grassland and mixed oak woodland on the subject parcel provide marginal nesting habitat for this species. The annual grassland and vineyards within the study area provide potential foraging habitat for this species.
- Two White-Tailed Kite occurrences have been recorded within 5 miles of the study area (Figure 4 of the ESA Biological Resources Reconnaissance Report). The trees in the oak woodland provide nesting habitat for this species, and the annual grassland and vineyards provide foraging habitat.
- There is one CNDDDB record for bald eagles within 5 miles of the study area. The record from 1988 reported bald eagles roosting on the north side of Lake Hennessey. The trees within the annual grassland and the trees within the mixed oak woodland provide marginal nesting habitat for this species. The habitat is marginal because the study area is not adjacent to any significant body of water, and most of the trees are too small to provide suitable nesting habitat.

Potential nesting habitat is present within and in the vicinity of the study area for nesting birds, including white-tailed kite, bald eagle, and Purple Martin. Additionally, trees within the study area have the potential to support day roosts or maternities for special-status bats such as: Pallid bat, Townsend's Big-Eared bat, and Western Red bat. The project is a land division, and while no development would be permitted with approval of the tentative parcel map, its approval would generate new parcels with the right develop ministerial land uses such as single-family residential structures and associated infrastructure. While no special-status species, raptors, nesting birds or bats were observed in the January 2024 reconnaissance survey, those species could move to the area between approval of the land division and potential future development. To reduce potentially significant impacts on candidate, special or sensitive animal species, nesting birds and bats to a less-than-significant level, Mitigation Measures BIO-2, BIO-3 and BIO-4, shall be implemented.

The Biological assessment conducted by ESA lists the following natural communities within the study area: annual grassland, mixed oak woodland, agriculture, and developed. Sensitive natural communities include those that are of special concern to resource agencies or those that are protected under California Environmental Quality Act (CEQA), Napa County regulations, Section 1600 of the California Fish and Game Code, or Section 404 of the Clean Water Act. Additionally, significant portions of the parcel are under a conservation easement, further limiting impacts to sensitive natural communities. Sensitive natural communities within the study area include the Valley Oak Riparian Forest Alliance, and oak trees within the oak woodland alliances. Mixed oak woodland is regulated via Policy CON-24(c) of the Napa County General Plan (Napa County, 2005). Should future potential development propose the loss of oak woodland habitat, the project must comply with all Napa County Conservation Regulations and standards. MM BIO-5 will reduce potential impacts to less than significant.

- c-d. Napa County Environmental Sensitivity Maps and the Baseline Data Report (Chapter 15. Surface Water Hydrology, Map 15-6, Land Cover) do not indicate the presence of any wetlands or potential wetlands within the project boundary. The project would not result in substantial impacts to federally protected or potentially sensitive wetlands as these resources are not present at the site. Three (3) ephemeral channels occur in the study area. These channels are potential waters of the state, and subject to regulation by the Regional Water Quality Control Board and CDFW. If impacts to these features are proposed in the future, the applicant will be required to obtain permits (i.e., Section 401 Water Quality Certification, and Section 1600 Lake and Streambed Alteration Agreement) and comply with the requirements of those permits. However, this project is a division of land where no physical improvements are proposed at this time. All future development would not impact the ephemeral channels as the project would need to comply with Napa County Conservation Regulations. All current agriculture activities and the potential future building envelopes and access roads are mostly graded or used for roads, buildings, or storage associated with the existing vineyard operations and residence. The land division and foreseeable future development of residential structures within the building envelopes would not interfere with the movement of any native resident or migratory fish or wildlife species or with their corridors or nursery sites.
- e-f. This project would not interfere with any ordinances protecting biological resources. None of the proposed building envelopes or access roads impact streams channels or trees as currently proposed. The proposed project would not conflict with the provisions of an adopted Habitat Conservation Plans, Natural Community Conservation Plans or other approved local, regional or state habitat conservation plans because there are no plans or physical improvements proposed. No impacts would occur.

Mitigation Measures:

MM BIO-1; Pre-Project Special-Status Plant Surveys: Prior to commencement of any construction, vegetation removal or earth-disturbing activities associated with future development projects on the newly created parcels, a floristic survey, during blooming season, of the development areas shall be conducted by a qualified biologist or botanist, for any special-status plant species. Surveys shall be conducted following CDFW's Protocol for Surveying and Evaluating Impacts to Special-Status Native Plant Populations and Sensitive Natural Communities

(<https://wildlife.ca.gov/Conservation/Survey-Protocols#377281280-plants>). Any special-status plants or populations found shall be mapped. To the fullest extent practicable, removal of special-status plants shall be avoided through adjustments to development area boundaries to avoid special-status plants/populations and provide them with a minimum 25-foot buffer. If impacts cannot be avoided, that project shall mitigate impacts at a minimum 3:1 mitigation to impact ratio through compensatory habitat, restoration, monitoring, and maintenance, or a combination thereof, following a plan approved in writing by CDFW. The plan may include preparing, funding, and implementing a long-term management plan in perpetuity.

Method of Monitoring: Prior to construction, vegetation removal or earth-disturbing activities of future development projects the applicant will provide to the Napa County Planning Division with the results of the floristic survey.

MM BIO-2; Pre-Project Special-Status Animal Surveys: A qualified biologist shall conduct a survey within 48 hours prior to the start of any construction, vegetation removal or earth-disturbing activity associated with future development on the newly created parcels, focusing on the presence of special-status animal species. The survey methodology shall be cleared with CDFW before implementation. If any special-status species are discovered during the survey, project activities shall not begin until CDFW has been consulted with regarding measures to avoid and minimize impacts on special-status species. Project applicants shall implement the avoidance and minimization measures if required by CDFW.

Method of Monitoring: Prior to construction, vegetation removal or earth-disturbing activities associated with any future development on the newly created parcels the applicant will provide to the Planning, Building and Environmental Services Department Planning Division the survey results.

MM BIO-3; Nesting Birds and Raptors: Applicants for future development on the newly created parcels shall implement the following measures to minimize impacts associated with the potential loss and disturbance nesting birds and raptors consistent with and pursuant to California Fish and Game Code Sections 3503 and 3503.5:

For construction, vegetation removal or earth-disturbing activities occurring between February 1 and August 31 (which coincides with the grading season of April 1 through October 15 – NCC Section 18.108.070.L, and bird breeding and nesting seasons), a qualified biologist (defined as knowledgeable and experienced in the biology and natural history of local avian resources with the potential to occur at the project site) shall conduct a survey for nesting birds within all suitable habitat in the project site, and where there is potential for impacts adjacent to the project areas (typically within 500 feet of project activities). The survey shall be conducted no earlier than seven days prior to when construction, vegetation removal or earth-disturbing activities are to commence. Should those activities commence later than seven days from the survey date, the survey shall be repeated. A copy of the survey shall be provided to the Napa County Planning Division and the CDFW prior to commencement of work.

After commencement of work if there is a period of no work activity of seven days or longer during the bird breeding season, surveys shall be repeated to ensure birds have not established nests during inactivity.

In the event that nesting birds are found, the owner/permittee shall identify appropriate avoidance methods and exclusion buffers in consultation with the County Conservation Division and the USFWS and/or CDFW prior to initiation of project activities. Exclusion buffers may vary in size, depending on habitat characteristics, project activities/disturbance levels, and species as determined by a qualified biologist in consultation with the Napa County Planning Division and the USFWS and/or CDFW.

Exclusion buffers shall be fenced with temporary construction fencing (or the like), the installation of which shall be verified by Napa County prior to the commencement of any construction, vegetation removal or earth-disturbing activities. Exclusion buffers shall remain in effect until the young have fledged or nest(s) are otherwise determined inactive by a qualified biologist.

Alternative methods aimed at flushing out nesting birds prior to surveys, whether physical (i.e., removing or disturbing nests by physically disturbing trees with construction equipment), audible (i.e., utilizing sirens or bird cannons), or chemical (i.e., spraying nesting birds or their habitats) would be considered an impact to nesting birds and is prohibited. Any act associated with flushing birds from project areas should undergo consultation with the USFWS/CDFW prior to any activity that could disturb nesting birds.

Method of Monitoring: If construction, vegetation removal or earth-disturbing activities are to occur between February 1 and August 31 the survey prepared by a qualified biologist shall be submitted to Planning Division staff and CDFW prior to beginning construction/earthmoving activity.

MM BIO-4; Bat Tree Habitat Assessment and Survey: Prior to commencement of any construction, vegetation removal or earth-disturbing activities associated with any future development on the newly created parcels that would remove trees, a qualified biologist shall conduct a habitat assessment for bats. A qualified biologist shall have: 1) at least two years of experience conducting bat surveys that resulted in detections for relevant species, such as pallid bat, with verified project names, dates, and references, and 2) experience with relevant equipment used to conduct bat surveys. The habitat assessment shall be conducted a minimum of 30 to 90 days prior to the beginning of Project activities.

For tree removal, the habitat assessment shall include a visual inspection of potential roosting features of trees to be removed (e.g., cavities, crevices in wood and bark, exfoliating bark for colonial species, suitable canopy for foliage roosting species). If suitable habitat trees are found,

they shall be flagged or otherwise clearly marked, CDFW shall be notified immediately, and tree trimming or removal shall not proceed without approval in writing from CDFW. If the presence of bats is presumed or documented, trees may be removed only: a) using the two-step removal process detailed below during seasonal periods of bat activity, from approximately March 1 through April 15 and September 1 through October 15, or b) after a qualified biologist, under prior written approval of the proposed survey methods by CDFW, conducts night emergence surveys or completes visual examination of roost features that establish absence of roosting bats. Two-step tree removal shall be conducted over two consecutive days, as follows: 1) the first day (in the afternoon), under the direct supervision and instruction by a qualified biologist with experience conducting two-step tree removal, limbs and branches shall be removed by a tree cutter using chainsaws only. Limbs with cavities, crevices or deep bark fissures shall be avoided, and 2) the second day the entire tree shall be removed.

Method of Monitoring: Prior to the issuance of permits for any construction, vegetation removal or earth-disturbing activities associated with future development projects on the newly created parcels the applicant will provide to the Napa County Planning Division the survey prepared by a qualified biologist.

MM BIO-5; Oak Woodland Habitat Evaluation: Prior to commencement of any construction, vegetation removal or earth-disturbing activities associated with future development projects on the newly created parcels a qualified biologist shall evaluate if Oak Woodland habitat will be impacted by the project. The evaluation must be approved in writing by CDFW prior to project activities. Any permanently impacted Oak Woodland shall be mitigated through restoration of this habitat type at a minimum 2:1 mitigation to impact ratio for acreage impacted. Restoration shall occur on-site to the extent feasible. If off-site restoration is necessary, it shall be as close to the Project site as possible and within the same watershed, unless otherwise approved in writing by CDFW. Restoration shall occur in the same year as the impacts. The restoration area shall be monitored for a minimum of five years until success criteria are met.

Method of Monitoring: Prior to the issuance of permits for any construction, vegetation removal or earth-disturbing activities associated with future development projects on the newly created parcels the applicant will provide to the Napa County Planning Division confirmation of CDFW's review of the Oak Woodland Habitat impact evaluation and if impacts were identified the associated restoration plan reviewed and approved by CDFW. Prior to permit final evidence of any restored acreage will be provided to the Napa County Planning Division.

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

Discussion:

- a. According to Napa County Environmental Resource Mapping (Historic Sites Layer – Historic Sites: Lines), two known historic resources are located near the subject property. The first resource is Stags’ Leap Winery, situated east of the subject property. Over the years, the winery has undergone evaluations by historians who have deemed it to hold significant historical value. Key historical elements of the winery include buildings, a stone bridge, a stone foundation, stone walls, roads, pathways, and ornamental landscaping features. The subject property shares the same access road as Stags’ Leap Winery, which directly connects to Silverado Trail to the west. Historic evaluations have determined that both the winery and the access road are historically significant and eligible for listing in the California Register of Historic Resources. The access road itself includes several historic features, such as stone walls, a stone bridge, the original alignment and grade scale from Silverado Trail, and ornamental landscaping elements. However, this project will not cause a substantial adverse change to the significance of these identified historic resources since no physical construction is proposed. Any future project will be required to conduct appropriate analysis and mitigation if there is potential to impact known historical resources.
- b. The project is a division of land with no proposed physical improvements. Any future development will need to comply with Napa County code requirements. Any future development will also be subject to approval by Napa County Public Works divisions, Engineering, and Napa County Fire. According to Napa County Environmental Resource Mapping (archaeology surveys, archeology sites, archeologically sensitive areas), no known archaeological resources are located on the project site. However, the Resource

Mapping layers do indicate archaeological sensitive areas that may have the potential to occur at the parcel immediately adjacent to the east. As a part of this application, the applicant team submitted an Archeological and Architectural Resource Report, prepared by ESA, dated February 2024. This reports concludes the following: This study identified no cultural resources in the Study Focus Area, and four cultural resources (all historic-era architectural resources) in the Project Area (outside the Study Focus Area) that were not formally recorded (residence, channelized creek, rock wall, retention pond an associated features), as the Project does not propose any activities that have the potential to impact said resources. As such, this study did not identify any historical resources or unique archaeological resources, as defined by CEQA, in the Study Focus Area. Therefore, ESA anticipates that the Project would have no impact on historical resources or unique archaeological resources, as defined by CEQA.

- c. No human remains have been encountered on the property and no information has been encountered that would indicate that this project would encounter human remains. Most construction activities would occur on previously disturbed portions of the site. However, if resources are found during construction activity, the project is required to cease, and a qualified archaeologist would be retained to investigate the site in accordance with the County’s standard condition of approval, Public Resource Code §5097.98, Health and Safety Code §7050.5 and CEQA §15064.5€. Impacts would be less than significant.

Mitigation Measures: No mitigation measures are required.

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

Discussion:

- a. The proposed project is a land division and does not include any physical development. Any potential future development on the resulting parcels would comply with Title 24 energy use requirements and would not result in significant environmental impacts due to wasteful, inefficient or unnecessary consumption of energy resources during project construction or operation. Impacts would be less than significant.
- b. The proposed project would not conflict with the provisions of a state or local plan for renewable energy or energy efficiency because there are no plans applicable to the subject site. No impacts would occur.

Mitigation Measures: No mitigation measures are required.

VII. GEOLOGY AND SOILS. Would the project:	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporation	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
a) Directly or indirectly cause potential substantial adverse effects, including the risk of loss, injury, or death involving: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> 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 	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>

substantial evidence of a known fault? Refer to Division of Mines and Geology Special Publication 42.

- | | | | | |
|---|--------------------------|--------------------------|-------------------------------------|--------------------------|
| ii) Strong seismic ground shaking? | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> |
| iii) Seismic-related ground failure, including liquefaction? | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> |
| iv) Landslides? | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> |
| b) Result in substantial soil erosion or the loss of topsoil? | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> |
| c) Be located on a geologic unit or soil that is unstable, or that would become unstable as a result of the project, and potentially result in on- or off-site landslide, lateral spreading, subsidence, liquefaction or collapse? | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> |
| d) Be located on expansive soil creating substantial direct or indirect risks to life or property? Expansive soil is defined as soil having an expansive index greater than 20, as determined in accordance with ASTM (American Society of Testing and Materials) D 4829. | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> |
| e) Have soils incapable of adequately supporting the use of septic tanks or alternative waste water disposal systems where sewers are not available for the disposal of waste water? | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> |
| f) Directly or indirectly destroy a unique paleontological resource or site or unique geologic feature? | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> |

Discussion:

- a.
- I. There are no known faults on the project site as shown on the most recent Alquist-Priolo Earthquake Fault Zoning Map. As such, any future development that would potentially result due to this project would result in a less than significant impact with regards to rupturing a known fault.
 - II. All areas of the Bay Area are subject to strong seismic ground shaking. Any future structure or improvement constructed as a result of this land division would be required to comply with the latest building standards and codes, including the California Building Code, that would reduce any potential impacts to a less than significant level.
 - III. No subsurface conditions have been identified on the project site that indicated susceptibility to seismic-related ground failure or liquefaction. Napa County Environmental Resource Mapping (liquefaction layer) indicates that the property is generally subject to a "low to very low" tendency to liquefy. Compliance with the latest edition of the California Building Code for seismic stability would result in less than significant impacts.
 - IV. A review of review of Napa County Environmental Resource Mapping (landslide line, landslide polygon, landslide geology, contours, and slopes layers) indicate the record of at least one (1) potential landslide to have occurred on the subject property. Any future project will require the preparation of additional site-specific analysis and implementation of report recommendations as well as the review by the County of Napa Engineering and the Building Divisions. These measures will reduce the risk that any potential future development will expose people or structures to potential substantial adverse effects, including the risk of loss, injury, or death involving landslides to less than significant.
- b. Based on Napa County Environmental Resource Mapping the project includes soil classified as Fagan clay loam (30 to 50 percent slopes). Clayey soils on steep slopes are susceptible to erosion when exposed to concentrated surface water flow. Construction of future development and grading will change existing surface drainage patterns. In order to prevent concentrated water flows and increase erosion from future development of the resulting parcels, any applicant of a building or grading plan will be required to submit an Erosion Control Plan per the current guidelines of the Napa Countywide Storm water Pollution Prevention Program (NCSPPP), which will be reviewed by the county Engineering Division. The design of an Erosion Control Plan in compliance with the NCSPPP will maintain all impacts resulting from erosion or loss of topsoil from to being less than significant.

- c-d Based on Napa County Environmental Resource Mapping the project includes soil classified as Fagan clay loam (30 to 50 percent slopes) and includes areas generally subject to very low tendencies to liquefy. Any future construction will be required to comply with all the latest building standards and codes at the time of construction. Compliance with the latest editions of the California Building Code for seismic stability would reduce any potential impacts to the maximum extent possible, resulting in less than significant impacts.
- e. The Napa County Environmental Health Division has reviewed this application and recommends approval as conditioned. When future development is proposed plans for water and septic systems will be reviewed for compliance with Napa County Code. Impacts are less than significant.
- f. No paleontological resources or unique geological features have been identified on the property. If resources are found during any earth disturbing activities associated with future development, construction is required to cease, and a qualified archaeologist will be retained to investigate the site in accordance with the Standard Condition of Approval 7.2 identified in Section V above.

Mitigation Measures: No mitigation measures are required.

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

Discussion:

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).² 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). 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

² <https://www.baaqmd.gov/plans-and-climate/california-environmental-quality-act-ceqa/updated-ceqa-guidelines>, April 2022

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 residential "construction" and development 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 Greenhouse Gas (GHG) emissions in Napa County were assessed in the Environmental Impact Report (EIR) prepared for the Napa County General Plan Update and certified in June 2008. GHG emissions were found to be significant and unavoidable in that document, despite the adoption of mitigation measures incorporating specific policies and action items into the General Plan. Consistent with these General Plan action items, Napa County participated in the development of a community-wide GHG emissions inventory and "emission reduction framework" for all local jurisdictions in the County in 2008-2009. This planning effort was completed by the Napa County Transportation and Planning Agency in December 2009, and served as the basis for development of a refined inventory and emission reduction plan for unincorporated Napa County.

In 2011, the Bay Area Air Quality Management District (BAAQMD) released California Environmental Quality Act (CEQA) Project Screening Criteria and Significance of Thresholds [1,100 metric tons per year (MT) of carbon dioxide and carbon dioxide equivalents (CO₂e)]. This threshold of significance is appropriate for evaluating projects in Napa County. During our ongoing planning effort, the County requires project applicants to consider methods to reduce GHG emissions consistent with Napa County General Plan Policy CON-65(e). (Note: Pursuant to State CEQA Guidelines Section 15183, because this initial study assesses a project that is consistent with an adopted General Plan for which an environmental impact report (EIR) was prepared, it appropriately focuses on impacts which are "peculiar to the project," rather than the cumulative impacts previously assessed.) For the purposes of this analysis potential GHG emissions associated with residential 'construction' and 'development' have been discussed.

GHGs are the atmospheric gases whose absorption of solar radiation is responsible for the greenhouse effect, including carbon dioxide, methane, ozone, and the fluorocarbons, that contribute to climate change (a widely accepted theory/science explain human effects on the atmosphere). Carbon Dioxide (CO₂) gas, the principal greenhouse gas (GHG) being emitted by human activities, and

whose concentration in the atmosphere is most affected by human activity, also serves as the reference gas to compare other greenhouse gases. Agricultural sources of carbon emissions include forest clearing, land-use changes, biomass burning, and farm equipment and management activity emissions (http://www.climatechange.ca.gov/glossary/letter_c.html). Equivalent Carbon Dioxide (CO₂e) is the most commonly reported type of GHG emission and a way to get one number that approximates total emissions from all the different gasses that contribute to GHG (BAAMD CEQA Air Quality Guidelines, May 2017). In this case, carbon dioxide (CO₂) is used as the reference atom/compound to obtain atmospheric carbon CO₂ effects of GHG. Carbon stocks are converted to carbon dioxide equivalents (CO₂e) by multiplying the carbon total by 44/12 (or 3.67), which is the ratio of the atomic mass of a carbon dioxide molecule to the atomic mass of a carbon atom (<http://www.nciasi2.org/COLE/index.html>)

There are no physical improvements associated with this project. One time “Construction Emissions” associated with a future project such as a single-family home may include: emissions associated with the energy used to develop and prepare the project area, construction, and construction equipment and worker vehicle trips (hereinafter referred to as Equipment Emissions). These emissions also include underground carbon stocks (or Soil carbon) associated with any existing vegetation that is proposed to be removed. As previously stated, this project is a division of land. Any future project would likely consist of the construction of a single-family home, accessory structures, and associated physical improvements.

As discussed in the Air Quality section of this Initial Study, in 2010, the BAAQMD adopted and later incorporated into its 2011 CEQA Guidelines project screening criteria (Table 3-1 – Criteria Air Pollutants and Precursors & GHG Screening Level Sizes) and thresholds of significance for air pollutants, including GHG emissions, which have now been updated by BAAQMD through May 2017. The future potential of one (1) new single-family residence, accessory (second) dwelling units, and one (1) guest cottage each that may foreseeably occur on the parcels resulting from the land division were compared to the BAAQMD’s GHG screening criteria of 56 dwelling units. The project was determined not to exceed the 1,100 MT of CO₂e/yr GHG threshold of significance.

The proposed project has been evaluated against the BAAQMD thresholds and determined that the project would not exceed the 1,100 MT/yr of CO₂e. As indicated above, the County is currently preparing a CAP and as the part of the first phase of development and preparation of the CAP has released Final Technical Memorandum #1 (2014 Greenhouse Gas Emissions Inventory and Forecast, April 13, 2016). Table 1 of the Technical Memorandum indicates that 2% of the County’s GHG emissions in 2014 were a result of land use change. The increase in emissions expected as a result of any future project would be relatively modest, and the project is in compliance with the County’s efforts to reduce emissions as described above.

Mitigation Measures: No mitigation measures are required.

IX.	HAZARDS AND HAZARDOUS MATERIALS. Would the project	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporation	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
	a) Create a significant hazard to the public or the environment through the routine transport, use, or disposal of hazardous materials?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
	b) Create a significant hazard to the public or the environment through reasonable foreseeable upset and accident conditions involving the release of hazardous materials into the environment?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
	c) Emit hazardous emissions or handle hazardous or acutely hazardous materials, substances, or waste within one-quarter mile of an existing or proposed school?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input 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?
- f) Impair implementation of or physically interfere with an adopted emergency response plan or emergency evacuation plan?
- g) Expose people or structures, either directly or indirectly, to a significant risk of loss, injury or death involving wild-land fires?

Discussion:

- a. Approval of the land division, in and of itself, will not involve routine transport, use, or disposal of hazardous materials. Future development of residential dwellings and their associated accessory structures could include limited quantities of miscellaneous hazardous substances, such as gasoline, diesel fuel, hydraulic fluid, solvents, oils, etc., used to maintain vehicles and motorized equipment during the construction-related activities. Standard conditions associated with grading and building operations would be issued with permits to decrease the hazard to a less than significant impact. Small quantities of publicly available hazardous materials, such as paint or maintenance supplies, may be routinely used within the project site for residential or agricultural maintenance and cleaning. These materials would not be used in sufficient strength or quantity to create a substantial risk to the public or environment.
- b. Hazardous materials such as diesel, maintenance fluids, and paints would be used onsite during construction. Should they be stored onsite, these materials would be stored in secure locations to reduce the potential for upset or accident conditions. The proposed project is a division of land with no physical improvements proposed. Any future construction would likely consist of road improvements to serve a new single-family home and accessory dwelling units which would not be expected to use any substantial quantities of hazardous materials. Therefore, it would not be reasonably foreseeable for the proposed project to create upset or accident conditions that involve the release of hazardous materials into the environment. Impacts would be less than significant.
- c. There are no schools located within one-quarter mile from the proposed project site. The closest schools are several miles away, located within City of Napa and City of St. Helena limits. No impacts would occur.
- d. Based on a search of the California Department of Toxic Substances Control database, the project site does not contain any known EPA National Priority List sites, State response sites, voluntary cleanup sites, or any school cleanup sites. No impact would occur as the project site is not on any known list of hazardous materials sites.
- e. Based upon the Napa County Planning General Maps (Angwin Airport and Napa Airport layers), the project site is not located within an airport land use plan or within two miles of a public airport. No impacts would occur.
- f. No impact would occur as the project site is not located within the vicinity of any private airports.
- g. The land division itself does not include any actions that would expose people or structures directly or indirectly to a significant risk of loss, injury, or death involving wildland fires. Future development will be required to comply with all current building and fire codes, reducing impacts to less than significant.

Mitigation Measures: No mitigation measures are required.

X.	HYDROLOGY AND WATER QUALITY. Would the project:	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporation	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
	a) Violate any water quality standards or waste discharge requirements or otherwise substantially degrade surface or groundwater quality?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
	b) Substantially decrease groundwater supplies or interfere substantially with groundwater recharge such that the project may impede sustainable groundwater management of the basin?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>

- c) Substantially alter the existing drainage pattern of the site or area, including through the alteration of the course of a stream or river or through the addition of impervious surfaces which would:
- i) result in substantial erosion or siltation on- or off-site?
 - ii) substantially increase the rate or amount of surface runoff in a manner which would result in flooding on- or off-site?
 - 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?
 - iv) impede or redirect flood flows?
- d) In flood hazard, tsunami, or seiche zones, risk release of pollutants due to project inundation?
- e) Conflict with or obstruct implementation of a water quality control plan or sustainable groundwater management plan?

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.

On June 7, 2022, the Napa County Board of Supervisors provided interim procedures to implement provisions of the Napa County Groundwater Sustainability Plan (GSP) for issuance of new, altered or replacement well permits and discretionary projects that would increase groundwater use. The direction limits a parcel's groundwater allocation to 0.3- acre feet per acre per year, or no net increase in groundwater use if that threshold is exceeded already for parcels located in the GSA Subbasin. For parcels not located in the GSA Subbasin (i.e., generally located in the hillsides), a parcel-specific Water Availability Analysis would suffice to assess potential impacts on groundwater supplies. There are no wells associated with this land division.

To assess potential impacts resulting from project well(s) interference with neighboring wells within 500 feet and/or springs within 1,500 feet, the County's WAA guidance³ requires applicants to perform a Tier 2 analysis where the proposed project would result in an increase in groundwater extraction from project well(s) compared to existing levels.

To assess the potential impacts of groundwater pumping on hydrologically connected navigable waterways and those non-navigable tributaries connected to navigable waters, the County's WAA guidance requires applicants to perform a Tier 3 or equivalent analysis for new or replacement wells, or discretionary projects that would rely on groundwater from existing or proposed wells that are located within 1,500 feet of designated "Significant Streams."⁴

Public Trust: The public trust doctrine requires the state and its legal subdivisions to "consider," give "due regard," and "take the public trust into account" when considering actions that may adversely affect a navigable waterway. (Environmental Law Foundation v. State Water Resources Control Bd.; San Francisco Baykeeper, Inc. v. State Lands Com.) There is no "procedural matrix" governing how an agency should consider public trust uses. (Citizens for East Shore Parks v. State Lands Com.) Rather, the level of analysis "begins and ends with whether the challenged activity harms a navigable waterway and thereby violates the public trust." (Environmental Law Foundation, 26 Cal.App.5th at p. 403.) As demonstrated in the Environmental Law Foundation vs State Water Resources Control Board Third District Appellate Court Case, that arose in the context of a lawsuit over Siskiyou County's obligation in administering groundwater well permits and management program with respect to Scott River, a navigable waterway (considered a public trust resource), the court affirmed that the public trust doctrine is relevant to

³ The County's Water Availability Guidelines (adopted May 2015)

⁴ Refer to Figure 1: Significant Streams for Tier 3, located at www.countyofnapa.org/3074/Groundwater-Sustainability. The "Significant_Streams" and "Significant_Streams_1500ft_buffer" GIS layers are published as publicly-available open data through the County's ArcGIS Online Account.

extractions of groundwater that adversely impact a navigable waterway and that Counties are obligated to consider the doctrine, irrespective of the enactment of the Sustainable Groundwater Management Act (SGMA).

On January 10, 2024, Napa County released the Interim Napa County Well Permit Standards and WAA Requirements - January 2024, providing guidance to complying with the Public Trust.

- a. The proposed project will not violate any water quality standards or waste discharge requirements. No new or enlarged wastewater treatment or disposal facilities are proposed. Future systems to serve potential development will be reviewed for compliance with the Napa County Code to ensure the systems do not create a significant impact on water quality standards or waste discharge requirements.
- b. The proposed project is a land division that includes no development. The parcel location falls within an area defined by the Napa County Water Availability Analysis Guidance Document as 'All Other Areas', which requires parcel specific analysis to determine the water availability of a parcel. Future development on the resulting parcels would likely be a single-family residence, associated accessory structures, access roads and infrastructure. Non-discretionary projects such as a single-family residence are not subject to CEQA, and their water usage is not considered a significant impact on groundwater supplies or recharge when on code-compliant parcels outside of the MST.
- c. The project would not substantially alter the drainage pattern on site or cause a significant increase in erosion or siltation on or off the project site. The application and associated plans have been reviewed and approved by the Engineering Division. The proposed project would implement standard stormwater quality treatment controls to treat runoff prior to discharge from the project site. The incorporation of these features into the project would ensure that the proposed project would not create substantial sources of polluted runoff. In addition, the proposed project does not have any unusual characteristics that create sources of pollution that would degrade water quality. Impacts would be less than significant.
- d. The proposed project is not located within the designated floodplain area. The parcel is not located in an area that is subject to inundation by tsunamis, seiches, or mudflows. No impacts would occur.
- e. The proposed project would not conflict with a water quality control plan or sustainable groundwater management plan. No impacts would occur.

Mitigation Measures: No mitigation measures are required.

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

Discussion:

- a. The project is located in rural Napa County and currently surrounded by agriculture, open space, and single-family residential homes on large parcels. The division of the subject property into two (2) parcels and any future subsequent development of single-family residential structures would not physically divide an established community.
- b. The subject parcel and the two (2) parcels which would result from the proposed land division are designated AR (Agricultural Resource) in the Napa County General Plan and contain Agricultural Watershed (AW) & Agricultural Preserve (AP) zoning districts. No new uses are proposed in this tentative parcel map and any future development on the resulting parcels would have to comply with restrictions of the General Plan and zoning code.

Mitigation Measures: No mitigation measures are required.

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

Discussion:

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

Mitigation Measures: No mitigation measures are required.

XIII.	NOISE. Would the project result in:	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporation	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
	a) Generation of a substantial temporary or permanent increase in ambient noise levels in the vicinity of the project in excess of standards established in the local general plan or noise ordinance, or applicable standards of other agencies?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input 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 checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>

Discussion:

a-b. The project involves the division of a parcel into two (2) resulting parcels and does not include any activity that would generate a substantial temporary or permanent increase in ambient noise levels or generate excessive ground-borne vibration or noise levels. The property includes both Agricultural Watershed and Agricultural Preserve zoning and will remain available to the land uses allowed within those zoning designations. The undeveloped parcel that will result from this land division has been designed with building envelopes, and it is foreseeable that up to one (1) new single-family residential dwelling unit, accessory structures, and any appurtenant improvements could develop subsequent to this project. Residential development on parcels in excess of 40-acres is not typically associated with sources of noise or vibration that would cause a significant impact on the environment.

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

Mitigation Measures: No mitigation measures are required.

XIV.	POPULATION AND HOUSING. Would the project:	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporation	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
	a) Induce substantial unplanned population growth in an area, either directly (for example, by proposing new homes and businesses) or indirectly (for example, through extension of roads or other infrastructure)?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
	b) Displace substantial numbers of existing people or housing, necessitating the construction of replacement housing elsewhere?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>

Discussion:

a. The proposed project includes the division of a parcel with an existing single-family residence into two (2) new parcels. The Association of Bay Area Governments' Plan Bay Area 2050 Growth Pattern figures indicate that the total households for Napa County are projected to increase some 10% by the year 2050, increasing from 50,000 to 56,000. Unincorporated Napa county, along with the cities of American Canyon, Napa, St. Helena, Calistoga and the town of Yountville all have existing compliant 6th Cycle Housing Elements certified by the State Department of Housing and Community Development. For the 6th Cycle, which runs from 2023 – 2031, Napa county jurisdictions have identified and have rezoned or are in the process of rezoning land to accommodate 3,844 dwelling units, more than half of the households projected by ABAG to develop in Napa county by 2050. In addition, the project would be subject to the County's housing impact mitigation fee, which provides funding to meet local housing needs. The addition of one (1) new parcel capable of supporting the types of residential land uses associated with AW or AP zoning districts would not significantly impact population growth in Napa County.

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

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

Mitigation Measures: No mitigation measures are required.

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

Discussion:

This project includes no development and will not, in and of itself, result in an increased demand for public services. Public services are currently provided to the project area and any additional demand resulting from future development would be minimal. The property is located within the service areas of both the Napa County Fire Department and the Napa County Sheriff's Office. Relevant agencies have reviewed the project and provided comments and conditions that will ensure that impacts related to public services are less than significant. While the proposed project does not include the construction of any residential units, it is foreseeable that low-density residential development could take place on the new parcel in the future. School impact fees levied as part of any residential building permit application, would assist in capacity building from any increase in student enrollment. Additionally, County revenue resulting from any building permit fees and property tax increases will help meet the costs of providing public services like increased fire and police presence, as well as park space.

Mitigation Measures: No mitigation measures are required.

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

Discussion:

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

Mitigation Measures: No mitigation measures are required.

XVII. TRANSPORTATION. Would the project:	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporation	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
a) Conflict with a program, plan, ordinance or policy addressing the circulation system, including transit, roadway, bicycle and pedestrian facilities?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
b) Would the project conflict or be inconsistent with CEQA Guidelines section 15064.3, subdivision (b)?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
c) Substantially increase hazards due to a geometric design feature, (e.g., sharp curves or dangerous intersections) or incompatible uses (e.g., farm equipment)?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
d) Result in inadequate emergency access?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
e) Conflict with General Plan Policy CIR-14, which requires new uses to meet their anticipated parking demand, but to avoid providing excess parking which could stimulate unnecessary vehicle trips or activity exceeding the site's capacity?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>

Discussion:

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 Department of Public Works has reviewed the project and approved it as conditioned. The project would not conflict or be inconsistent with CEQA Guidelines section 15064.3, subdivision (b). Impacts would be less than significant.

- a. The subject property is located west of Silverado Trail, in unincorporated Napa County. The property to be subdivided measures 126.8-acres in area and is located east of Yountville Crossroad and approximately 6 miles north of the City of Napa. Valleys surrounding the study area have been developed with approximately 22-acres of vineyards. Portions of the property have been developed with a residence and guest house, barns and associated agricultural infrastructure, and paved and graded roads. The proposed project is a land division and includes no actual development, but foreseeable future development could include a new single-family residence on the resulting parcel. Full dwelling unit build-out of the resulting parcel would include one (1) new single-family residence and accessory dwelling units. A future proposed single-family residence and accessory dwelling units, including the construction trips are anticipated to generate approximately 9.57 new daily trips each based upon the ITE Trip Generation Manual, 10th Edition. The daily trips to and from future proposed homesites are not anticipated to impact nearby circulation systems. There are no transit, bicycle or pedestrian facilities on or within the vicinity of the subject property.
- b. 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 County maintains a set of Transportation Impact Study Guidelines (TIS Guidelines) that 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. The TIS Guidelines state that if the net cumulative result of all project modifications after January 1, 2022, would generate less than 110 net new daily passenger vehicle and truck trips the project is presumed to have a less than significant impact for VMT. As noted above, any future proposed single-family residence and accessory dwelling units are anticipated to generate approximately 9.57 new daily trips each, well below the screening criteria.

The project is a division of land with no physical development. Thus, the project would not conflict or be inconsistent with CEQA Guidelines section 15064.3, subdivision (b).

- c-e. After implementation of the proposed land division, access to the site would remain unchanged from Silverado Trail. The project would result in no significant off-site circulation system operational impacts nor any sight line impacts at the project driveway. Any future proposed site access and parking measures will be reviewed and conditioned by the Napa County Fire Department and Engineering Services Division. The proposed project would not be in conflict with General Plan Policy CIR-14 as this project is a division of land with no proposed dwellings at this time. Any future development of a single-family home and associated accessory structures will be required to provide adequate parking, as conditioned.

Mitigation Measures: No mitigation measures are required.

XVIII. TRIBAL CULTURAL RESOURCES. Would the project cause a substantial adverse change in the significance of a tribal cultural resource, defined in Public Resources Code section 21074 as either a site, feature, place, cultural landscape that is geographically defined in terms of the size and scope of the landscape, sacred place, or object with cultural value to a California Native American tribe, and that is:	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporation	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
a) Listed or eligible for listing in the California Register of Historical Resources, or in a local register of historical resources as defined in Public Resources Code section 5020.1(k); or	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input 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"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>

Discussion:

a-b. On December 5, 2024, County Staff sent invitations to consult on the proposed project to Native American Tribes who had a cultural interest in the area and who as of that date had requested to be invited to consult on projects, in accordance with the requirements of Public Resources Code Section 21080.3.1. County staff received one (1) reply. The reply was received on December 9, 2024, from Lena Murphy of Middletown Rancheria Tribal Historic Preservation Department in which comment or consult on the project was declined.

Mitigation Measures: No mitigation measures are required.

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?
- e) Comply with federal, state, and local management and reduction statutes and regulations related to solid waste?

Discussion:

- a. The project is a land division and no relocation, construction, or expansion of water, wastewater, storm water, electrical, natural gas or telecommunication facilities is proposed. It is foreseeable that the parcel which results from the land division would be developed with single-family residential structure as well as associated accessory structures and infrastructure. Before any of the above facilities could be constructed on the parcels, oversight from the applicable regulatory agency in order to issue a permit would be required. Review of plans with applicable codes and regulations will ensure that the environmental impact from the addition of any of the above facilities to the resulting parcels will be less than significant.
- b. The proposed project is a land division that includes no development. The parcel location falls within an area defined by the Napa County Water Availability Analysis Guidance Document as 'All Other Areas', which requires parcel specific analysis to determine the water availability of a parcel. Future development on the resulting parcels would likely be a single-family residence, associated accessory structures, access roads and infrastructure. Non-discretionary projects such as a single-family residence are not subject to CEQA, and their water usage is not considered a significant impact on groundwater supplies or recharge when on code-compliant parcels outside of the MST. Any potential future discretionary projects will be required to conduct a Water Availability Analysis prior to project approval. .
- c. The subject property is not served by a wastewater treatment provider.
- d. The project is a land division and includes no development which would generate solid waste. Future development of single-family residential structures will be served by a landfill with sufficient capacity to meet the project's demands. No significant impact will occur from the disposal of solid waste generated by the project.
- e. Future development of the project will be required to comply with all federal, state, and local reduction statutes and regulations related to solid waste.

Mitigation Measures: No mitigation measures are required.

XX.	WILDFIRE. If located in or near state responsibility areas or lands classified as very high fire hazard severity zones, would the project:	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporation	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
	a) Substantially impair an adopted emergency response plan or emergency evacuation plan?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
	b) Due to slope, prevailing winds and other factors, exacerbate wildfire risks and thereby expose project occupants to pollutant concentrations from a wildfire or the uncontrolled spread of a wildfire?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
	c) Require the installation or maintenance of associated infrastructure (such as roads, fuel breaks, emergency water sources, power lines or other utilities) that may exacerbate fire risk or that may result in temporary or ongoing impacts to the environment?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
	d) Expose people or structures to significant risks, including downslope or downstream flooding or landslides, as a result of runoff, post-fire slope instability, or drainage changes?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>

Discussion:

- a-d. A majority of the subject site is located within a very high fire hazard severity zone and in the Napa County State Responsibility Area (SRA district). Since this project is a land division with no actual development, there are no project features that would substantially impair an adopted emergency response plan or emergency evacuation plan. Foreseeable future development would be single-family residential structures on parcels in excess of 85.8-acres, which would reduce the risk of pollutant concentrations or uncontrolled spread of wildfire on occupants to a less than significant impact. Napa County Fire has reviewed and approved this project.

Mitigation Measures: No mitigation measures are required.

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

Discussion:

- a. The proposed project is a land division and includes no actual development. Foreseeable future development would consist of single-family residential structures, associated accessory buildings, access roads and infrastructure. As discussed above the project would have a less than significant impact on wildlife resources. No sensitive resources or biologic areas will be converted or affected by this project. Also as analyzed above, the project would not result in a significant loss of native trees, native vegetation, or important examples of California’s history or pre-history.
- b. As described in the sections above, air quality, transportation/traffic impacts, and population and housing, the proposed project which is a land division with no physical developments proposed at this time. Any future development activities would be related to the construction of a single-family dwelling and associated physical improvements with no cumulatively considerable impacts.
- c. There are no schools or hospitals housing sensitive receptors within a quarter-mile of the subject parcel. Noise from construction that would occur with construction and installation of potential future single-family residential structures would be temporary, limited to daytime hours, and would be subject to best management practices intended to limit fugitive dust and protect storm water quality. The operation of single-family residences would have a less than significant noise impact on nearby residences due to distance between those residences and the building envelopes.

Mitigation Measures: No mitigation measures are required.

