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

**Initial Study Checklist**
**(form updated January 2019)**

1. **Project Title**: 80 Clear Creek Road, Viewshed Protection Program Application P22-00182-VIEW

2. **Property Owner:** Ponderosa One, LLC. 80 Clear Creek Road., Oakville, CA 94562

3. **County Contact Person, Phone Number and email:** Trevor Hawkes, Supervising Planner. Planning, Building and Environmental Services Department, 1195 Third Street, Second Floor. Napa, CA 94559. Phone: 707-253-4388 or email: trevor.hawkes@countyofnapa.org

4. **Project Location and Assessor's Parcel Number (APN):** 80 Clear Creek Road., Oakville, CA 94562. The project site is located on an approximately 123-acre parcel approximately .65 miles north of the intersection of Dry Creek Road and Clear Creek Road. APN 027-310-032 & APN 027-310-043.

5. **Project sponsor's name and address:** Briana Albini, Summit Engineering, Inc., 463 Aviation Boulevard, Suite 200., Santa Rosa, CA 95403. Phone (707) 527-0775 ex. 110 or email: briana@summit-sr.com

6. **General Plan description:** Agriculture, Watershed and Open Space (AWOS)

7. **Zoning:** Agricultural Watershed (AW)

8. **Background/Project History:** The existing 11,759 sq. ft. single-family residence was finaled on October 23, 2013, under Building Permit B11-00256 while the existing Guest House was developed under B11-00257.

9. **Description of Project:** Request for approval of a Viewshed Protection Program application on APN 027-310-032 for earthmoving activities, new construction and expansion of existing structures on slopes exceeding 15% and located on a Minor Ridgeline. The project consists of the construction of a 3,830 sq. ft. underground storage structure, a 6,240 sq. ft. tennis pavilion with interior Accessory Dwelling Unit (ADU) adjacent to an existing tennis court and the expansion of an existing single-family residential structure consisting of 2,700 sq. ft. of underground spa and 4,350 sq. ft. of underground wine and art storage. The project also includes the development of a ground mounted solar panel array. The project footprint will require the removal of 15 native Oak trees and approximately .13 acres of tree canopy. Spoils from excavation to establish building foundations will be located at a disturbed area on APN 027-310-043. The applicant is requesting exception from the Napa County Road and Street Standards for five (5) driveway segments with longitudinal slopes between 18 – 20 percent along the centerline which exceed 300 feet in length and do not provide transition area of 10 percent or less for the 100 feet immediately preceding. The exception request is supported by the Napa County Engineering Division and Fire Marshal's office. No road work is required for the existing roadway to meet same overall practical effect if the exception is approved.

10. **Describe the environmental setting and surrounding land uses.**
The project is located on a minor ridgeline at approximately 1300 feet elevation, in Napa County west of Oakville adjacent to an existing residence. There is an existing paved driveway to the project site which runs through APN 027-310-043. Vegetation on the west side of the residence burned in 2017. Understory vegetation has been cleared around the structures. Vegetation associated with the project consists of landscaped nursery stock and small oaks and re-sprouting California Bay. The project site drains by direct infiltration or sheet flow into ephemeral drainages downslope to tributaries of Dry Creek.

The property is within the inner North Coast Range Mountains, a geographic subdivision of the larger California Floristic Province. The property and surrounding region are strongly influenced by storms and fog from the Pacific Ocean. The region is in climate Zone 14 "Ocean influenced Northern and Central California" characterized as an inland area with ocean or cold air influence. The climate of the region is characterized by hot, dry summers and cool, wet winters, with precipitation that varies regionally from less than 30 to more than 60 inches per year. This climate regime is referred to as a "Mediterranean Climate." The average annual temperature ranges from 45 to 90 degrees Fahrenheit. The variations of abiotic conditions including geology results in a high level of biological diversity per

unit area in the region.

Pyrophytic Species defined as fire-prone vegetation that are highly flammable are present within the proposed clearing limits and surrounding environment. These species include; Manzanita, Coyote Brush, Chamise, Scrub Oak, Douglas Fir, and California Bay.

11. **Other agencies whose approval is required** (e.g., permits, financing approval, or participation agreement).
The project would also require various ministerial approvals by the County, including but not limited to building permits, grading permits, waste disposal permits, in addition to meeting CalFire standards.

**Responsible (R) and Trustee (T) Agencies**
CDFW

**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 July 31, 2025, County Staff sent invitations to consult on the proposed project to Native American tribes who had a cultural interest in the area and who as of that date had requested to be invited to consult on projects, in accordance with the requirements of Public Resources Code section 21080.3.1. No responses were received within 30-days of the tribe's receipt of the invitations.

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

**ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACTS AND BASIS OF CONCLUSIONS:**

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

On the basis of this initial evaluation:

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

Trevor Hawkes — September 18, 2025

Signature — Date

Name: Trevor Hawkes

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? | ☐ | ☐ | ☒ | ☐ |
| b) | Substantially damage scenic resources, including, but not limited to, trees, rock outcroppings, and historic buildings within a state scenic highway? | ☐ | ☐ | ☐ | ☒ |
| 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? | ☐ | ☐ | ☒ | ☐ |
| d) | Create a new source of substantial light or glare which would adversely affect day or nighttime views in the area? | ☐ | ☐ | ☒ | ☐ |

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 project is the expansion of an existing single-family residence, the construction of an accessory underground storage structure, the construction of an accessory structure with interior ADU which are subject to the County's Viewshed Protection Program because earthmoving activity and new construction is proposed along a minor ridgeline of the county and on slopes exceeding 15%. The project also proposes to construct a solar array on slopes in excess of 15%, but due to the Solar Right Act, the solar array is exempt from the County's Viewshed Protection Program. The project location is not within an area considered a scenic vista, nor does it preclude views of a scenic vista. The project's land uses are considered rural residential, which along with agriculture and wineries, is one of the predominate land uses in the surrounding area. The project will be required to demonstrate compliance with the Viewshed Protection Program in order to gain approval, which will include screening 51 percent of new construction from public roads with landscaping, painting all new structures earth tone colors and using non reflective materials, amongst other things, in order to reduce the impact of man-made structures and grading on views of existing landforms, unique geologic features, existing landscape features and open space. The project would not be expected to substantially degrade the existing visual character or quality or public views of the site.

b. The project does not substantially damage any scenic resources within a state scenic highway, such as trees, rock outcroppings or historic buildings, because the project is not viewable from a designated state scenic highway.

d. The proposed project may result in the use of additional lighting that may have the potential to impact nighttime views. Pursuant to standard conditions of approval for Viewshed Protection Program applications the project will be required to design all outdoor lighting to be shielded and directed downwards. As designed and operating subject to the County's standard condition of approval, below, the project would not have a significant impact resulting from new sources of outside lighting.

*4.8 GENERAL PROPERTY MAINTENANCE – LIGHTING, LANDSCAPING, PAINTING, OUTDOOR EQUIPMENT STORAGE, AND TRASH ENCLOSURE AREAS*

*a. All lighting shall be permanently maintained in accordance with the lighting and building plans approved by the County. Lighting utilized during harvest activities is exempt from this requirement.*

*6.3 LIGHTING – PLAN SUBMITTAL*

*a. Two (2) copies of a detailed lighting plan showing the location and specifications for all lighting fixtures to be installed on the property shall be submitted for Planning Division review and approval. All lighting shall comply with the CBC.*

b. *All exterior lighting, including landscape lighting, shall be shielded and directed downward, shall be located as low to the ground as possible, shall be the minimum necessary for security, safety, or operations; on timers; and shall incorporate the use of motion detection sensors to the greatest extent practical. All lighting shall be shielded or placed such that it does not shine directly on adjacent properties or impact vehicles on adjacent streets. No flood-lighting or sodium lighting of the building is permitted, including architectural highlighting and spotting. Low-level lighting shall be utilized in parking areas as opposed to elevated high-intensity light standards.*

Mitigation Measures: None 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? | ☐ | ☐ | ☐ | ☒ |
| b) | Conflict with existing zoning for agricultural use, or a Williamson Act contract? | ☐ | ☐ | ☒ | ☐ |
| 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)? | ☐ | ☐ | ☐ | ☒ |
| 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? | ☐ | ☐ | ☐ | ☒ |
| 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? | ☐ | ☐ | ☒ | ☐ |

Discussion:

a. The project will not convert Prime Farmland, Unique Farmland, or Farmland of Statewide Important (Farmland) as designated by the Farmland Mapping and Monitoring Program of the California State Department of Conservation to non-agricultural use because the entirety of the project parcel is designated as Other Land.

b. The project parcel has a Agriculture, Watershed and Open Space (AWOS) General Plan designation and is within the Agricultural Watershed (AW) zoning district designation. Single-family residences, their accessory uses and ADUs are recognized as compatible land uses within the AW zoning district and supported by General Plan policy AG/LU-20 which identifies single-family dwellings as a general use for those areas within the designation (the requirement to allow ADUs in any zoning district which allows single-family residential structures is required by state law). There is no active Williamson Act contract for the parcel, and the proposed land uses

[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.

would not conflict with the potential for future Williamson Act contracts.

c/d. The proposed project does not contain any 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) nor will the project result in the loss of forest land or conversion to non-forest use in a manner that will significantly affect timber, aesthetics, fish and wildlife, biodiversity, water quality, recreation, or other public benefits because this land type does not exist on the parcel.

e. All development areas, including spoils stockpiles, are outside of areas identified as farmland and there have been no identified aspects of the project which could result in the conversion of farmland to non-agricultural use.

Mitigation Measures: None 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? | ☐ | ☐ | ☒ | ☐ |
| | 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? | ☐ | ☐ | ☒ | ☐ |
| | c) Expose sensitive receptors to substantial pollutant concentrations? | ☐ | ☐ | ☒ | ☐ |
| | d) Result in other emissions (such as those leading to odors adversely affecting a substantial number of people)? | ☐ | ☐ | ☒ | ☐ |

Discussion:

On June 2, 2010, the Bay Area Air Quality Management District's (now known as Bay Area Air District) 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 Bay Area Air District believed air pollution emissions would cause significant environmental impacts under CEQA and were posted on Bay Area Air District's website and included in Bay Area Air District 's updated CEQA Guidelines (updated May 2012). The Thresholds are advisory and may be followed by local agencies at their own discretion.

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

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

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

On April 20, 2022, the Bay Area Air District adopted updated thresholds of significance for climate impacts: CEQA Thresholds for Evaluating the

Significance of Climate Impacts, Bay Area Air District April 2022. The proposed thresholds to evaluate GHG and climate impacts from land use projects are qualitative, therefore there is no bright-line (quantitative) level to mitigate below. Projects that decline to integrate qualitative design elements can alternatively demonstrate consistency with a local Greenhouse Gas (GHG) Reduction Strategy that meets the criteria of the State CEQA Guidelines section 15183.5(b).

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.

In short, these thresholds of significance changes can be used by agencies as guidelines for determining climate impacts from projects subject to CEQA. However, agencies are not required to abide by these thresholds, as they are only guidelines. Refer to Section VIII, Greenhouse Gas Emissions.

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 consistently with guidance provided by Bay Area Air District. 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.

Bay Area Air District 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. Bay Area Air District 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 Bay Area Air District 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 Bay Area Air District 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 Bay Area Air District through May 2017. BAAMQD screens residential projects based upon the amount of dwelling units (DU) proposed. Considering the project is the expansion of a single-family residence, the construction of an underground storage structure, the construction of an accessory building with interior ADU and a solar array the project is well below the screening criteria for operational pollutant screening (oxides of nitrogen, 325 DU) or construction-related screening size (reactive organic gases, 114 DU) for the land use category of "Single-Family". Thus the project would contribute an insignificant amount of air pollution and would not result in a conflict or obstruction of an air quality plan. The project falls well below the screening criteria as noted above, and consequently will not significantly affect air quality individually or contribute considerably to any cumulative air quality impacts.

c/d. In the short term, potential air quality impacts are most likely to result from earthmoving and construction activities required for project construction. Earthmoving and construction emissions would have a temporary effect; consisting mainly of dust generated during grading

and other construction activities, exhaust emissions from construction related equipment and vehicles, and relatively minor emissions from paints and other architectural coatings. The Air District recommends incorporating feasible control measures as a means of addressing construction impacts. If the proposed project adheres to these relevant best management practices identified by the Air District and the County's standard conditions of project approval, construction-related impacts are considered less than significant:

*7.1 SITE IMPROVEMENTS*

*c. AIR QUALITY*

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

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

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

*7.1 SITE IMPROVEMENTS*

*b. DUST CONTROL*

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

While the Air District defines public exposure to offensive odors as a potentially significant impact, residences are not known operational producers of pollutants capable of causing substantial negative impacts to sensitive receptors.

Mitigation Measures: None 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? | ☐ | ☒ | ☐ | ☐ |

| | | | | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| 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? | ☐ | ☐ | ☒ | ☐ |
| 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? | ☐ | ☐ | ☒ | ☐ |
| 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? | ☐ | ☐ | ☒ | ☐ |
| e) | Conflict with any local policies or ordinances protecting biological resources, such as a tree preservation policy or ordinance? | ☐ | ☐ | ☒ | ☐ |
| 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? | ☐ | ☐ | ☐ | ☒ |

The applicant has submitted a Biological Resource Reconnaissance Survey with their application, prepared by Kjeldsen Biological Consulting, dated May 2024. Fieldwork conducted to inform the survey was conducted on March 21, 2024, April 1, 2024, and May 19, 2024.

a. Reconnaissance surveys were conducted by Kjeldsen Biological Consulting by walking the proposed project area, with the intent of locating suitable habitat for organism or indications that such habitat exists within the project's clearing limits. The project is the expansion of a single-family residence, the construction of an underground storage structure, the construction of an accessory structure with interior ADU and the construction of a solar array. In order to develop the project 15 native Oak trees and approximately 0.13 acres of tree canopy are identified for removal.

The Biological Resource Reconnaissance Survey did not find any special-status plant or animal species known for the Quadrangle, surrounding Quadrangles or for the region that would be impacted by the proposed project. The CDFW CNDDB does not record any special-status plants for the property. California Department of Fish and Wildlife CNDDB lists the Sonoma ceanothus, Rincon Ridge Manzanita and Jepson's leptosiphon in close proximity of the property.

Sonoma ceanothus (Ceanothus sonomensis) is a shrub that is native to California, and endemic (limited) to California. California Rare Plant Rank: 1B.2 (rare, threatened, or endangered in CA and elsewhere). Sonoma ceanothus is a rare species of shrub in the buckthorn family Rhamnaceae. It is endemic to northern California. It is known only from the Hood Mountain Range. Most of its 10 or so occurrences are located in Sonoma County, and one remains in Napa County. It is a member of the chaparral plant community in the California montane chaparral and woodlands sub-ecoregion. This species was not observed within the project clearing limits.

Rincon Ridge Manzanita (Arctostaphylos stanfordiana ssp. decumbens) is a shrub that is native to California, and endemic (limited) to California. California Rare Plant Rank: 1B.1 (rare, threatened, or endangered in CA and elsewhere). Rincon Manzanita is a rare native shrub that grows in Central California, primarily in the North Coast and North Coast Range regions. It tends to grow in slopes and ridges and, at elevations from 300-4300 feet. This species was not observed within the project clearing limits.

Jepson's leptosiphon (Leptosiphon jepsonii) This plant is listed by the CNPS Rare Plant Inventory as a 1B.2 (rare, threatened, or endangered in CA and elsewhere). This species is unlikely within or adjacent to the project site. This plant is sensitive to disturbance and non-native plant competition. This species was not observed within the project clearing limits.

The majority of trees within the proposed project site are small and unlikely to contain potential roosting habitat for bats. Foliage and bark with small cavities in any tree could provide suitable temporary habitat for solitary tree-roosting bat species. Trees within the proposed project site are small and do not contain cavities which would support bat roosting habitat.

No raptors or nesting birds were identified during the survey nor were there any indications of nesting raptors or birds through the identification of any nests, whitewash or nest droppings, or perching on the property or in the near vicinity of the project sites. While there were no observations of raptors and nesting birds during the survey, because the project proposes the removal of 15 standing native Oak trees where nests could be established between the time the survey was completed and vegetation clearing Mitigation Measure **BIO-1** is proposed which, if implemented, would reduce potential impacts to less than significant.

b. The vegetation of California has been considered to be a mosaic with major changes present from one area to another often with distinct vegetation changes within short distances. It is generally convenient to refer to the vegetation associates on a site as a plant community

or alliance. Typically plant communities or vegetation alliances are identified or characterized by the dominant vegetation form or plant species present. There have been numerous community classification schemes proposed by different authors using different systems for the classification of vegetation. A basic premise for the designation of plant communities, associations or alliances is that in nature there are distinct plant populations occupying a site that are stable at any one time (climax community is a biotic association, that in the absence of disturbance maintains a stable assemblage over long periods of time).

The Napa County Baseline Data Report defines Biotic Communities as the characteristic assemblages of plants and animals that are found in a given range of soil, climate, and topographic conditions across a region. The following Napa County vegetation types are mapped on the project site Chamise, Northern Mixed Chaparral, and Mixed Hardwoods.The following habitat types are currently surrounding or adjacent to the fringes of the proposed project footprint, as categorized by *A Manual of California Vegetation Second Edition* (Sawyer et al 2009): Annual Grasslands, Shrubland/Chaparral Alliance, Chamise chaparral Shrubland Alliance, Woodland Alliance, Coast Live Oak Forest and Woodland Alliance, Douglas fir Forest and Woodland Alliance and California Bay Forest and Woodland Alliance.

The Biological Resouce Reconnaissance Survey did no identify any Sensitive Biotic Communities and/or Biotic Communities of Limited Distribution as defined on the Napa County Baseline Data Report or listed by CDFW on the property. Grasslands on the property do not include native grasses.

c. According to the Biological Resource Reconnaissance Survey there are no vernal pools, marshes, wetlands ephemeral drainages, Napa County defined drainages or Water of the State on the property

d. Wildlife corridors are natural areas interspersed with developed areas that are important for animal movement, increasing genetic variation in plant and animal populations, reduction of population fluctuations, and retention of predators of agricultural pests and for movement of wildlife and plant populations. Wildlife corridors have been demonstrated to not only increase the range of vertebrates including avifauna between patches of habitat but also facilitate two key plant-animal interactions: pollination and seed dispersal. Corridors also preserve watershed connectivity. Corridor users can be grouped into two types: passage species and corridor dwellers. The data from various studies indicate that corridors should be at least 100 feet wide to provide adequate movement for passage species and corridor dwellers in the landscape. There are no identifiable wildlife corridors on the project site, or unique wildlife habitat that will be impacted by the project. The project site is located with an area of Critical Linkages by the California Bay Area Linkage Network. The primary objective of this effort is to identify lands essential to maintain or restore functional connectivity among wildlands for all species or ecological processes of interest in the California bay area. The project is adjacent to an existing development and will not significantly impact this linkage corridor.

e. The recommendations section of the Biological Reconnaissance Survey correctly identifies that since the project is proposing ground disturbance in areas that were previously undisturbed that the project must comply with Napa County General Plan Policy CON-24(c) which seeks to maintain and improve oak woodland habitat by providing replacement of lost oak woodland or preservation of like habitat at a 2:1 ratio when retention of existing vegetation is found to be infeasible. Despite this overlays of the project's disturbance areas with identified adjacent habitats (Plate IV, Aerial Photo/Vegetation Map (2021), Biological Resource Reconnaissance Survey for 80 Clear Creek Road) does not indicate that the project is disturbing habitat that would qualify as oak woodland, so the project as proposed would appear to comply with CON-24(c).

The project parcel is within an Agricultural Watershed (AW) zoning district and is thus subject to the requirements of Napa County's Water Quality and Tree Preservation Ordinance (WQTPO; Ordinance #1438). Under Ordinance 1438, for earthmoving activities within the AW zoning district, a minimum of 70 percent of vegetation canopy cover as configured on a particular date shall be maintained. Removal of any vegetation canopy cover shall also be mitigated by permanent replacement or preservation of comparable vegetation canopy cover, on an acreage basis at a minimum 3:1 ratio. The Biological Reconnaissance Survey approximates that the removal of the 15 native Oak trees is likely equivalent to the removal of 0.13 acres of vegetation canopy cover. On sheet LA2 of the applicant's Plan Set they propose tree screening that would cover approximately 0.42 acres of the parcel which satisfies the minimum 3:1 replacement ratio. Tree species are proposed as a mixture of coast live oak, interior live oak and California sycamore. The applicant does not intend to include these trees on the project's irrigation schedule and will supply them with trucked in water until they reach establishment. For this reason the proposal would quality as the replacement of comparable vegetation canopy cover. Since this vegetation is required to screen the project from identified public viewshed roads it will be deed restricted to be maintained in perpetuity and reestablished should initial establishment of the vegetation fail or be removed for any reason.

f. The proposed project would not conflict with the provisions of an adopted Habitat Conservation Plan, Natural Community Conservation Plan or other approved local, regional or state habitat conservation plan because there are no plans applicable to the subject site.

Mitigation Measures:

**MM BIO-1; Nesting Birds and Raptors:** The owner/permittee 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 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 preconstruction surveys 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 preconstruction survey shall be conducted no earlier than seven days prior to when vegetation removal and ground disturbing activities are to commence. Should ground disturbance commence later than seven days from the survey date, surveys 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 County Conservation 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 earthmoving and/or development 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 preconstruction 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/earthmoving activity is 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.

---

| 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? | ☐ | ☐ | ☐ | ☒ |
| b) | Cause a substantial adverse change in the significance of an archaeological resource pursuant to CEQA Guidelines §15064.5? | ☐ | ☐ | ☒ | ☐ |
| c) | Disturb any human remains, including those interred outside of dedicated cemeteries? | ☐ | ☐ | ☒ | ☐ |

Discussion:

a. There are no identified historical resources within the vicinity of the project site. The expansion to the existing single-family residence would not impact historic resources since the structure does not qualify for consideration as a historic resource since its age is less than 50 years. The tennis pavilion/ADU and underground storage structure would be new construction which also does not qualify as a historic resource.

b. On July 31, 2025, County Staff sent invitations to consult on the proposed project to Native American tribes who had a cultural interest in the area and who as of that date had requested to be invited to consult on projects, in accordance with the requirements of Public Resources Code section 21080.3.1. No responses were received within 30-days of the tribe's receipt of the invitations.

Given the location of the project, the overall small area of disturbance, and its adjacency to existing disturbed areas, construction of the project is unlikely to disturb archaeological resourced. In the event that any archaeological materials are encountered during earth-

disturbing activities when an archaeologist is not present the project would be expected to comply with standard Condition of Approval 7.2, listed below, and construction of the project would be required to cease, and a qualified archaeologist would be retained to investigate the site. Compliance project's conditions of approval are expected to keep potential impacts to cultural resources from being potentially significant.

*7.2 ARCHEOLOGICAL FINDING*

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

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

c. No human remains have been encountered on the property and no information has been encountered that would indicate that this project would encounter human remains. If human remains are encountered during project development, construction of the project is required to cease, and the requirements of Condition of Approval 7.2, listed above, would apply.

Mitigation Measures: None 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? | ☐ | ☐ | ☒ | ☐ |
| b) | Conflict with or obstruct a state or local plan for renewable energy or energy efficiency? | ☐ | ☐ | ☒ | ☐ |

Discussion:

a. The proposed project would comply with Title 24 energy use requirements and would not result in significant environmental impacts due to wasteful, inefficient or unnecessary consumption of energy resources during project construction or operation. Impacts would be less than significant.

b. The proposed project would not conflict with the provisions of a state or local plan for renewable energy or energy efficiency because there are no plans applicable to the subject site. No impacts would occur.

Mitigation Measures: None 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: | | | | |
| | i) Rupture of a known earthquake fault, as delineated on the most recent Alquist-Priolo Earthquake Fault Zoning Map issued by the State Geologist for the area or based on other substantial evidence of a known fault? Refer to Division of Mines and Geology Special Publication 42. | ☐ | ☐ | ☒ | ☐ |
| | ii) Strong seismic ground shaking? | ☐ | ☐ | ☒ | ☐ |
| | iii) Seismic-related ground failure, including liquefaction? | ☐ | ☐ | ☒ | ☐ |
| | iv) Landslides? | ☐ | ☐ | ☒ | ☐ |
| b) | Result in substantial soil erosion or the loss of topsoil? | ☐ | ☐ | ☒ | ☐ |
| 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? | ☐ | ☐ | ☒ | ☐ |
| 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. | ☐ | ☐ | ☒ | ☐ |
| 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? | ☐ | ☐ | ☒ | ☐ |
| f) | Directly or indirectly destroy a unique paleontological resource or site or unique geologic feature? | ☐ | ☐ | ☒ | ☐ |

Discussion:

a. i) There are no known faults on the project site as shown on the most recent Alquist-Priolo Earthquake Fault Zoning Map. As such, the proposed project would result in a less than significant impact with regards to rupturing a known fault.

ii) All areas of the Bay Area are subject to strong seismic ground shaking. Construction of the project will be required to comply with all the latest building standards and codes, including the California Building Code that would reduce any potential impacts to a less than significant level.

iii) No subsurface conditions have been identified on the project site that indicated a susceptibility to seismic-related ground failure or liquefaction. The areas of disturbance on the project site is identified as having a very low liquefaction potential according to the Napa County Environmental Resource Maps (liquefaction layers), compliance with the latest edition of the California Building Code for seismic stability would result in less than significant impacts.

iv) Napa County Environmental Resource Maps Landslides line layer identifies a small landslide deposit approximately 450 feet to the southeast of the existing single-family residence and approximately 200 feet from the existing driveway, and on the other side of the ridgeline topographically from the areas of disturbance for the proposed project. A Supplemental Stability Evaluation by PJC & Associates (PJC, March 2023) was conducted to assess the landslide feature (the supplement references road widening, a feature of the project prior to project revisions). According to the U.S. Geological Survey Open File Map, 76-74 (Sheet 16), of the Rutherford Quadrangle, dated 1976, the feature is mapped as a questionable landslide. Mapping performed at this scale is generally completed

by review of aerial photographs, with no verification through subsequent fieldwork or subsurface exploration. The outline of the purported landslide is not indicated on the map, as it is characterized as being too small for the map scale to be outlined. Based on our visual observations and the preliminary grading plans, the slope in questions is located on very steeply sloping topography with maximum estimated natural gradients on the order of one horizontal to one vertical (1H:1V). On March 6, 2023, PJC's engineering geologist visited the site to review the site geologic conditions, with particular interest to slope stability within the questionably mapped landslide areas indicated on the Open File Map. No additional subsurface exploration was performed.

The engineering geologist did not observe any geomorphic features indicative of recent earth movement, such as landslide scraps, debris flows, or earth slumps near the proposed driveway widening, or within the questionably mapped landslide area indicated on the Open File Map. Furthermore, during their site reconnaissance, they noted that the steeply sloping hill side was heavily vegetated. However, due to the very steeply sloping topography, the surface soils on the hillside could be subject to soil creep.

PJC also reviewed more current geologic mapping of the site. According to the Geologic Map of the Rutherford Quadrangle, dated 2005, and the California Department of Conservation Landslide Inventory website, the property is not located within a mapped landslide or area of marginal slope stability. Additionally, historical aerial photography and LiDAR imagery of the site were reviewed, and does not indicate previous slope movement in the questionably mapped landslide area of the 1976 Open File Map. The road widening which triggered the supplemental stability evaluation is no longer being proposed and project features are more than 450 feet away and primarily on the other side of the ridgeline. Impacts would be less than significant.

b. The proposed improvements would occur on slopes of zero to 29.9 percent. Because average slope within areas of disturbance is less than 30 percent, the project does not trigger the Napa County Conservation Regulations regarding slope disturbance. The project would require incorporation of best management practices and would be subject to the Napa County Stormwater Ordinance which addresses sediment and erosion control measures and dust control, as applicable.

c/d. According to preliminary geologic mapping, the geologic unit underlying the project is Great Valley Complex (Cretaceous – Jurassic) and the soil type is Lodo-Maymen-Felton association, 30 to 75 percent slopes. There are no active faults or potentially active faults through the project site. As mentioned in Section VII(a)(iv) Napa County Environmental Resource Maps has identified a 'questionable' landslide feature 450 feet from the existing single-family residence, but given the location of the feature in relation to the project and the technical requirements of the County Building Permit process, the feature should not be of concern to the project. There are no other slope instability or unstable landforms mapped beneath or near the vicinity of the project. Based on the Napa County Environmental Sensitivity Maps (liquefaction layer) the project site has a very low susceptibility for liquefaction in the location where development will occur. Development will be required to comply with all the latest building standards and codes, including the California Building Code that would reduce any potential impacts to the maximum extent possible.

e. The existing single-family residence has locations for septic tanks, leach fields and reserve area. The applicant has shown locations for septic tanks, leach fields and reserve areas for the ADU adjacent to areas for the single-family residence's wastewater infrastructure and these plans have been reviewed by the Napa County Environmental Health Division who has recommended approval with conditions.

f. In the event that any unique paleontological resources or unique geologic features are encountered during earth-disturbing activities when an archaeologist is not present the project would be expected to comply with standard Condition of Approval 7.2, listed below, and construction of the project would be required to cease, and a qualified archaeologist would be retained to investigate the site. Compliance with the project's conditions of approval are expected to keep potential impacts to cultural resources from being potentially significant.

*7.2 ARCHEOLOGICAL FINDING*

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

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

Mitigation Measures: None 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? | ☐ | ☐ | ☒ | ☐ |
| 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? | ☐ | ☐ | ☒ | ☐ |

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 applicable State requirements, and iv) result in a functional and legally defensible CAP. On April 13, 2016, the County, as the part of the first phase of development and preparation of the CAP, released Final Technical Memorandum #1: 2014 Greenhouse Gas Emissions Inventory and Forecast, April 13, 2016. This initial phase included: i) updating the unincorporated County's community-wide GHG emissions inventory to 2014, and ii) preparing new GHG emissions forecasts for the 2020, 2030, and 2050 horizons. On July 24, 2018, the County prepared a Notice of Preparation of a Draft Focused EIR for the Climate Action Plan. The review period was from July 24, 2018, through August 22, 2018. The Draft Focused EIR for the CAP was published May 9, 2019. Additional information on the County CAP can be obtained at the Napa County Department of Planning, Building and Environmental Services or online at https://www.countyofnapa.org/589/Planning-Building-Environmental-Services. The County's draft CAP was placed on hold, when the Climate Action Committee (CAC) began meeting on regional GHG reduction strategies in 2019. The County is currently preparing an updated CAP to provide a clear framework to determine what land use actions will be necessary to meet the State's adopted GHG reduction goals, including a quantitative and measurable strategy for achieving net zero emissions by 2045.

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

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

Regarding operational emissions, as part of the statewide implementation of Senate Bill (SB) 743, the Governor's Office of Land Use and Climate Innovation (LCI) 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 LCI 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.)

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)

One time "Construction Emissions" associated with the project include: emissions associated with the energy used to develop and prepare the project area, construction, and construction equipment and worker vehicle trips (hereinafter referred to as Equipment Emissions). These emissions also include underground carbon stocks (or Soil carbon) associated with any existing vegetation that is proposed to be removed. As previously stated, this project is the expansion of a single-family residence, the construction of an underground storage structure, the construction of an accessory structure with interior ADU and the construction of a solar array and the removal of 15 trees.

In addition to the one time Construction Emissions, "Operational Emissions" of the project are also considered and include: i) any reduction in the amount of carbon sequestered by existing vegetation that is removed as part of the project compared to a "no project"

scenario (hereinafter referred to as Operational Sequestration Emissions); and ii) ongoing emissions from the energy used to maintain and operate the single-family residence, guest house and accessory building with interior ADU, including vehicle trips associated with residents (hereinafter referred to as Operational Emissions). See Section XVI, Transportation/Traffic, for anticipated number of operational trips. Operational Emissions from the project would be the primary source of emissions over the long-term when compared to one time construction emissions.

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 expansion of an existing single-family residence and the construction of an accessory structure with interior ADU would account for 1-2 dwelling units (DU), well below the 56 DU operational GHG screening criteria used by BAAQMD.

Furthermore, the applicant intends to implement the following GHG reduction methods: onsite solar array.

The proposed project has been evaluated against the BAAQMD thresholds and determined that the project would not exceed the operational GHG thresholds. GHG Emission reductions from local programs and project level actions, such as application of the Cal Green Building Code, tightened vehicle fuel efficiency standards, and those features noted above would combine to further reduce emissions below BAAQMD thresholds. 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 the project would be relatively modest and the project is in compliance with the County's efforts to reduce emissions as described above.

Further, as stated above, per the LCI Technical Advisory, the addition of 110 or fewer daily trips could be presumed to have a less than significant VMT impact. As detailed in Section XVII (Transportation), a single-family residence and ADU are expected to generate 20 average daily trips which would be well below the LCI's recommended screening criterion threshold for small projects generating fewer than 110 trips per day; therefore, less-than-significant impacts related to operational GHG emissions are anticipated.

Mitigation Measures: None 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? | ☐ | ☐ | ☒ | ☐ |
| 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? | ☐ | ☐ | ☒ | ☐ |
| c) | Emit hazardous emissions or handle hazardous or acutely hazardous materials, substances, or waste within one-quarter mile of an existing or proposed school? | ☐ | ☐ | ☐ | ☒ |
| 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? | ☐ | ☐ | ☐ | ☒ |
| 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. The proposed project is not expected to cause a significant impact through the routine transports, use or disposal of hazardous materials because the project is the project is the expansion of a single-family residence, the construction of an underground storage structure, the construction of an accessory structure with interior ADU and the construction of a solar array, all of which are land uses not associated with storage of large amounts of hazardous materials. During construction of the project some hazardous materials, such as building coatings/ adhesives/ etc., will be utilized. However, given the quantities of hazardous materials and the limited duration, they will result in a less than significant impact.

b. Hazardous materials such as diesel, maintenance fluids, and paints would be used onsite during construction. Should they be stored onsite, these materials would be stored in secure locations to reduce the potential for upset or accident conditions. The proposed project consists of the expansion of a single-family residence, the construction of an underground storage structure, the construction of an accessory structure with interior ADU and the construction of a solar array that 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 environments.

c. There are no schools located within one-quarter mile from the proposed project. According to Google Earth, the nearest school to the project site is St. Helena Unified in the City of St. Helena, located approximately 5.5 miles to the north.

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.

e. No impact would occur as the project site is not located within an airport land use plan.

f. The access driveway and on-site circulation configuration meets Napa County Road and Street Standards. The project has been reviewed by the County Fire Department and Engineering Services Division and found acceptable, as conditioned. Therefore, the proposed project would not obstruct emergency vehicle access.

g. The project would not increase exposure of people and/or structures to a significant loss, injury or death involving wild land fires. The project would comply with current California Department of Forestry and California Building Code requirements for fire safety. Viewshed screening has been reviewed by the Napa County Fire Marshal and found to be compliant with defensible space requirements.

Mitigation Measures: None 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? | ☐ | ☐ | ☒ | ☐ |
| b) | Substantially decrease groundwater supplies or interfere substantially with groundwater recharge such that the project may impede sustainable groundwater management of the basin? | ☐ | ☐ | ☒ | ☐ |
| 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 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. The project wells are located outside of the GSA subbasin.

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 guidance[3] 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 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).

[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.

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 project is the expansion of a single-family residence, the construction of an underground storage structure, the construction of an accessory structure with interior ADU and the construction of a solar array. The project would not violate any water quality standards or waste discharge requirements. There are existing wells on the project parcels and water delivery infrastructure will be expanded so that plumbing can be accommodated within the expansion to the single-family residence and to the newly constructed accessory building and interior ADU. Plans for this would be reviewed during the building permit stage by appropriate review divisions. A septic system and leach field already exist for the existing single-family residence and the applicant has demonstrated on their submitted plans where additional wastewater infrastructure will go for the newly constructed ADU including sufficient area for septic, leach fields and reserve area. The Division of Environmental Health has reviewed the plans, recommended approval and conditioned the project as necessary.

b. A Water Availability Analysis was prepared by Summit Engineering, dated July 11, 2025. As directed by the County's Water Availability Analysis Guidance Document of May 2015 (WAA) and the Interim Standards, the report includes Tier 1 calculations for the existing and proposed water uses and a groundwater recharge analysis, a Tier 2 well interference analysis, and a Tier 3 surface water interference analysis.

The project is located on APN 027-310-032 which covers 123.07 acres. Existing groundwater users include the single-family residence and associated landscaping. APN 027-310-043 covers 95.05 acres and contains the gate and entrance road to the property, along with minor landscaping. Both parcels are outside of the Napa Valley Subbasin and the Milliken-Sarco-Tulucay groundwater deficient area. There are four existing wells on site, but only three are currently in use: Well A, Well B, and Well D. Wells A and B are located on APN 027-310-032 and supply all domestic water and landscape irrigation water for the parcel. Well D is located on APN 027-310-043 and provides landscape irrigation water for the minor landscaping on this parcel. Well C, located on APN 027-310-043, was drilled for a proposed residence which was never built and is currently non-operational. This inactive well is proposed to remain on site for potential future use, following the criteria listed in Napa County Code 13.12.460(B) and under the condition that no groundwater extracted from the well will be used to support the proposed developments of P22-00182.

Tier 1: Per the January 2024 Interim Napa County Well Permit Standards and WAA Requirements, projects outside of the Napa Valley Subbasin and the Milliken-Sarco-Tulucay area are required to estimate the average annual recharge occurring on the project parcel and consider this recharge relative to the estimated project water use.

Luhdorff & Scalmanini Consulting Engineers (LSCE) previously prepared a Hydrogeologic Conceptualization and Characterization of Conditions for Napa County regarding the groundwater and hydrogeology of the Napa Valley, including a detailed study of the anticipated rainfall recharge in several watersheds. LSCE used a mass balance approach to provide groundwater recharge estimates for several watersheds within Napa County. The project APNs 027-310-032 and 027-310-043 are located within the Dry Creek watershed, which LSCE estimates to have an average annual recharge rate equal to 6% of annual precipitation. The average annual precipitation for the site was taken to be 37.21 inches/year based on the last ten years (2015–2024) of precipitation data from PRISM.

Per the LSCE report, recharge potential is significantly reduced for areas of land with a slope greater than 30 degrees (approximately 57% slope). As such, areas of the site with slopes greater than 57% are excluded from the parcel acreage when calculating recharge. A site slope analysis was prepared for each parcel based on digital elevation models downloaded from the USGS National Map. The slope analysis revealed a total of approximately 52.08 acres of land sloped more than 57% on APN 027-310-032 and approximately 37.12 acres sloped less than 57% on APN 027-310-043. Therefore, the total land area available for recharge over the two parcels is approximately 89.20 acres. Utilizing the watershed's rainfall recharge fraction of 6% (according to the LSCE groundwater characterization), the anticipated annual recharge for a typical year is calculated to be 16.60 af/yr.

Historical flow meter data is not available for the property, and therefore the existing domestic water demand for the property is estimated following the Guidelines for Estimating Residential Water Use from the Napa County 2015 WAA Guidance Document. The resulting existing domestic water demand is 0.75 af/yr (Main residence – 0.50 af/yr, guest house – 0.20 af/yr, pool with cover – 0.05 af/yr). The existing landscape on APN 027-310-032 consists primarily of drought-tolerant trees and shrubs surrounding the main residence and guest house, as well as two lawn areas to the east and northwest of the main residence. The Water Efficient Landscape Worksheet included with the irrigation plans for the building permit of the existing single-family residence show an Estimated Total Water Use of 1,037,134 gallons per year, or approximately 3.18 af/yr. Landscaping on APN 027-310-043 includes olive and ginkgo trees planted near the site's entrance gate. The irrigated area for these trees spans approximately 10,300 sq. ft. resulting in an estimated irrigation demand of 0.56 af/yr. The resulting total existing irrigation water demand for both parcels is 3.74 af/yr. Combined the project is estimated to have a groundwater demand of 4.49 af/yr.

New or modified water use from the proposed project includes the newly constructed ADU and additions/modifications to the landscaping

due to construction of project features. According to the WAA trees for landscaping and screening are proposed from drought tolerant species and will not require irrigation once established, so no irrigation lines are proposed. These trees will be watered until they are established with trucked in water and will not impact the project's overall groundwater demand. The applicant wishes for the project to maintain a 'no net increase' in groundwater use. To demonstrate how this could be achieved the WAA provides an example where the removal of lawn area equal to two spray valves worth of water could reduce groundwater demand by approximately 0.34 af/yr, more than the required 0.20 af/yr needed to offset the groundwater demand for the addition of the ADU. A table is provided below demonstrating existing and proposed groundwater use for the project where a 0.20 af/yr reduction is achieved due to applicant's modifications to their landscape irrigation.

Existing and Proposed Groundwater Usage

| Source of Demand | Existing (AFY) | Proposed (AFY) | Difference (AFY) |
|---|---|---|---|
| Well A | | | |
| Domestic water | 0.46 | 0.58 | +0.12 |
| Landscape irrigation | 1.94 | 1.82 | -0.12 |
| Total of Well A | 2.40 | 2.40 | 0.00 |
| Well B | | | |
| Domestic water | 0.29 | 0.37 | +0.08 |
| Landscape irrigation | 1.24 | 1.16 | -0.08 |
| Total for Well B | 1.53 | 1.53 | 0.00 |
| Well D | | | |
| Landscape irrigation | 0.56 | 0.56 | 0.00 |
| Total for Well D | 0.56 | 0.56 | 0.00 |

While the applicant has provided a specific example of how the project's landscape irrigation could be modified to achieve no net increase in groundwater demand, overall the intent is to reduce landscape irrigation by 65,710 galloons per year (0.20 af/yr) to offset the addition of the ADU groundwater demand. The project will include project specific Conditions of Approval setting a limitation on groundwater use for the parcel to 4.49 af/yr and requiring well monitoring. Conditions would also include the potential to modify/alter permitted uses on site should groundwater resources become insufficient to supply the use and a requirement for the submitted landscape plans to demonstrate a reduction in the Estimated Total Water Use of 65,710 gallons from what was previously approved under B11-00256.

*4.12 OTHER CONDITIONS APPLICABLE TO THE OPERATIONAL ASPECTS OF THE PROJECT*

*a. Groundwater Management - The parcel shall be limited to 4.49 acre-feet of groundwater per year for all water consuming activities (utilizing wells) on the parcels. A Groundwater Demand Management Program shall be developed and implemented for the property as outlined in COA 6.16(a) below.*

*In the event that changed circumstances or significant new information provide substantial evidence that the groundwater system referenced in the Use Permit would significantly affect the groundwater basin, the PBES Director shall be authorized to recommend additional reasonable conditions on the permittee, or revocation of this permit, as necessary to meet the requirements of the County Code and to protect public health, safety, and welfare.*

*6.16 OTHER CONDITIONS APPLICABLE TO THE PROJECT PERMITTING PROCESS*

*a. Groundwater Demand Management Program*

*1. The permittee shall install a meter on each well serving the parcel. Each meter shall be placed in a location that will allow for the measurement of all groundwater used on the project parcel. Prior to the issuance of a grading or building permit for the accessory dwelling unit, the permittee shall submit for review and approval by the PBES Director a groundwater demand management plan which includes a plan for the location and the configuration of the installation of a meter on all wells serving the parcels.*

*2. The Plan shall identify how best available technology and best management water conservation practices will be applied throughout the parcel.*

*3. The Plan shall identify how best management water conservation practices will be applied where possible in the structures on site. This includes but is not limited to the installation of low flow fixtures and appliances.*

*4. As a groundwater consuming activity already exists on the property, meter installation and monitoring shall begin immediately and the first monitoring report is due to the County within 120 days of approval of this modification.*

*5. For the first twelve months of operation under this permit, the permittee shall read the meters at the*

*beginning of each month and provide the data to the PBES Director monthly. If the water usage on the property exceeds, or is on track to exceed, the maximum groundwater usage values in i through iii below,, or if the permittee fails to report, additional reviews and analysis and/or a corrective action program at the permittee's expense shall be required and shall be submitted to the PBES Director for review and action. In addition to monthly meter readings, Permittee shall also provide well level data to the PBES Director.*

*i. Annual cumulative groundwater usage for all wells on the property shall not exceed 4.49 af/yr*

*ii. Annual groundwater usage for Well A shall not exceed 2.40 af/yr*

*iii. Annual groundwater usage for Well D shall not exceed 0.56 af/yr*

*6. The permittee's wells shall be included in the Napa County Groundwater Monitoring program if the County finds the well suitable.*

*7. At the completion of the reporting period per 6.16(a)(5) above, and so long as the water usage is within the maximum acre- feet per year as specified above, the permittee may begin the following meter reading schedule:*

*i. On or near the first day of each month the permittee shall read the water meter, and provide the data to the PBES Director during the first weeks of April and October. The PBES Director, or the Director's designated representative, has the right to access and verify the operation and readings of the meters during regular business hours.*

*b. The detailed final landscape and irrigation plan submittal required under COA 6.4(a) will include exhibits demonstrating how the project landscaping will be modified to achieve a 0.20 af/yr (65,170 gallons) or greater reduction in groundwater demand, as compared to the Water Efficient Landscape Worksheet included with the irrigation plans for building permit B11-00256 in compliance with the Water Efficient Landscape Ordinance.*

*9.9 OTHER CONDITIONS APPLICABLE PRIOR TO ISSUANCE OF A FINAL CERTIFICATE OF OCCUPANCY*

*a. All required meters shall be installed and all groundwater usage monitoring required in COA 4.12(a) and 6.16(a) above shall commence prior to issuance of a final certificate of occupancy.*

Tier 2: Pursuant to the 2024 Interim Napa County Well Permit Standards and WAA Requirements, a Tier 2 analysis of an existing well is required only for projects that demonstrate a net increase in groundwater use from wells within 500 feet of an offsite non-project well or 1,500 feet from a natural spring. Only one (1) offsite non-project well was identified to be approximately 157 feet from project Well D. The distances from this well to project Well A and Well B exceeds the 500 foot distance. Because the project does not propose to modify groundwater demand at Well D a Tier 2 analysis is not required. Despite this the applicant provided a theoretical Tier 2 analysis for each of the project wells based off the distance of that well to the closest parcel boundary, which demonstrated that the estimated drawdown for each well to these distances could meet the standard of no drawdown greater than 10 feet. There are no identified natural springs within 1,500 feet of any of the project well. Tier 2 criteria for the project is met.

Tier 3: A Tier 3 review is the County's adopted method for complying with its duties under the Doctrine. As discussed herein, Wells A and D are required to demonstrate compliance with the WAA Guidance document because they are located within 1,500 feet of an identified significant stream. Per the interim Napa County Well Permit Standards and WAA requirements (January 2024), projects modifying the use of an existing well within 1,500 feet of a significant stream inside the Napa River watershed are not required to conduct a Tier 3 analysis if modifications to the location, construction, or operations of the project wells are made to reduce harm relative to current conditions. The applicant already proposes to maintain a 'no net increase' in groundwater demand, and will be conditioned to achieve this pursuant to conditions outlined above. Wells A & D will be conditioned to not exceed proposed demand analyzed in the WAA. The applicant has also proposed to modify the both Wells A and D, installing flow restrictors to reduce the pumping rates of these wells, thereby reducing the potential impact these wells may have surface waters of the significant streams. The County will condition the project with the following Conditions of Approval;

*4.12 OTHER CONDITIONS APPLICABLE TO THE OPERATIONAL ASPECTS OF THE PROJECT*

*b. Well pumping rate for Well A shall not exceed 25 gallons per minute (gpm) and the well pumping rate for Well D shall not exceed 16 gpm. Equipment selection and a maintenance plan shall be developed and implemented for the property as outlined in COA No. 6.16.c below.*

*6.16 OTHER CONDITIONS APPLICABLE TO THE PROJECT PERMITTING PROCESS*

c. *In conjunction with well water meter installation and timing required in COA 6.16.a.5, the permittee shall install a well pump flow restrictor or equivalent equipment on Wells A & D. The submittal shall include a narrative providing information of how the device works, equipment specifications, and a maintenance and monitoring plan. Within 14 days of installation, evidence shall be provided to the County demonstrating installation and operation.*

With the conditions of approval outlined above the County has satisfied its duty to consider impacts to trust resources and no further

analysis is required.

c. All proposed work would take place on areas with slopes of less than 30 percent. The project would not substantially alter the drainage pattern on site or cause a significant increase in erosion or siltation on or off the project site. Improvement plans prepared prior to the issuance of a building permit would ensure that the proposed project does not increase runoff flow rate or volume as a result of project implementation. 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.

d. The project is not located in a flood hazard, tsunami, or seiche zone and thus there is no danger to project inundation.

e. Project wells are outside of the Napa County GSA boundaries. Even in the event that the project did fall within the regulatory authority of the GSP the project has demonstrated no net increase for groundwater use under the proposed project. Water quality would be maintained through standard stormwater quality treatment control measures and compliance with Engineering Division Conditions of Approval.

Mitigation Measures: None 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? | ☐ | ☐ | ☐ | ☒ |
| b) | Cause a significant environmental impact due to a conflict with any land use plan, policy, or regulation adopted for the purpose of avoiding or mitigating an environmental effect? | ☐ | ☐ | ☒ | ☐ |

Discussion:

a/b. The project would not occur within an established community and given that could not result in the division of an established community.

The project complies with the Napa County Code and all other applicable regulations governing placement and location of project features. The subject parcel is located in the AW (Agricultural Watershed) zoning district, which allows single-family structures, uses accessory to single-family structures and accessory dwelling units. The property's General Plan land use designation is AWOS (Agriculture, Watershed, and Open Space) which allows "agriculture, processing of agricultural products, and single-family dwellings." State law requires that the County allow ADU's wherever single-family residential structures are allowed. The proposed project is compliant with the physical limitations of the Napa County Zoning Ordinance.

The applicant is requesting approval of a Viewshed Protection Program (Napa County Code 18.106) application for construction and earthmoving associated with the expansion of a single-family residence, the construction of an underground storage structure, the construction of an accessory structure with interior ADU on slopes in excess of 15% and on a minor ridgeline. The Viewshed Protection Program's intent is to protect the public health, safety, and community welfare and to otherwise protect the scenic quality of the county both for visitors to the county as well as for its residents by ensuring that future improvements are compatible with existing land forms, particularly county ridgelines and that views of the county's many unique geologic features and the existing landscape fabric of the county's hillside areas are protected and preserved. These regulations are consistent with the goals and policies of the Napa County general plan, particularly as specified in the land use, open space and conservation, circulation and the scenic highways elements. The applicant has submitted project documents demonstrating compliance with the Viewshed Protection Program and the project has been conditioned appropriately.

Mitigation Measures: None 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? | ☐ | ☐ | ☐ | ☒ |
| b) | Result in the loss of availability of a locally-important mineral resource recovery site delineated on a local general plan, specific plan or other land use plan? | ☐ | ☐ | ☐ | ☒ |

Discussion:

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

Mitigation Measures: None 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? | ☐ | ☐ | ☒ | ☐ |
| b) | Generation of excessive groundborne vibration or groundborne noise levels? | ☐ | ☐ | ☒ | ☐ |
| c) | For a project located within the vicinity of a private airstrip or an airport land use plan or, where such a plan has not been adopted, within two miles of a public airport or public use airport, would the project expose people residing or working in the project area to excessive noise levels? | ☐ | ☐ | ☐ | ☒ |

Discussion:

a/b. The project would result in a temporary increase in noise levels during grading and construction activities. However, the nearest off-site sensitive receptor is approximately half a mile to the northeast. For this reason, noise generated due to grading and construction for the project is not anticipated to be significant. Conditions of approval identified below would require construction activities to be limited to daylight hours, vehicles to be muffled, and backup alarms adjusted to the lowest allowable levels. Impacts would be less than significant.

*"7.3 CONSTRUCTION NOISE*

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

*of 8 am to 5 pm."*

The proposed project is the expansion of a single-family residence, the construction of an underground storage structure, the construction of an accessory structure with interior ADU and the construction of a solar array. These land uses are not normally associated with the generation of high levels of noise and the existing ambient noise levels includes the existing single-family residence. Combined with the significant distance from the closest off-site sensitive receptor operation of the project is not expected to generate substantial temporary or permanent increases in the ambient noise level nor excessive groundborne vibration.

c. The project site is not located within the influence area of either the Napa County or Angwin Airports.

Mitigation Measures: None 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)? | ☐ | ☐ | ☒ | ☐ |
| b) | Displace substantial numbers of existing people or housing, necessitating the construction of replacement housing elsewhere? | ☐ | ☐ | ☐ | ☒ |

Discussion:

a. The applicant proposes to expand an existing single-family residence and construct an underground storage structure, accessory structure with interior ADU and a solar array. Build out of the project would result in the addition of one (1) dwelling unit in Napa County. The addition of the one (1) dwelling unit would be in full compliance with population growth projections analyzed in the 2023 Napa County Housing Element Update and would not result in unplanned growth. There is no planned expansion of the existing driveway and construction of wastewater infrastructure for the ADU would not indirectly induce substantial unplanned population growth in the surrounding area.

b. The project does not displace any existing people or housing.

Mitigation Measures: None 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? | ☐ | ☐ | ☒ | ☐ |

| | | | | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| ii) | Police protection? | ☐ | ☐ | ☒ | ☐ |
| iii) | Schools? | ☐ | ☐ | ☒ | ☐ |
| iv) | Parks? | ☐ | ☐ | ☒ | ☐ |
| v) | Other public facilities? | ☐ | ☐ | ☒ | ☐ |

Discussion:

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

Mitigation Measures: None 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? | ☐ | ☐ | ☒ | ☐ |
| b) | Does the project include recreational facilities or require the construction or expansion of recreational facilities which might have an adverse physical effect on the environment? | ☐ | ☐ | ☐ | ☒ |

Discussion:

a/b. The project would not significantly increase the use of recreational facilities, nor does the project include recreational facilities that may have a significant adverse effect on the environment.

Mitigation Measures: None 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?

| | | | | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| b) | Would the project conflict or be inconsistent with CEQA Guidelines section 15064.3, subdivision (b)? | ☐ | ☐ | ☒ | ☐ |
| c) | Substantially increase hazards due to a geometric design feature, (e.g., sharp curves or dangerous intersections) or incompatible uses (e.g., farm equipment)? | ☐ | ☐ | ☒ | ☐ |
| d) | Result in inadequate emergency access? | ☐ | ☐ | ☒ | ☐ |
| 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 commercial activity exceeding the site's capacity? | ☐ | ☐ | ☒ | ☐ |

Discussion:

As part of the statewide implementation of Senate Bill (SB) 743, the Governor's Office of Land Use and Climate Innovation (LCI) 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 LCI 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. LCI 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.

a. The proposed project would not conflict with any plans, ordinances or policies addressing the circulation system. Existing pedestrian, bicycle and transit facilities serving the site are limited, though given the rural location of the project site and the rural residential nature of the project, this is considered an acceptable condition. CalFire and Engineering divisions have reviewed the proposed plans for access and circulation and found them to be in compliance with the Napa County Road and Street Standards.

b. The proposed project would not conflict or be inconsistent with CEQA Guidelines section 15064.3, subdivision (b). A single-family residence and ADU are expected to generate a cumulative total of 20 ADT. As described above in the Discussion section, a project which is adding less than 110 daily trips is expected to have a less than significant impact on VMT.

c. The existing project driveway meets the minimum standards for the Napa County Roads and Street Standards, except for five (5) segments where the longitudinal slopes of the centerline of the road are between 18-20 percent and exceed 300 feet in length. The applicant has submitted a request for exception to the RSS for these segments and the Napa County Engineering Division has reviewed the request, determined that the applicant can meet the Findings required to approve an exception to the RSS and provided conditions which would ensure that roadway meets the Same Overall Practical Effect as the State Responsibility Area Fire Safe Regulations. The conditions do not require any changes to the design or geometry of the roadway, only maintenance and vegetation clearance. Thus the project will not substantially increase hazards due to a geometric design features since no changes to access will be made. The project would expand an existing single-family residence and construct an underground storage structure, an accessory structure with interior ADU and a solar array. Residential is already the primary land use for the project parcel and no agricultural activities are proposed with this project, indicating that it would not cause hazards due to incompatible uses.

d. The project has been review by the Napa County Engineering Division and Fire Marshal's office. Both have recommended approval of the project as conditioned. The driveway meets the minimum standards of the Napa County Road and Streets Standards, except for 5 segments where the longitudinal slope is between 18 and 20 percent along the centerline. The applicant has submitted a letter requesting exception to the standards for these segments and provided evidence that the Findings necessary to support an exception can be made, which the Engineering Division and Fire Marshal's office have reviewed and support.

e. Under county code the existing single-family residence is required to provide two (2) off-street parking spaces and the ADU would be required to provide one (1) parking space. The applicant has provided seven (7) parking spaces. The project is not a commercial project and its parking spaces would not stimulate commercial activity exceeding the site's capacity.

Mitigation Measures: None 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 | ☐ | ☐ | ☒ | ☐ |
| 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. | ☐ | ☐ | ☒ | ☐ |

Discussion:

a/b. On July 31, 2025, County Staff sent invitations to consult on the proposed project to Native American tribes who had a cultural interest in the area and who as of that date had requested to be invited to consult on projects, in accordance with the requirements of Public Resources Code section 21080.3.1. No responses were received within 30-days of the tribe's receipt of the invitations.

Mitigation Measures: None 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? | ☐ | ☐ | ☒ | ☐ |
| b) | Have sufficient water supplies available to serve the project and reasonably foreseeable future development during normal, dry and multiple dry years? | ☐ | ☐ | ☒ | ☐ |
| c) | Result in a determination by the wastewater treatment provider which serves or may serve the project that it has adequate capacity to serve the project's projected demand in addition to the provider's existing commitments? | ☐ | ☐ | ☐ | ☒ |
| d) | Generate solid waste in excess of State or local standards, or in excess of the capacity of local infrastructure, or otherwise impair the attainment of solid waste reduction goals? | ☐ | ☐ | ☒ | ☐ |
| e) | Comply with federal, state, and local management and reduction statutes and regulations related to solid waste? | ☐ | ☐ | ☒ | ☐ |

Discussion:

a. The existing single-family residential structure has an existing wastewater system including septic tanks and leachfields with reserve areas identified from prior permits. The expansion of the single-family residence and the construction of the accessory structure with interior ADU would require the addition of some wastewater infrastructure (3,000 gallon septic tank, advantex pretreatment system, dripfield) and stormwater infrastructure (bioretention facility), but the locations of the improvements have all been located in areas adjacent to existing areas for that type of facility or adjacent to the development footprints and would not significantly impact the environment.

b. As discussed in Section X. Hydrology and Water Quality the parcel is outside of the GSA subbasin and Milliken-Sarco-Tulucay Groundwater Deficient Area. The project's Water Availability Analysis conducted a Tier 1 project specific recharge and determined that the project parcels had an annual groundwater recharge of 16.60 af/yr. Existing groundwater demand for the single-family residence and associated landscaping was determined to be 4.49 af/yr. On top of that the applicant has proposed modifications to their landscape irrigation which, if implemented, would see a 'no net increase' in groundwater demand with build out of the project.

c. Wastewater would be treated on-site and would not require a wastewater treatment provider.

d/e. According to the Napa County Baseline Data Report, all of the solid waste landfills where Napa County's waste is disposed have more than sufficient capacity related to the current waste generation The project would comply with federal, state, and local statutes and regulations related to solid waste.

Mitigation Measures: None 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? | ☐ | ☐ | ☒ | ☐ |
| 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? | ☐ | ☐ | ☒ | ☐ |
| 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? | ☐ | ☐ | ☒ | ☐ |
| 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? | ☐ | ☐ | ☒ | ☐ |

Discussion:

a. There are no proposed project features that would substantially impair an adopted emergency response plan or emergency evacuation plan. The existing driveway currently meets residential standards as defined in the Napa County Road and Street Standards (RSS). Access onto and throughout the parcel includes design components to accommodate fire and emergency apparatus. The Fire Marshal's office has reviewed the plans, which demonstrate that the project would have adequate emergency access to the proposed project.

b. The proposed project is located within a very high fire hazard severity zone and in the State Responsibility Area (SRA) district. The project proposes to expand an existing single-family residence, construct an underground storage structure, accessory structure with interior ADU and a solar array. Development on the parcel is contained to slopes below 30% and adjacent to existing developed areas. As the project is subject to the Viewshed Protection Program due to proposed development on slopes over 15% and being located on a Minor Ridgeline that project proposes to add landscape screening to screen structures from views from designated public roads. The Napa County Fire Marshal has reviewed the project's proposed screening for compliance with Napa County defensible space guidelines and has recommended approval as conditioned.

c. The existing driveway meets County RSS. While the project proposed to construct some new wastewater and stormwater infrastructure, these are not infrastructure that are typically known to exacerbate fire risk or impacts to the environment. The project would develop a nearby solar array, but transmission lines between array and residential structures is a short distance through an area that wouldn't be considered at risk to wildfire and the array and transmission line would be built to current California Building Code standards. All other infrastructure is existing.

d. The proposed project has been reviewed by the Engineering Department, who has approved the project as conditioned. The project would require incorporation of best management practices and would be subject to the Napa County Stormwater Ordinance which addresses sediment and erosion control measures and dust control, as applicable. The project is also located atop a Minor Ridgeline, topographically higher than surrounding areas on all sides, preventing it from being downslope or downstream of other adjacent areas.

Mitigation Measures: None 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? | ☐ | ☐ | ☒ | ☐ |
| 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)? | ☐ | ☐ | ☒ | ☐ |
| c) Does the project have environmental effects that will cause substantial adverse effects on human beings, either directly or indirectly? | ☐ | ☐ | ☒ | ☐ |

Discussion:

a. The project does not 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 or substantially reduce the number or restrict the range of a rare or endangered plant or animal species. Development and ground disturbance activities associated with the proposed project are primarily adjacent to existing developed areas of the single-family residential structure. The Biological Resource Reconnaissance Survey did not identify that any sensitive habitat would be impacted by the project nor any existing special-status plant or animal species, however because the project proposes to remove 15 trees within the development areas of the proposed project, **BIO-1** is recommended which would ensure that if any raptors or nesting birds established nests between the time period of the survey and the initiation of project ground disturbance that appropriate measures are taken. With the inclusion of this mitigation measure, along with the particular small scale of the proposed project, impacts to less than significant.

As identified in Section V. above, no known historically sensitive sites or structures, archaeological or paleontological resources, sites of unique geological features have been identified within the project site. No historic or prehistoric resources are anticipated to be affected by the proposed project nor will the proposed project eliminate important examples of the major periods of California history or prehistory. In the event archaeological artifacts are found, a standard condition of approval is included to stop work and contact the appropriate authorities. Impacts would be less than significant.

b. The project does not have impacts that are individually limited, but cumulatively considerable. Potential impacts to air quality, greenhouse gas emissions, hydrology, and traffic are discussed in the respective sections above and were determined to have a less than significant impact. Because of the small scale nature of this project, which is the expansion of an existing single-family residence, the construction of an underground storage structure, the construction of an accessory structure with interior ADU and the construction of a solar array, the project screens out of BAAQMD's operational screening criteria for air quality and greenhouse gas emissions. The project also does not generate enough VMT to require further study or to reduce its VMT by 15 percent. Project wells are within the distances where Napa County Water Availability Analysis Guidelines would tend to require Tier 2 & 3 analysis, but the applicant has demonstrated and proposed project features which would ensure met or screened out of that standard of analysis. Conditions of Approval are proposed to ensure the project operates within these bounds. Potential cumulative impacts would be less than significant.

c. All potential impacts identified in this Mitigated Negative Declaration are less than significant with the exception of Biological Resources, for which Mitigation Measures are proposed. The impacts to categories identified in this Mitigated Negative Declaration are not expected to cause substantial adverse effects on human beings and the impacts can be mitigated to a less than significant impact with the implementation of proposed Mitigation Measures. Therefore, the proposed project would not result in significant environmental effects that cause substantial adverse effects on human beings either directly or indirectly. Impacts would be less than significant.

Mitigation Measures: None are required.

# 80 Clear Creek Viewshed Protection Program #P22-00182-VIEW
# Mitigation Monitoring and Reporting Program

| Potential Environmental Impact | Adopted Mitigation Measure | Monitoring and Reporting Actions and Schedule | Implementation | Monitoring | Reporting & Date of Compliance/ Completion |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| **Impact BIO-1: Pre-Project Special-Status Plant Surveys.** Because there is potential for certain species to occur in the Study Area, preconstruction surveys would confirm presence/absence of these species at the time of the proposed construction and ensure no adverse effect to any species encountered. The following measures are recommended to avoid or otherwise minimize potential impacts to these species. | **MM BIO-1; Nesting Birds and Raptors:** The owner/permittee 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:<br><br>For 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 preconstruction surveys 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 preconstruction survey shall be conducted no earlier than seven days prior to when vegetation removal and ground disturbing activities are to commence. Should ground disturbance commence later than seven days from the survey date, surveys 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.<br><br>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.<br><br>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 County Conservation Division and the USFWS and/or CDFW.<br><br>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 earthmoving and/or development activities. Exclusion buffers shall remain in effect until the young have fledged or nest(s) are otherwise determined inactive by a qualified biologist.<br><br>Alternative methods aimed at flushing out nesting birds prior to preconstruction surveys, whether physical (i.e., removing or disturbing nests by physically | If construction/earthmoving activity is 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. | P | PD | PC<br><br>___/___/___ |

| Potential Environmental Impact | Adopted Mitigation Measure | Monitoring and Reporting Actions and Schedule | Implementation | Monitoring | Reporting & Date of Compliance/ Completion |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| | 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. | | | | |