Planning, Building & Environmental Services

1195 Third Street, Suite 210
Napa, CA 94559
www.napacounty.gov
Main: (707) 253-4417

Brian D. Bordona
Director

Initial Study Checklist/Mitigated Negative Declaration

(form updated January 2019)

1. **Project Title:** Hess Collection Tentative Parcel Map

2. **Property Owner Contact:** Matt Wood, (707) 265-3489, mwood@hesspersson.com

3. **County Contact Person, Phone Number and email:** Enrique Torres, (707) 253-4307, enrique.torres@countyofnapa.org

4. **Project Location and Assessor's Parcel Number (APN):**

   - 1701 Mount Veeder Road, Napa, CA 94558, APN 034-230-020-000
   - Section 23, Township 06 North, Range 05 West, Mt. Diablo Principal Meridian
   - Latitude 38° 20' 47.884" N / Longitude 122° 23' 5.814" W

5. **Project Sponsor's name and address:** George Nystrom, 1113 Hunt Avenue, Saint Helena, CA 94574, (707) 290-6740, gnystrom@albionsurveys.com

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

7. **Zoning:** Agricultural Watershed

8. **Background/Project History:** The property is owned by Hess Collection Vineyards Inc. and is 502.41-acres. The project parcel proposed for subdivision has a General Plan Designation of Agriculture, Watershed, and Open Space (AWOS) and is located within the Agricultural Watershed Zoning District (AW). The project site has its earliest development permits dating March 20, 1972, for a Travel Trailer with an 810-gallon septic tank, and June 20, 1972, for two (2) mobile homes with a 1,200-gallon septic tank. Further permits were later applied and issued for trailer hookups (B-16330), a shed (B-16748), an agricultural barn (B-16747), a storage building (B-18303), one (1) 10,500 water tank (B10-01014), and a pump house (BC21-00734). In addition to the residential and agricultural uses, a septic system, shed, a well, two agricultural ponds, and 95.8 acres of vineyard are existing on-site. Additionally, there was an approved Winery Use Permit (587778-UP, Mount Veeder Vineyards) for the property. However, the small winery conversion was never vested, and the permit consequentially expired.

9. **Description of Project:** The project applicant is requesting the approval of a Tentative Parcel Map, which includes a proposed subdivision of a 502.41-acre parcel into three (3) parcels with residential building envelope locations identified. The three (3) proposed parcels are listed as parcel A (177.10-acres), parcel B (160.83-acres), and parcel C (164.48-acres). Based off the proposed configurations, the existing residences (mobile homes), will be located within the proposed parcel A. There is no immediate physical development proposed on the resulting new parcels, although future single-family residential structures and associated infrastructure would be foreseeable development on the undeveloped parcels as they are considered by-right uses allowed without a use permit pursuant to our zoning code. The Hess Collection Tentative Parcel Map has existing access to the proposed project parcels located within parcel A, B, & C, along Mount Veeder Road. The project is generally located just northwest of the intersection of Redwood Road and Mount Veeder Road.

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

The 502.41-acre property is proposed for land division for the purpose of establishing three (3) new parcels. The property is located on the west side of Mount Veeder Road, approximately three (3) miles west of the City of Napa and three (3) miles west of State Highway 29. The project is located within the Redwood Creek watershed and the Mayacamas Mountains, with the highest elevation at approximately 1,100 feet and the lowest elevation at 420 feet above sea level. General habitat among the project site consisting primarily of Annual Brome Grasslands and Coast Live Oak Woodlands, and interspersed with actively cultivated vineyards on steeply rolling hills. The Annual Brome Grasslands consisting primarily of six (6) species, and twelve (12) species in small amounts also occurring within the community, for a total of eighteen (18) species within the Annual Brome Grassland. Within the Coast Live Oak Woodland, there are five (5) tree species, within their understory there are three (3) shrubs and one (1) herb. Additionally, there are four (4) shrubs and five (5) herbs located on-site. The soils found within the study area consist of 109 – Boomer gravelly loam (14 to 60%), 113 – Bressa-Dribble complex (15 to 30% slopes), 133 – Fagan clay loam (30 to 50%), 136 – Felton gravelly loam (30 to 50%), and 157 – Lodo-Maymen-Felton association (30 to 75%). In the three (3) proposed parcels, the primary soil type is Felton gravelly loam.

There are approximately 8.136-acres of mapped aquatic resources, consisting of a seep, ponds, drainages, and a perennial creek were identified on-site during a protocol-level aquatic resource delineation. The study area supports a single seep within the study area. Numerous ephemeral drainages drain the steep property, with their features being often incised within the study area and unvegetated with a dirt or rock bottom due to water only flowing during rainfall. The roadside ditches within the study area function the same as the ephemeral

drainages but are constructed to run along Mount Veeder Road. There are two (2) intermittent drainages running along the property, Pickle Canyon Creek runs along the eastern edge of the property, and an unnamed inaccessible drainage through the western portion of the property. There is an inaccessible perennial creek to the southern edge, identified as Redwood Creek, along with two agricultural ponds, and a water quality basin on-site. Uses surrounding the property are compatible with allowable uses found within the AW zoning district, such as vineyards, wineries, and large lot single-family residences. The site is long, wide, and is relatively steep with slopes ranging from 1.34% to 70%.

11. Other agencies whose approval is required.

The project would also require various ministerial approvals by the County, including but not limited to building permits, grading permits, waste disposal permits, water supply permits, and an encroachment permit, in addition to meeting CalFire standards.

Responsible (R) and Trustee (T) Agencies

California Department of Fish & Wildlife (CDFW) (T)
Alcoholic Beverage Control (R)

Other Agencies Contacted

Middletown Rancheria
Mishewal Wappo Tribe of Alexander Valley
Yocha Dehe Wintun Nation

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.?

Notice of the proposed project was sent certified mail to Middletown Rancheria, Mishewal Wappo Tribe of Alexander Valley, and Yocha Dehe Wintun Nation on May 8, 2026, 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. The Yocha Dehe Wintun Nation responded on May 28, 2026, confirming the project is not within their aboriginal territories, declined to comment on the project, and deferred correspondence to the Mishewal Wappo Tribe. The Middletown Rancheria Tribe responded on June 3, 2026, confirming the project is not within their aboriginal territories, declined to comment on the project, and

deferred correspondence to the Mishewal Wappo Tribe. The Mishewal Wappo Tribe of Alexander Valley responded June 30, 2026, confirming that the project is within their aboriginal territories and due to the absence of earth disturbing activities, opted to not conduct consultation on the project. **Section XVIII (Tribal Cultural Resources).**

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.

Other sources of information used in the preparation of this Initial Study include site-specific studies conducted and filed by the applicant in conjunction with P25-00299-TPM as listed below, and the environmental background information contained in the permanent file on this project. These documents and information sources are incorporated herein by reference and available for review at the Napa County Department of Planning, Building and Environmental Services located at 1195 Third Street, Suite 210, Napa, CA 94559, or on the County's website at: Current Projects Explorer | Napa County, CA (napacounty.gov)

- Tentative Parcel Map Plans **(Exhibit A)**
- Biological Resource Study **(Exhibit B)**
- Archeological Resource Study **(Confidential)**
- Napa County Geographic Information Systems (GIS) Environmental Maps/Layers.
- Napa County Permit History Records for 1701 Mount Veeder Road, Napa, CA 94558

ENVIRONMENTAL FINDING:

On the basis of this initial evaluation:

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.

Enrique Torres — October 19, 2026

Signature — Date

Name: Enrique Torres, Planner II
Napa County Planning, Building, and Environmental Services Department (PBES)

EVALUATION OF ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACTS

This section analyzes the potential environmental impacts of this project based on the criteria set forth in the State CEQA Guidelines and the County's implementing ordinances and guidelines. For each item, one of four responses is given:

No Impact: The project would not have the impact described. The project may have a beneficial effect, but there is no potential for the project to create or add increment to the impact described.

Less Than Significant Impact: The project would have the impact described, but the impact would not be significant. Mitigation is not required, although the project applicant may choose to modify the project to avoid the impacts.

Less Than Significant with Mitigation Incorporation: The project would have the impact described, and the impact could be significant. One or more mitigation measures have been identified that will reduce the impact to a less than significant level.

Potentially Significant Impact: The project would have the impact described, and the impact could be significant. The impact cannot be reduced to less than significant by incorporating mitigation measures. An environmental impact report must be prepared for this project.

Each question was answered by evaluating the project as proposed, that is, without considering the effect of any added mitigation measures. The Initial Study includes a discussion of the potential impacts and identifies mitigation measures to substantially reduce those impacts to a level of insignificance where feasible. All references and sources used in this Initial Study are listed above and are incorporated herein by reference.

Matt Woods has agreed to accept all mitigation measures listed in this Initial Study as Conditions of Approval for the proposed project, and to obtain all necessary permits, notify all contractors, agents and employees involved in project implementation and any new owners should the property be transferred to ensure compliance with the mitigation measures.

1. AESTHETICS:

Except as provided in Public Resources Code Section 21099, would the project:

a) Have a substantial adverse effect on a scenic vista?

Discussion:
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 parcel is a large agricultural parcel currently developed with 95.8-acres of vineyards, two residences (one not in use), a well, a septic system, pump house, water tank, storage buildings, an agricultural barn, and two agricultural ponds. The area around the project site includes open space, rural residential uses, and agricultural/vineyard and winery uses.

No grading, tree removal, or construction activities are proposed as part of the Tentative Map application. Any construction activities on the proposed parcels would be required to comply with applicable Napa County Code regulations, including the conservation regulations, viewshed protection program, and rural design standards intended to preserve the County's scenic and rural character. The proposed project consists solely of a parcel subdivision and does not include approval or construction of any residential or non-agricultural development at this time. No physical development is proposed beyond the conceptual establishment of future building envelopes for planning purposes. The subdivision would create parcels that could accommodate by-right residential uses consistent with Napa County Code and underlying zoning regulations, including a primary single-family residence, ADU/JADU, and guest cottage structures on each parcel.

Significance Level: Less than significant impact.

Mitigation Measures: None.

b) Substantially damage scenic resources, including, but not limited to trees, rock outcroppings, and historic buildings within a state scenic highway?

Discussion: The proposed project would not be located in an area which would substantially damage any known scenic vista, or damage scenic resources, rock outcroppings, or historic buildings. Both Mount Veeder Road and Redwood Road, while holding a status of eligibility at the county level, are neither eligible as a state designated highways or existing as state designated highways. Therefore the proposed project is not only incapable of damaging scenic resources seen from state scenic routes due

to the lack of but has been configured so that the building envelopes and foreseeable development shall have all visual effects minimized to the maximum extent by preventing the removal of any vegetation or damage any other scenic resources. The proposed entitlement is limited to a land division and does not authorize any physical construction activities, vegetation removal, or grading beyond the conceptual identification of future building envelope locations. No specific residential development plans are currently proposed. As such, no direct impacts to scenic resources would occur as part of the requested entitlement.

Significance Level: No Impact.

Mitigation Measures: None.

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 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?

Discussion: The project site is located within a rural, non-urbanized portion of Napa County, developed with 95.8 acres of vineyard, open space, rural residential development, and agricultural uses. Public viewsheds of the area are primarily found along both Mount Veeder Road and/or Redwood Road, both of which are designated viewshed roads pursuant to Napa County Code Chapter 18.106 (Viewshed Protection Program). The County's Viewshed Protection Program applies to any future development located on slopes greater than 15 percent and is located on a ridgeline or along a county viewshed road, establishing design and siting criteria intended to minimize visual impacts to public views and preserve the County's rural character.

The conceptual building envelopes associated with the proposed land have been configured to maximize avoidance of grading on slopes exceeding 15 percent and minimize potential habitat removal. Although the conceptual building envelopes are located on slopes exceeding 15 percent, the existing topography and vegetation would likely substantially screen future development from Mount Veeder Road and/or Redwood Road. Any future residential development would require separate County approvals and would be required to demonstrate compliance with applicable Napa County Code requirements, including the Viewshed Protection Program, conservation regulations, building siting, grading, and rural design standards. Future development applications would be required to provide a viewshed analysis demonstrating that proposed development is adequately screened from designated viewshed roads or incorporate appropriate measures to minimize potential visual impacts. The current project is limited to the subdivision entitlement and does not authorize the construction of residences, grading, roadway improvements, vegetation removal, or other physical development activities.

Accordingly, the proposed land division would not alter the existing visual character or quality of public views of the site and its surroundings. Therefore, the project would result in no impacts.

Significance Level: No Impact

Mitigation Measures: None

d) Create a new source of substantial light or glare which would adversely affect day or nighttime view in the area?

Discussion: The proposed subdivision consists of establishing three (3) new parcels but does not include the approval or construction of any physical development at this time. This would result in the project not directly introducing new sources of substantial light or glare that could adversely affect daytime or nighttime views in the area. The proposed project does however increase the amount of foreseeable by-right development, therefore increasing the potential for light and glare. These potential adverse effects to the viewshed from light and glare, are subject to Title 24 of the California Building Code, and if an application to the viewshed protection program is submitted, then the project could be subject to Standard Conditions of Approval, and Napa County Code 18.106.040(C)(f), with both code sections establishing regulations for low placement and downward shielding of proposed light sources. Therefore, the proposed project would not directly create a new source of substantial light or glare which would adversely affect day or nighttime views in the area, and any foreseeable by-right development shall have less than significant impacts.

Significance Level: Less than significant impact.

Mitigation Measures: None required.

2. AGRICULTURE AND FOREST RESOURCES[1]:

Would the project:

[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

a) Convert Prime Farmland, Unique Farmland, or Farmland of Statewide Importance (Farmland), as shown on the maps prepared pursuant to the Farmland Mapping and Monitoring Program of the California Resources Agency, to non-agricultural use?

Discussion: According to the Napa County Important Farmlands Map of 2020 prepared by the California Department of Conservation District, Division of Land Resource Protection, approximately 151 acres of the property is mapped as designated Unique Farmland.

The California Department of Conservation's "Important Farmland Categories"[2] define 'Unique Farmland' as Farmland of lesser quality soils used for the production of the state's leading agricultural crops. This land is usually irrigated, but may include non-irrigated orchards or vineyards as found in some climatic zones in California. Land must have been cropped at some time during the four years prior to the mapping date.

The proposed project is not expected to convert any farmland to non-agricultural use. While the project documents show an estimated 25,806 sq ft (0.6 acres) for conceptual building envelopes for parcels B & C, any foreseeable by-right development in the Agricultural Watershed zoning district is considered compatible with agricultural uses and with by-right development provided in the Agricultural Watershed zoning code. The proposed project is consistent with the Land Use policies of the Napa County General Plan and the site's zoning designation of Agricultural Watershed. No change in the land use or zoning is proposed. No impact would occur.

Significance Level: No impact.

Mitigation Measures: None required.

b) Conflict with existing zoning for agricultural use, or a Williamson Act Contract?

---

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.

[2] California Department of Conservation, "Important Farmland Categories," Farmland Mapping and Monitoring Program, accessed February 10, 2026, https://www.conservation.ca.gov/dlrp/fmmp/Pages/Important-Farmland-Categories.aspx

Discussion: The project parcel has an AWOS General Plan designation and is located in an AW zoning district, which allows one single-family residential dwelling unit per legal lot, accessory dwelling units and guest cottages, without the granting of a use permit, however any future developments shall be subject to all applicable Napa County Code, including but not limited to the Viewshed Protection Program and the Conservation Regulations. Additionally, the project parcel is not encumbered by a Williamson Act contract. No impact would occur.

Significance Level: No Impact.

Mitigation Measures: None required.

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)?

Discussion: 'Forest Land' is defined in California Public Resource Code Section 12220(g) as "land that can support 10% native tree cover of any species, including hardwoods, under natural conditions, and that allows for management of one or more forest resources, including timber, aesthetics, fish and wildlife, biodiversity, water quality, recreation, and other public benefits."

According to Napa County GIS Sensitivity Layers (Vegetation Map), the property contains a total of 299.6 acres of oak woodland canopy and the project speculates that there will be 0.1 acre of Coast Live Oak Woodland impacted by the building envelope in Parcel C, which is less than 0.01% of the total vegetation canopy cover currently present within the parcel. No other trees are proposed for canopy disturbance; thus, the project would not result in conversion of forest land. Additionally, the project site is zoned as AW and is not zoned as forest land as defined in Public Resource Code Section 12220(g), timberland as defined in Public Resource Code Section 4526, or a Timberland Production Zone (TPZ) as defined in Government Code Section 51104(g). No impacts will occur.

Significance Level: No impact.

Mitigation Measures: None required.

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?

Discussion: See response to Subsection 2(c) above.

Significance Level: No impact.

Mitigation Measures: None required.

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 or conversion of forest land to non- forest use?

Discussion: See response to 2(a) above.

Significance Level: No impact.

Mitigation Measures: None required.

3. AIR QUALITY:

Background information[3]:
On June 2, 2010, the Bay Area Air Quality Management District's (BAAQMD) (now known as the Bay Area Air District) (BAAD) 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 BAAD believed air pollution emissions would cause significant environmental impacts under CEQA and were posted on BAAD's website and included in BAAD'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

[3] CEQA Thresholds and Guidelines Update (baaqmd.gov): https://www.baaqmd.gov/plans-and-climate/california-environmental-quality-act-ceqa/updated-ceqa-guidelines

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 BAAD 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.

See Section 8 (Greenhouse Gas Emissions) for the greenhouse gas (GHG) emissions disclosure and impact assessment.

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:

a) Conflict with or obstruct implementation of the applicable air quality plan?

Discussion: 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 (BAAD, In Your Community: Napa County, April 2016).

The potential impacts associated with implementation of the project were evaluated consistent with guidance provided by BAAD. 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.

BAAD 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. BAAD 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 BAAD 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 2022. These guidelines outline substantial evidence supporting a variety of thresholds of significance.

As mentioned above, in 2010, the BAAD 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 BAAD through 2022. The BAAD project screening criteria for 2022 CEQA Guidelines project screening criteria (Table 4-1 Single Land Use Construction and Operational Criteria Air Pollutant and Precursor Screening Levels) has construction criterion of 254 dwelling units and an operational criterion of 421 dwelling unit.

The proposed project is a land division which is an action that will not affect an applicable air quality plan or result in a net increase of criteria pollutants. However, it is foreseeable that the resulting parcels from the land division could be developed for single-family residential dwellings. Under Napa County Code, two (2) parcels (B & C) in the AW zoning designation could develop a total of six (6) dwelling units at full build out (two (2) single-family dwelling units, two (2) accessory dwelling units, and two (2) guest cottages). With Parcel A having two (2) existing residences, the subject parcel is allowed one (1) guest cottage by-right. When compared to the BAAD's screening criterion for single-family development for both operational criteria (421 dwelling units) and construction criteria (254 dwelling units) 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.

Significance Level: Less than significant impact.

Mitigation Measures: None required.

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?

Discussion: See response to Subsection 3(a) above.

Significance Level: Less than significant impact.

Mitigation Measures: None required.

c) Expose sensitive receptors to substantial pollutant concentrations?

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

Land uses in the vicinity of project parcel include rural residential, and agriculture (primarily vineyard). The closest school (Napa Valley Unified – La Sagrada Familia Catholic International Home School Academy) is over two (2) linear miles to the southeast of the project site in unincorporated Napa. The closest residence to the proposed land division is about 100 feet from the project site to the east. The City of Yountville is approximately two (2) miles north of the project area.

In the short term, there are no potential air quality impacts as the project scope does not include earthmoving activities and/or construction emissions which would otherwise consist 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. These sources would generally be temporary and/or seasonal in nature and would occur at least two (2) miles from the closest school and two (2) miles from the nearest incorporated city (City of Yountville), providing dilution of pollutants and odors. Approval of the proposed project does not entitle any physical structures and/or earthmoving activities, although the establishment of the three (3) parcels would allow by-right development typical for large lot rural residential; a single-family dwelling

unit, accessory dwelling units and a guest cottage. 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 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 BAAD 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 BAAD'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 BAAD's jurisdiction shall have either a California Air Resources Board (ARB) registration Portable Equipment Registration Program (PERP) or a BAAD 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.

Significance Level: Less than significant impact.

Mitigation Measures: None required.

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

Discussion: While the Air District defines public exposure to offensive odors as a potentially significant impact, single-family residential dwellings are not known operational producers of pollutants capable of causing substantial negative impacts to sensitive receptors. The project proposes to subdivide the 502.41-acre project parcel in order to establish three (3) new parcels. Any foreseeable development proposed on the parcels will consists of a single-family residence, accessory dwelling unit, and a guest cottage. Any foreseeable development to occur within the proposed parcels will conform with all applicable Napa County Code including but not limited to the Viewshed Protection Program and the Conservation Regulations. Construction-phase pollutants to neighboring residences would be reduced to a less than significant level by the above-noted standard Condition of Approval. The project would not create pollutant concentrations or objectionable odors affecting a substantial number of people. Impacts would be less than significant.

Significance Level: Less than significant impact.

Mitigation Measures: None required.

4. BIOLOGICAL RESOURCES:

Would the project:

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 U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service?

Discussion: A Biological Resources Assessment of the subject property dated August, 2025 (**Exhibit B**), was prepared by Madrone Ecological Consulting, to determine if any biological resources were potentially present including the potential presence of special-status plant and wildlife species, sensitive natural communities, and wetland riparian areas.

Madrone Ecological Consulting had six (6) biologists conduct ten (10) field surveys, to assess vegetation and wildlife communities within the project site. Surveys incorporated into this report included an aquatic resources delineation, special-status plants survey, protocol-level California red-legged frog & foothill yellow-legged frog, a California spotted owl habitat assessment, an arborist survey near potential building envelopes, and bat roosting habitat surveys near potential building envelopes. The report also utilizes literature review of the California Natural Diversity Database, USFWS Information for Planning & Conservation, California Native Plant Society Rare and Endangered Plant Inventory, and Western Bat Working Group, to develop a list of all special status-species.

The study area is located within the Redwood Creek Watershed, within the Mayacamas Mountains, which run along the western edge of Napa County. The study area consists of actively cultivated vineyards on steeply rolling hills, interspersed primarily with Annual Brome Grasslands, Coast Live Oak Woodlands, and smaller components of other terrestrial vegetation communities. Mount Veeder Road runs along the eastern edge of the study area, where Pickle Creek runs along a majority of the road. A majority of Pickle Canyon Creek runs through White Alder Riparian Woodland with Coast Redwood Forest bordering several reaches and spreading up the steep east-facing hillside. Multiple intermittent drainages run through the study area, where segments of the drainage are bordered by Willow Riparian Scrub. The occasional clearing in the Coast Live Oak Woodland also supports isolated patches of disturbed chapparal and in some segments, is found to support Coyote Bush Scrub. Some portions of the annual brome grasslands have become dominated by the perennial bunchgrass Harding grass and have been mapped as Harding Grass Grasslands. Elevations within the Study Area range from approximately 420 feet in the southeastern corner along Mount Veeder Road to 1,100 feet on hilltops in the northern portion of the Study Area.

The report concluded that there are thirteen (13) varietals of special-status plant species with suitable habitat on-site. These species included Napa False Indigo, Bent-Flowered Fiddleneck, Big-Scale Balsamroot, Streamside Daisy, Congested-Head Hayfield Tarweed, Thin-Lobed Horkelia, Jepson's Leptosiphon, Cobb Mountain Lupine, Mount Diablo Cottonweed, Sanford's Arrowhead, Napa Bluecurls, Two Fork Clover, and Oval Leaved Viburnum. While the suitable habitats for the thirteen (13) special-

status plant species are found on site, the species were absent at the time the Special-Status Plant Survey was conducted.

As a result of no special-status plant species being present on-site, the project is not expected to impact special-status plant species, however, to prevent any significant impacts to any future presence of special-status species, the project shall implement mitigation measure **BIO-1**. Mitigation measure **BIO-1** ensures that if any future earth disturbing or construction activities were to commence after May 2027, another round of special-status plant surveys shall be required to be conducted in all existing suitable habitats. In the case where special-status plant species later appear as present and cannot be avoided, the applicant and a Qualified Botanist shall, in coordination/consultation with the County, California Department of Fish & Wildlife (CDFW) or United States Fish & Wildlife Services (USFWS), as appropriate depending on species status, develop and implement a site-specific mitigation strategy to compensate for loss of occupied habitat or individuals according to CDFW and USFWS guidelines.

The report included an assessment of the sixteen (16) special-status wildlife with potential to occur within the Study Area. The list included four (4) invertebrates (Crotch's bumble bee, Western bumble bee, Monarch butterfly, & California freshwater shrimp), two (2) fish (Southern coastal roach & Steelhead), three (3) amphibians (California giant salamander, Foothill yellow-legged frog, & California red-legged frog), one (1) reptile (Northwestern pond turtle), two (2) birds (Sharp-shinned hawk & Northern spotted owl), and four (4) mammals (Pallid bat, Townsend's big-eared bat, Fringed myotis, & Long-legged myotis). Amongst the sixteen (16) species identified with the potential to occur, only three (3) species (Steel Head, Foothill yellow-legged frog, & Northwestern pond turtle) were present on-site. As a result of the surveys conducted, to mitigate any potential impacts to the sixteen (16) special-status wildlife species including the three (3) special-status wildlife species present on-site, the project shall consider the implementation of the following mitigation measures BIO-2 through BIO-10 in order to prevent any significant impacts to any future presence of special-status species.

Through implementation of mitigation measure **BIO-2**, any future earth disturbing or construction activities with potential impacts to Western bumble bee and Crotch's bumble bee could be mitigated to less than significant by scheduling initial ground disturbing activities between September 1 to March 31, so that impacts to colonies during the active period, are minimized to the maximum extent feasible. If initial ground disturbing activities outside of the recommended dates are to take place, then a qualified biologist shall conduct preconstruction surveys, at least 14 days prior to construction. If special-status bumble bees are confirmed and avoidance is not feasible, the applicant shall obtain an incidental take permit from CDFW prior to issuance of construction-related permits and shall implement all permit conditions.

All future earth disturbing or construction activity impacts to the Monarch Butterfly are to be mitigated through mitigation measure **BIO-3**, which will schedule ground disturbance within annual brome grassland between October to mid-March. If ground disturbance is not possible within the scheduled dates, a qualified biologist shall conduct a survey a minimum of 15 days prior to construction. In the case eggs, caterpillars or chrysalises are found, the plants shall be avoided with a 50-foot buffer until metamorphosis is completed and adult butterflies emerge and voluntarily leave the host plant. If the eggs, larvae, or chrysalises cannot be avoided, all eggs, larvae, and chrysalises, including the portion of the plant to which they are attached, will be translocated to an alternative location.

When assessing potential impacts to the California Freshwater Shrimp, the potential impacts also extend to the two (2) fish species (Central California Coast Steelhead & Southern Coastal Roach). Although no California Freshwater Shrimp or Southern Coastal Roach were identified during field surveys, habitat does exist onsite. Central Coast Steelhead were surveyed in Pickle Canyon Creek during the May 2025 survey. While the intermittent tributaries to Pickle Canyon Creek do not have appropriate substrate for spawning and their intermittent nature renders them unsuitable for rearing habitat, it is possible that steelhead could swim into these drainages occasionally. Due to Pickle Canyon Creek and intermittent tributaries providing potential and existing habitat running along the eastern edge of the project, adjacent to Mount Veeder Road, the potential impacts to these species will be mitigated through **BIO-4** for all future earth disturbing or construction activities. The mitigation measure shall require that a Stormwater Pollution Prevention Plan (SWPPP) is prepared prior to grading, and best management practices shall be implemented as specified by a Certified Professional in Erosion and Sediment Control.

During the biological field surveys conducted, the NWPT and FYLF were found to be present on site, with the existing habitat also demonstrating potential for occurrence of the CGS. On May 28, 2025, Madrone herpetologist Dustin Brown visited the site to conduct a FYLF habitat suitability assessment of Pickle Canyon Creek within the Study Area and documented 47 adult FYLF and hundreds of tadpoles in the creek, with all reaches of Pickle Canyon Creek within the Study Area identified as suitable habitat. Redwood Creek, while inaccessible during the survey, was presumed to support suitable habitat as well. In each of the two (2) field surveys conducted within the agricultural ponds on May 29, 2025, several NWPT were identified, with additional suitable habitat found within intermittent and perennial creeks, along with suitable upland habitat in the adjacent uplands. Mitigation measure **BIO-5** shall require a qualified biologist to conduct a survey every day prior to the start of construction for any future earth disturbing or construction activities. The survey shall target California giant salamander (CGS), Northwestern pond turtle (NWPT), Foothill yellow-legged frog (FYLF), and any other non-avian special-status species. In the event that the targeted species are identified, the qualified biologist shall relocate them outside the proposed impact area prior to the commencement of construction for the day.

Additionally, prior to earth disturbing or construction activities, mitigation measure **BIO-6** shall require pre-construction surveys for the GCS and NWPT within any Coast Live Oak Woodlands in the construction area. In the event that either species is identified on-site, the qualified biologist shall relocate the species outside of the proposed impact area prior to construction, and if a NWPT nest is observed within the proposed impact area, the nest shall be fenced off with an adequate buffer as determined by a qualified biologist and avoided until the eggs hatch. A qualified biologist shall monitor to ensure that hatchlings do not disperse into the construction area.

To mitigate potential impacts to the Northern Spotted Owl (NSO), raptors, and nesting birds, all future earth disturbing or construction activities shall implement mitigation measure **BIO-7**. The mitigation measure shall be implemented if construction activities are proposed to occur within the typical bird nesting season from February 15 to September 1. In the event that construction activities are not feasible outside of the nesting season, a qualified biologist shall prepare a targeted NSO survey and a pre-construction survey for nesting birds. The NSO survey shall be conducted within all accessible areas located ¼ mile of the proposed construction area and no more than 14 days prior to construction. If the surveys identify any NSO nests to be present, construction shall cease until a qualified biologist determines that the young have fledged. Work within the nesting locations if unavoidable shall be coordinated with the USFWS and CDFW. Pre-construction nesting bird surveys shall be conducted by a qualified biologist within the proposed construction area, along with a 500-foot radius of from a future proposed area of disturbance, no more than seven (7) days prior to construction. If construction is prolonged for more than two (2) weeks, additional surveys shall be conducted prior to the resumption of construction. If active raptor nests are identified, no construction shall occur within 500 feet until the young have fledged. If active songbird nests are identified, a 100-foot no-disturbance buffer shall be established, until the nesting birds have been confirmed to have fledged or the nesting season has been confirmed to have ended. A summary report of the surveys is to be submitted to the County within 30 days of completion.

Due to the potential of occurrence of the Pallid Bat, Townsend's Big-Eared Bat, Fringed Myotis, and Long-Legged Myotis within the project site, mitigation measure **BIO-8** shall implement a pre-construction survey for all future earth disturbing or construction activities. The proposed survey shall be conducted during the active season (April through October, or January through March) to determine the presence of roosting bats. A two-step tree removal method shall be utilized under the supervision of a qualified biologist. The two-step tree removal involves removal of all branches of the tree that do not provide roosting habitat on the first day, and then the next day cutting down the remaining portion of the tree. Additionally, any potentially proposed permitted tree removal or demolition of a structure shall be conducted between January through March, so that impacts are avoided to the maximum extent feasible.

Additionally mitigation measures **BIO-9** & **BIO-10** shall be implemented prior to all future earth disturbing or construction activities. The applicant shall conduct a Workers Environmental Awareness Training (WEAT), and retain a qualified biologist and arborist. Although the land division itself does not propose any tree removal, it does propose a conceptual building envelope to impact 0.1 acre of Coast Live Oak Woodland, which is less than 0.01% of the total vegetation canopy cover currently present within proposed parcel C. No other trees are proposed for canopy disturbance, and the entitlement of this Tentative Parcel Map does not include the removal of tree canopy. The scope of the project, including the land division and any foreseeable developments, shall not have substantial adverse effects on the observed species, or any species with potential to occur on-site with incorporation of mitigation measures **BIO-9** through **BIO-10**.

Significance Level: Less Than Significant with Mitigation Incorporation.

Mitigation Measures: Provided below;

Mitigation Measure BIO-1 (Pre-Construction Special-Status Plant Surveys): If all future earth disturbing or construction activities do not commence prior to May 1st, 2027, an additional round of special-status plant surveys shall be conducted within all areas proposed for impact prior to construction. Surveys shall be conducted in accordance with the Guidelines for Conducting and Reporting Botanical Inventories for Federally Listed, Proposed, and Candidate Plants (USFWS 2000), the California Native Plant Society Botanical Survey Guidelines (CNPS 2001), and Protocols for Surveying and Evaluating Impacts to Special Status Native Plant Populations and Natural Communities (CDFW 2018). These protocols require that surveys be conducted during appropriate seasonal windows when target species are in bloom.

If no special-status plant species are identified during surveys, no further mitigation is required. If special-status plant species are identified and cannot be avoided, the applicant shall retain a Qualified Botanist to consult with the County and coordinate with the California Department of Fish and Wildlife (CDFW) or U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service (USFWS), as appropriate based on listing status, to develop and implement a site-specific mitigation plan. The mitigation plan shall be designed to compensate for any future potential loss of occupied habitat or individual plants in accordance with applicable CDFW and USFWS guidelines.

Method of Monitoring: The above measures shall be incorporated as Conditions of Approval of the project (if approved) and apply to associated building and grading permits with survey recommendations to be implemented in conjunction with all construction activities.

Mitigation Measure BIO-2 (Special-Status Bumble Bee Surveys, Seasonal Work Timing, and Avoidance): If potential habitat for Crotch's or western bumble bees is present within the project site

then all future earth disturbing or construction activities, shall be scheduled between September 1st and March 31st, if feasible, to avoid impacts during the colony active period.

If completion of all initial ground-disturbing work between September 1st and March 31st is not feasible, a senior biologist with at least ten (10) years of experience conducting biological resource surveys in California shall conduct a pre-construction survey for special-status bumble bees within the proposed impact area no more than 14 days prior to construction. Surveys shall be conducted between one hour after sunrise and two hours before sunset under suitable weather conditions, including temperatures between 65°F and 90°F, low wind, and no precipitation. If weather conditions do not allow surveys within this range, the biologist shall use the National Weather Service seven-day forecast to select the most suitable survey day and conduct surveys during the portion of the day that most closely approximates the required temperature range.

Survey effort shall be proportional to habitat availability and shall include a minimum of one person-hour per three acres of suitable floral resources. A meandering pedestrian survey shall be conducted throughout the impact area to identify patches of suitable floral resources. Suitable floral resources for Crotch's bumble bee include species in the families Apocynaceae, Asteraceae, Boraginaceae, Fabaceae, and Lamiaceae. Suitable floral resources for western bumble bee include species in the families Asteraceae, Fabaceae, Rhamnaceae, and Rosaceae, as well as species in the genera Eriogonum and Penstemon.

Pre-construction surveys shall include, at a minimum, searches for foraging bumble bees within floral resource areas, observation of bee flight paths to identify potential nest locations, and visual inspection of burrows, cavities, logs, and other suitable nesting substrates. If vegetation obstructs nest detection, limited hand removal, line trimming, or mowing to a height of no less than four (4) inches may be conducted to facilitate survey visibility. Surveys shall also include observations of concentrated bee activity, listening for colony humming, and photographing individuals when present for species identification.

The biologist shall document survey dates and conditions, habitat and floral resource descriptions, observed bumble bee activity, species observed, any vegetation modification conducted for survey purposes, and an assessment of whether a nest may be present or whether construction could result in take. A written report shall be submitted to the County prior to commencement of construction activities.

If no bumble bees are detected, or if all observed individuals are definitively identified as common species, no further mitigation or coordination with the California Department of Fish and Wildlife (CDFW) shall be required.

If evidence of a bumble bee nest is observed and the species cannot be confirmed as non–special-status, construction shall not proceed until either the individuals are confirmed by a qualified taxonomist as non–special-status species or coordination with CDFW is completed to determine appropriate mitigation. Such mitigation may include delaying construction until the end of the active season, establishing protective buffers, or obtaining an Incidental Take Permit (ITP) from CDFW.

Pre-construction surveys conducted in the year prior to construction are recommended, but not required, to reduce the potential for delays associated with late detection of special-status bumble bees. These surveys shall follow the same protocol described above.

If special-status bumble bees are confirmed and avoidance is not feasible, the applicant shall obtain an ITP from CDFW prior to issuance of construction-related permits and shall implement all permit conditions. Mitigation measures may include translocation of nesting substrate consistent with current scientific guidance, enhancement of on-site habitat, worker environmental awareness training, and any additional measures required by CDFW.

Method of Monitoring: The above measures shall be incorporated as Conditions of Approval of the project (if approved) and apply to associated building and grading permits with survey recommendations to be implemented in conjunction with all construction activities.

Mitigation Measure BIO-3 (Monarch Butterfly and Milkweed Host Plant Surveys and Protection): If future earth disturbing or construction activities ground disturbance occurs within annual brome grassland during the time when milkweed plants may host monarch eggs or caterpillars (approximately mid-March through late September), a pre-construction survey shall be conducted by a qualified biologist who is knowledgeable and experienced in the biology, life stages, natural history, and identification of local fish and wildlife resources at the Project Site (Qualified Biologist) no earlier than 15 days prior to construction within the proposed impact area and a 50-foot buffer in accessible areas. The biologist shall comprehensively search the Survey Area for milkweed plants, and all milkweed plants found shall be surveyed for monarch eggs, larvae (i.e., caterpillars), and chrysalises. Additionally, other plants immediately adjacent to milkweed plants shall also be searched for chrysalises. If no eggs, caterpillars, or chrysalises are detected, no additional mitigation measures are necessary. Survey results shall be provided to the County within 15 days of completion of all surveys, and prior to commencement of ground disturbance.

If eggs, caterpillars or chrysalises are found, the plants shall be avoided with a 50-foot buffer until metamorphosis is completed and adult butterflies emerge and voluntarily leave the host plant. If the eggs, larvae, or chrysalises cannot be avoided, all eggs, larvae, and chrysalises, including the portion of the plant to which they are attached, will be translocated to an alternative location. That location must be a minimum of 50 feet outside of the impact area and contain a similarly sized or

larger population of larval host plants. The portions of the plants supporting eggs or chrysalises shall be tied to the live stem of the avoided larval host plant while caterpillars will be placed directly on a stem or leaf of a larval host plant. Should the species be listed under FESA in the future, coordination with USFWS shall be conducted prior to translocation.

Method of Monitoring: The above measures shall be incorporated as Conditions of Approval of the project (if approved) and apply to associated building and grading permits with survey recommendations to be implemented in conjunction with all construction activities

Mitigation Measure BIO-4 (SWPPP Implementation and Water Quality Protection): Future work across the street from Pickle Canyon Creek could result in water quality impacts if appropriate runoff, erosion, and sediment control Best Management Practices (BMPs) are not implemented. Therefore, the applicant shall prepare a Stormwater Pollution Protection Plan (SWPPP) for future projects prior to issuance of the grading permit, and implement the SWPPP during construction. Examples of BMPs that may be specified by the Certified Professional in Erosion and Sediment Control (CPESC) that prepares the SWPPP include silt fencing between any areas of ground disturbance and Pickle Canyon Creek and tributaries to Pickle Canyon Creek, straw wattles or straw bales around drop inlets, compaction and hydroseeding of bare soil following construction, and locating concrete washouts, refueling areas, and materials storage, etc. a minimum of 200 feet from Pickle Canyon Creek.

Method of Monitoring: The above measures shall be incorporated as Conditions of Approval of the project (if approved) and apply to associated building and grading permits with survey recommendations to be implemented in conjunction with all construction activities.

Mitigation Measure BIO-5 (Daily Pre-Construction Non-Avian Special-Status Species Surveys): All future projects shall conduct a survey prior to construction each day, a qualified biologist or personnel trained by a qualified biologist shall conduct the survey of all areas proposed for impact that day, including areas where vehicles will be driving. The survey shall target California giant salamander, northwestern pond turtle, foothill yellow-legged frog, and any other non-avian special-status species. The survey shall include looking into and under debris as well as any remaining logs, bark, and other items that wildlife could be sheltering in or under. If no special-status species are found, construction may commence.

If non-avian special-status wildlife species are observed within the proposed impact area, a qualified biologist (who has any required permits to do so) shall relocate the individual to suitable habitat outside of the proposed impact area prior to construction commencement for the day. The applicant may choose to install silt fence around the entire perimeter of the construction area to minimize encroachment of special-status species individuals within the construction area.

Method of Monitoring: The above measures shall be incorporated as Conditions of Approval of the project (if approved) and apply to associated building and grading permits with survey recommendations to be implemented in conjunction with all construction activities.

Mitigation Measure BIO-6 (Pre-Construction Surveys for California Giant Salamander and Northwestern Pond Turtle): For all future earth disturbing or construction activities, a pre-construction survey for the California giant salamander and northwestern pond turtle shall be conducted within any Coast Live Oak Woodlands within any future construction area within 48 hours prior to construction. This pre-construction survey shall include looking under logs, bark, rocks, and other debris within the habitat areas. If no California giant salamander and northwestern pond turtle or their nests are found, no further mitigation is necessary.

If either of the species is observed within the proposed impact area, a qualified biologist shall relocate the individual to suitable habitat outside of the proposed impact area prior to construction. If a northwestern pond turtle nest is observed within the proposed impact area, the nest shall be fenced off with an adequate buffer as determined by a qualified biologist and avoided until the eggs hatch. A qualified biologist shall monitor to ensure that hatchlings do not disperse into the construction area. Relocation of hatchlings will occur as stipulated above, if necessary.

Method of Monitoring: The above measures shall be incorporated as Conditions of Approval of the project (if approved) and apply to associated building and grading permits with survey recommendations to be implemented in conjunction with all construction activities.

Mitigation Measure BIO-7 (Pre-Construction Nesting Bird and Northern Spotted Owl Surveys and Avoidance Buffers): The following nest survey requirements shall apply if future projects anticipate construction activities are to occur during the typical bird breeding season (approximately February 15 through September 1).

A targeted northern spotted owl survey shall be conducted within all accessible areas located within ¼ mile of the proposed construction area no more than 14 days prior to construction. If active northern spotted owl nests are identified within ¼ mile, construction within that buffer area shall cease until a qualified biologist determines that the young have fledged or that the nesting attempt has failed. If work within the buffer is requested, the applicant shall consult with the County to determine whether the buffer may be reduced, and the County may coordinate with the U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service (USFWS) and California Department of Fish and Wildlife (CDFW) as needed to determine appropriate buffer adjustments and any required monitoring.

A pre-construction nesting bird survey shall also be conducted by a qualified biologist within the proposed construction area and within a 500-foot radius of accessible areas no more than seven days prior to construction. If construction is interrupted for more than two weeks, additional surveys shall be completed prior to resumption. If active raptor nests are identified, no construction shall

occur within 500 feet until the young have fledged. If active songbird nests are identified, a 100-foot no-disturbance buffer shall be established. These buffers may be reduced if approved by the County based on species biology, existing disturbance levels, and site-specific conditions such as visual or acoustic screening. The qualified biologist shall determine when nesting is complete, either through direct monitoring or by confirming the end of the breeding season.

A summary report of all nesting bird surveys, including northern spotted owl surveys, shall be submitted to the County within 30 days of survey completion and shall remain valid for one construction season. If no active nests are found, no further mitigation is required.

If construction activities result in disturbance behaviors indicative of nest stress, including alarm calls, defensive flights, flushing from nests, or abandonment of brooding behavior, the buffer shall be expanded until such behaviors cease. The buffer shall remain in place until chicks have fledged or as otherwise determined by the qualified biologist in consultation with the County. Construction may resume within the buffer only after a follow-up survey confirms that the nest is no longer active and no new nests are present.

Method of Monitoring: The above measures shall be incorporated as Conditions of Approval of the project (if approved) and apply to associated building and grading permits with survey recommendations to be implemented in conjunction with all construction activities.

Mitigation Measure BIO-8 (Pre-Construction Bat Roosting Habitat Surveys): For all future earth disturbing or construction activities, a qualified biologist shall survey the potential bat roosting habitat identified in the northern Impact Area for all future earth disturbing or construction activities during the active season (generally April through October or from January through March on days with temperatures in excess of 50 degrees F) to determine presence of roosting bats. These surveys are recommended to be conducted utilizing methods that are considered acceptable by CDFW and bat experts. Methods may include evening emergence surveys, acoustic surveys, inspecting potential roosting habitat with fiberoptic cameras or a combination thereof.

If roosting bats are identified, or if presence is assumed, the trees shall be removed outside of pup season only on days with temperatures in excess of 50 degrees F. Pup season is generally during the months of May through August. Two-step tree removal shall be utilized under the supervision of the qualified biologist. Two-step tree removal involves removal of all branches of the tree that do not provide roosting habitat on the first day, and then the next day cutting down the remaining portion of the tree. Additionally, it is recommended that all other tree removal and/or structure demolition be conducted from January through March on days with temperatures in excess of 50 degrees F to avoid potential impacts to foliage-roosting bat species.

Method of Monitoring: The above measures shall be incorporated as Conditions of Approval of the project (if approved) and apply to associated building and grading permits with survey recommendations to be implemented in conjunction with all construction activities.

Mitigation Measure BIO-9 (Arborist Evaluation and Implementation of Tree Protection Measures): There are no trees within the Impact Areas and therefore none will be removed by the Project. The applicant shall retain an arborist at the time of construction to review the final construction plans and determine if any best management practices would be required to avoid impacts to adjacent avoided trees such as protective fencing or root pruning. These best management practices shall be implemented during construction.

Method of Monitoring: The above measures shall be incorporated as Conditions of Approval of the project (if approved) and apply to associated building and grading permits with survey recommendations to be implemented in conjunction with all construction activities.

Mitigation Measure BIO-10 (Environmental Awareness Training and Sensitive Habitat Avoidance Requirements): Prior to all future earth disturbing or construction activities, a Worker Environmental Awareness Training (WEAT) shall be prepared and administered to the construction crews. The WEAT will include the following: discussion of the state and federal Endangered Species Act, the Clean Water Act, the Project's permits and CEQA documentation, and associated mitigation measures; consequences and penalties for violation or noncompliance with these laws and regulations; identification of special-status wildlife, hazardous substance spill prevention and containment measures; and the contact person in the event of the discovery of a special-status wildlife species. The WEAT will also discuss the different habitats used by the species' different life stages and the annual timing of these life stages. A handout summarizing the WEAT information shall be provided to workers to keep on-site for future reference. Upon completion of the WEAT training, workers will sign a form stating that they attended the training, understand the information presented and will comply with the regulations discussed. Workers will be shown designated "avoidance areas" during the WEAT training; worker access should be restricted to outside of those areas to minimize the potential for inadvertent environmental impacts. Fencing and signage around the boundary of avoidance areas may be helpful.

Method of Monitoring: The above measures shall be incorporated as Conditions of Approval of the project (if approved) and apply to associated building and grading permits with survey recommendations to be implemented in conjunction with all construction activities.

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?

Discussion: See response to subsection 4(a) above.

Significance Level: Less than significant with mitigations incorporated.

Mitigation Measures: See mitigation measures **BIO-4** through **BIO-6** within subsection 4(a).

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?

Discussion: No direct impacts to state or federally protected wetlands are anticipated as part of the Project. Pickle Canyon Creek and associated drainage features adjacent to the Project area are not considered state or federally protected wetlands, therefore the project would result in no impacts.

Significance Level: No impact.

Mitigation Measures: None required.

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?

Discussion: The Project site and surrounding habitats may support movement, foraging, nesting, and dispersal opportunities for native resident and migratory wildlife species, including birds, bats, amphibians, reptiles, and other special-status wildlife species. There are sixteen (16) special-status species with the potential to occur, and seven (7) of the special-status species have high potential to occur within the project site. Construction activities such as grading, vegetation removal, increased noise, vehicle traffic, and human presence could temporarily disturb wildlife movement and breeding or nursery activities within and adjacent to the Project area. To minimize the potential impacts towards the special-status plant species, mitigation measures are warranted and incorporated into the project.

Potential impacts include disturbance to nesting birds and raptors, temporary displacement of wildlife species, disruption of bat roosting activities, and impacts to amphibians and reptiles utilizing nearby woodland and aquatic habitats. The project scope which solely consists of a land division, would not directly cause impacts, however the land division would cause for an increase in foreseeable development among the project site. All foreseeable development would be required to be in compliance with Napa County Code & Regulations, ensuring that all future developments be an allowed land use in the Agricultural Watershed zoning district, follow the conservation regulations, and the viewshed protection program. Therefore, while the land division does increase the amount of development allowed within the project site, the land division itself would only establish new property lines for new parcels, and does not include any construction or earth moving activities.

Implementation of Mitigation Measures **BIO-2, BIO-3, BIO-5, BIO-6, BIO-7, BIO-8, & BIO-10**, would reduce potential impacts to wildlife movement and potential special-status plant species sites to a less-than-significant level. These measures include pre-construction surveys for California Giant

Salamander, Northwestern Pond Turtle, Monarch Butterfly, Crotch's and Western Bumble Bee; daily biological monitoring during construction; relocation of special-status wildlife by qualified biologists if encountered; nesting bird and northern spotted owl surveys with establishment of no-disturbance buffers; bat roost surveys and seasonal tree removal restrictions; and Worker Environmental Awareness Training (WEAT) for construction personnel. These measures would minimize disturbance to wildlife movement, nesting, roosting, and dispersal activities during any potential future construction activities.

The Napa County Baseline Data Report emphasizes preservation of wildlife corridors and prevention of habitat fragmentation. According to the Napa County of Environmental Mapping (GIS CNDDB layer) and the Biological Resources Assessment (Madrona Ecological Consulting, August, 2025, **Exhibit B**), there are riparian wildlife corridors on the parcel. With mitigation measures incorporated the project activities would not interfere with the movement of any native resident or migratory fish or wildlife species or with their corridors or nursery sites. The study area is currently partially developed with 95.8 acres of actively farmed vineyards surrounding the project area. The proposed project only proposes a land division, to establish 3 new parcels but all foreseeable developments/improvements would occur within the project study areas. As such, the proposed project would result in a less than significant impact with mitigations incorporated on wildlife movement.

Significance Level: Less than significant impact with mitigations incorporated.

Mitigation Measures: See mitigation measures **BIO-2, BIO-3, BIO-5, BIO-6, BIO-7, BIO-8, & BIO-10** within subsection 4(a).

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

Discussion: Because the project parcel is located within an AW zoning district, future projects which propose to remove vegetation will be subject to the vegetation canopy cover retention and removal mitigation requirements of Napa County's Conservation Regulations (NCC 18.108.020). This section requires 70% retention of the vegetation canopy cover on the parcel (or contiguous parcels under common ownership), and that any vegetation canopy cover removed as part of the project be mitigated at a 3:1 ratio (by acreage) via preservation or restoration, and permanently preserved through deed restriction or other means acceptable to the County. Vegetation canopy cover subject to NCC Section 18.108.020 is defined as "the biotic communities classified as oak woodland, riparian oak woodland, or coniferous forest based on the current Manual of California Vegetation (MCV) and as described in the Napa County Baseline Data Report (2005 or as amended)." As discussed above, the project is a land division, and approval would not result in entitlements that would result in the removal of any trees or oak woodland. Additionally, the project proposes a conceptual building envelope to impact 0.1 acre of Coast Live Oak Woodland, which is less than 0.01% of the total

vegetation canopy cover currently present within proposed parcel C. No other trees are proposed for canopy disturbance.

Significance Level: Less than significant Impact.

Mitigation Measures: None Required.

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?

Discussion: The Project site is not located within the boundaries of an adopted Habitat Conservation Plan (HCP), Natural Community Conservation Plan (NCCP), or other approved local, regional, or state habitat conservation plan. Therefore, implementation of the Project would not conflict with the provisions of any adopted conservation plan. No impacts would occur.

Significance Level: No Impact.

Mitigation Measures: None required.

5. CULTURAL RESOURCES:

Would the project:

a) Cause a substantial adverse change in the significance of a historical resource pursuant to CEQA Guidelines §15064.5?

Discussion: The project site is currently developed with 95.8-acres of vineyards, two residences (one not in use), a well, septic system, pump house, 10,500 gallon water tank, storage building, an agricultural barn, and two agricultural ponds. To further assess any potential historical resources, permitting research was completed having found its earliest development permits dating March 20, 1972, for a Travel Trailer with a 810-gallon septic tank, and June 20, 1972, for two (2) mobile homes with a 1,200-gallon septic tank. Further permits were later applied and issued for trailer hookups (B-16330), a shed (B-16748), an agricultural barn (B-16747), a storage building (B-18303), one (1) 10,500 water tank (B10-01014), and a pump house (BC21-00734). Research into past uses has not identified historic resources that may be present at the site.

A Cultural Resources Study of the project site was conducted by Eileen Barrow & Associates (EBA) and report prepared, dated May 5, 2026, as part of the application submittal. The report indicated that there were no archaeological, prehistoric or historic-era archaeological sites found within the project site. In

addition, the Napa County Environmental Resource Maps (based on the following layers –Historical sites points & lines, Archaeology sites and flags) do not identify any historical or archaeological resources, sites or unique geological features on the project site. There is no information in the County's files that would indicate that there is potential for occurrence of these resources.

Significance Level: Less than significant impact.

Mitigation Measures: None required.

b) Cause a substantial adverse change in the significance of an archaeological resource pursuant to CEQA Guidelines §15064.5?

Discussion: On May 8, 2026, 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. The Yocha Dehe Wintun Nation responded on May 28, 2026, confirming the project is not within their aboriginal territories, declined to comment on the project, and deferred correspondence to the Mishewal Wappo Tribe. The Middletown Rancheria Tribe responded on June 3, 2026, confirming the project is not within their aboriginal territories, declined to comment on the project, and deferred correspondence to the Mishewal Wappo Tribe. The Mishewal Wappo Tribe of Alexander Valley responded June 30, 2026, confirming that the project is within their aboriginal territories and due to the absence of earth disturbing activities, opted to not conduct consultation on the project. See Section 18 (Tribal Cultural Resources) for further discussion.

However, if archaeological or cultural resources are found during any foreseeable proposed development/improvements of the project, construction of the project is required to cease, and a qualified archaeologist will be retained to investigate the site in accordance with the following standard condition of approval that will be imposed on the project:

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.

Significance Level: Less than significant impact.

Mitigation Measures: None required.

c) Disturb any human remains, including those interred outside of dedicated cemeteries?

Discussion: 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. Impacts would be less than significant.

Significance Level: Less than significant impact.

Mitigation Measures: None required.

6. ENERGY:

Would the project:

a) Result in potentially significant environmental impact due to wasteful, inefficient or unnecessary consumption of energy resources during project construction or operation?

Discussion: The proposed project is a land division and does not include any physical development. Any potential future development on the resulting parcels would comply with Title 24 energy use requirements and would not result in significant environmental impacts due to wasteful, inefficient or unnecessary consumption of energy resources during project construction or operation. Impacts would be less than significant.

Significance Level: Less than significant impact.

Mitigation Measures: None required.

b) Conflict with or obstruct a state or local plan for renewable energy or energy efficiency?

Discussion: 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.

Significance Level: No impact.

Mitigation Measures: None required.

7. GEOLOGY AND SOILS:

Would the project:

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.

Discussion: There are no known active faults that run beneath the project site on the most recent Alquist-Priolo Earthquake Fault Zoning Map. According to Napa County GIS Environmental Maps (Fault layers), the project is over two (2) miles from the nearest Alquist-Priolo Earthquake fault zones (West Napa Fault). Any foreseeable proposed construction, as a result of the proposed land division, will need to comply with standard County building permit policies which require geotechnical reports and appropriate structural design considerations as a part of the building permit application. Geotechnical reports are prepared by a California licensed geotechnical engineer and include recommendations for appropriate setback widths from fault traces that may exist on a property. As such, impacts would be reduced to a less than significant level.

Significance Level: Less than significant impact.

Mitigation Measures: None required.

ii. Strong seismic ground shaking?

Discussion: All areas of the Bay Area are subject to strong seismic ground shaking. Any future structure or improvement constructed as a result of this land division would be required to comply with the latest building standards and codes, including the California Building Code, that would reduce any potential impacts to a less than significant level.

Significance Level: Less than significant impact.

Mitigation Measures: None required.

iii. Seismic-related ground failure, including liquefaction?

Discussion: No subsurface conditions have been identified on the project site that indicated a susceptibility to seismic-related ground failure or liquefaction. 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.

Significance Level: Less than significant impact.

Mitigation Measures: None required.

iv. Landslides?

Discussion: According to the Napa County GIS Environmental Maps (Landslides line, polygon, and geology layers), the project site does have small and large deposit landslides within the project site. While potential for landslide exists, the distance of the landslides is less than significant due to the distance of each respective proposed building envelope and existing residence. Within Parcel A the nearest landslide deposit is approximately 1,100 feet southwest of the existing residence. Parcel B 's nearest landslide deposit is approximately 500 feet to the west of the proposed building envelope. Lastly, the nearest landslide deposit to the building envelope in Parcel C is approximately 800 feet to west of the proposed building envelope. The Tentative Parcel Map does not approve any construction, and all future building and grading permits will require site-specific geotechnical analysis prior to permit issuance which will consider these features and their impacts to future earthmoving and construction activities. Therefore, the landslide deposits will not have significant impacts on either the existing residence or the proposed building envelopes as they are not in close proximity to any landslide deposit along with the project entitlement not incorporating construction or earth moving activities, resulting in the impacts being less than significant.

Significance Level: Less than significant impact.

Mitigation Measures: None required.

b) Result in substantial soil erosion or the loss of topsoil?

Discussion: The proposed project is requesting a land division to establish three (3) parcels. There is the potential for future development of by-right land uses allowed within the AW zoning district. According

to the Madrone Ecological Consulting Biological Resource Assessment (August, 2025) and Napa County GIS Environmental Maps (SSURGO Soil Type, line, polygon, and geology layers), the soils are composed of 109 – Boomer gravelly loam (14 to 60% slopes), 113 – Bressa-Dribble complex (15 to 30% slopes), 133 – Fagan clay loam (30 to 50% slopes), 136 – Felton gravelly loam (30 to 50% slopes), and 157 – Lodo-Maymen-Felton association (30 to 75% slopes).

Soils found on the property from the Boomer gravelly loam (14 to 60 percent slopes) consist of steep soils on foothills and mountain slopes; runoff is rapid to very rapid and erosion hazard is high, Bressa-Dibble complex series (15 to 30 percent slopes) consist of moderately steep soils on uplands and hillsides; runoff is medium to rapid and the erosion hazard is moderate, the Fagan clay loam series (30 to 50 percent slopes) consist of steep clayey soils on uplands and rolling hills; runoff is rapid and the erosion hazard is high, the Felton gravelly loam series (30 to 50 percent slopes) consist of steep gravelly soils on uplands and mountainous terrain; runoff is rapid and the erosion hazard is moderate to high, and the Lodo-Maymen-Felton complex series (30 to 75 percent slopes) consist of very steep, rocky soils on mountainous uplands and dissected terrain; runoff is very rapid and the erosion hazard is high to severe. In the three (3) proposed parcels, the primary soil type is Felton gravelly loam.

All foreseeable future development will be required to be constructed according to plans prepared by a registered civil engineer, which will be reviewed and approved by the County Engineering Division prior to the commencement of any on site land preparation or construction. Grading and drainage improvements shall be constructed according to the current Napa County Road and Street Standards (RSS), Chapter 16.28 of the Napa County Code, and Appendix J of the California Building Code. Prior to issuance of a building or grading permit the owner shall submit the necessary documents for Erosion Control as determined by the area of disturbance of the proposed development in accordance with the Napa Countywide Stormwater Pollution Prevention Program Erosion and Sediment Control Plan Guidance. Engineering Division Conditions of Approval have been included to ensure compliance with the requirements. Impacts would be less than significant.

Significance Level: Less than significant impact.

Mitigation Measures: None required.

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?

Discussion: As discussed above, the proposed project is composed of Bressa-Dibble complex (113), Fagan clay loam (133), Felton gravelly loam (136), and Lodo-Maymen-Felton (157). However, the proposed building envelopes, within proposed parcel A & B, are located within Felton gravelly loam

(136) and proposed parcel C is located within Fagan clay loam (133). Soils from the Felton gravelly loam series consist of well-drained soils on uplands with moderate permeability and slight to moderate erosion hazard depending on slope. Soils from the Fagan clay loam series consist of moderately well-drained soils on rolling uplands with slow to moderate runoff and a slight to moderate erosion hazard.

Prior to issuance of project related grading and building permits, a geotechnical report must be submitted for review and acceptance by the Building Division. Requirements to obtain building permits for new structures and change in occupancy will ensure the project complies with the latest edition of the California Building Code; and that any potential instability related to construction of the project will be addressed so that no on-or off-site landslide, lateral spreading, subsidence, liquefaction or collapse occurs. Additionally, proposed earthwork will be designed in accordance with Engineering Division Conditions of Approval to ensure that grading and construction activities do not create unstable slopes. Erosion control measures would be implemented in accordance with the Napa Countywide Stormwater Pollution Prevention Program which would reduce the impact of stormwater runoff or drainage changes being discharged on or offsite. Thus, potential impacts relating to soil stability will be addressed through appropriate structural design and construction standards and as a result, will be reduced to less than significant.

Significance Level: Less than significant impact.

Mitigation Measures: None required.

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.

Discussion: See response to Subsection 7(c) above.

Significance Level: Less than significant impact.

Mitigation Measures: None required.

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?

Discussion: The Napa County Environmental Health Division has reviewed this application and recommends approval as conditioned. When future development is proposed plans for water and septic systems will be reviewed for compliance with Napa County Code. Impacts are less than significant.

Significance Level: Less than significant impact.

Mitigation Measures: None required.

f) Directly or indirectly destroy a unique paleontological resource or site or unique geologic feature?

Discussion: No paleontological resources or unique geological features have been identified in the project area. Impacts would be less than significant.

Significance Level: Less than significant impact.

Mitigation Measures: None required.

8. GREENHOUSE GAS EMISSIONS:

Background information:

On April 20, 2022, the BAAD adopted updated thresholds of significance for climate impacts (CEQA Thresholds for Evaluating the Significance of Climate Impacts, BAAD April 2022)[4]. The updated thresholds evaluate GHG and climate impacts from land use projects are qualitative and geared toward building and transportation projects. Per the BAAD, 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

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

considered adoption of the proposed CAP. In addition to reducing Napa County's GHG emissions, the proposed plan was intended to address compliance with CEQA for projects reviewed by the County and to lay the foundation for development of a local offset program. While the BOS acknowledged the plan's objectives, the BOS requested that the CAP be revised to better address transportation-related greenhouse gas, to acknowledge and credit past accomplishments and voluntary efforts, and to allow more time for establishment of a cost-effective local offset program. The BOS also requested that best management practices be applied and considered when reviewing projects until a revised CAP is adopted to ensure that projects address the County's policy goal related to reducing GHG emissions. In addition, the BOS recommended utilizing the emissions checklist and associated carbon stock and sequestration factors in the Draft CAP to assess and disclose potential GHG emissions associated with project development and operation pursuant to CEQA.

In July 2015, the County re-commenced preparation of the CAP to: i) account for present day conditions and modeling assumptions (such as but not limited to methods, emission factors, and data sources), ii) address the concerns with the previous CAP effort as outlined above, iii) meet applicable State requirements, and iv) result in a functional and legally defensible CAP. On April 13, 2016, the County, as the part of the first phase of development and preparation of the CAP, released Final Technical Memorandum #1: 2014 Greenhouse Gas Emissions Inventory and Forecast, April 13, 2016. This initial phase included: i) updating the unincorporated County's community-wide GHG emissions inventory to 2014, and ii) preparing new GHG emissions forecasts for the 2020, 2030, and 2050 horizons. On July 24, 2018, the County prepared a Notice of Preparation of a Draft Focused EIR for the Climate Action Plan. The review period was from July 24, 2018, through August 22, 2018. The Draft Focused EIR for the CAP was published May 9, 2019. Additional information on the County CAP can be obtained at the Napa County Department of Planning, Building and Environmental Services or online at https://www.countyofnapa.org/589/Planning-Building-Environmental-Services. The County's draft CAP was placed on hold, when the Climate Action Committee (CAC) began meeting on regional GHG reduction strategies in 2019. The County is currently preparing an updated CAP to provide a clear framework to determine what land use actions will be necessary to meet the State's adopted GHG reduction goals, including a quantitative and measurable strategy for achieving net zero emissions by 2045.

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

in this Initial Study reasonably reflect proposed conditions and therefore are considered appropriate and adequate for project impact assessment.

Regarding operational emissions, as part of the statewide implementation of Senate Bill (SB) 743, the Governor's Office of Planning and Research (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.

Would the project:

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?

Discussion: 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.

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

GHGs are the atmospheric gases whose absorption of solar radiation is responsible for the greenhouse effect, including carbon dioxide (CO2), methane, ozone, and the fluorocarbons, which contribute to climate change. CO2 is the principal GHG emitted by human activities, and its concentration in the atmosphere is most affected by human activity. It also serves as the reference gas to which to compare other GHGs. For the purposes of this analysis potential GHG emissions associated with winery 'construction' and 'development' and with 'ongoing' winery operations have been discussed.

GHG emissions from any potential construction as a direct result of the land division represents a very small portion of a project's lifetime GHG emissions. While the project does not include a One-time "Construction Emissions" due to the requested project entitlements only involving a subdivision, the any future foreseeable One time "Construction Emissions" associated with the project would 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).

There are no physical improvements associated with this project. One time "Construction Emissions" associated with a future project such as a single-family home may include: emissions associated with the energy used to develop and prepare the project area, construction, and construction equipment and worker vehicle trips (hereinafter referred to as equipment emissions). These emissions also include underground carbon stocks (or soil carbon) associated with any existing vegetation that is proposed to be removed. As previously stated, this project is a division of land. Any future project would likely consist of the construction of a single-family home, accessory structures, and associated physical improvements, on each parcel. As discussed in Section III. (Air Quality), construction emissions would have a temporary effect, and BAAD recommends incorporating feasible control measures as a means of addressing construction impacts. If the future development adheres to relevant best management

practices identified by the BAAD and the County's standard Conditions of Approval, foreseeable construction-related impacts are considered less than significant. See Section III. (Air Quality) for additional information.

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 foreseeable development consists of one (1) new single-family residence, one (1) accessory dwelling unit, and one (1) guest cottage, may occur on each parcel established through the land division at full buildout. The potential dwelling units were compared to the BAAQMD's GHG screening criteria of 53 dwelling units. Since the 53 dwelling units would produce 975 MT of CO2e/yr GHG, it is clear that the nine (9) potential dwelling units would not exceed the 1,100 MT of CO2e/yr GHG threshold of significance.

The existing project parcel currently has two (2) residences developed on site, however the proposed land division would allow for each new parcel to have one (1) single-family residence, accessory dwelling units, and (1) guest cottage at full build out. The existing project parcel would allow a total of nine (9) total dwelling units through the proposed land division, which has been evaluated against the BAAQMD's GHG screening criteria of 53 dwelling units producing 975 MT/yr of CO2e. Therefore, the proposed project has been assessed with the BAAQMD thresholds and determined that the project would not exceed the 1,100 MT/yr of CO2e. As indicated above, the County is currently preparing a CAP and as the part of the first phase of development and preparation of the CAP has released Final Technical Memorandum #1 (2014 Greenhouse Gas Emissions Inventory and Forecast, April 13, 2016). Table 1 of the Technical Memorandum indicates that 2% of the County's GHG emissions in 2014 were a result of land use change. The increase in emissions expected as a result of any future project would be relatively modest, and the project is in compliance with the County's efforts to reduce emissions as described above.

Significance Level: Less than significant impact.

Mitigation Measures: None required.

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: See response to Subsection 8(a) above.

Significance Level: Less than significant impact.

Mitigation Measures: None required.

9. HAZARDS AND HAZARDOUS MATERIALS:

Would the project:

a) Create a significant hazard to the public or the environment through the routine transport, use, or disposal of hazardous materials?

Discussion: Approval of the land division, in and of itself, will not involve routine transport, use, or disposal of hazardous materials. The land division itself does however allow for the development of residential dwellings and their associated accessory structures, which could include limited quantities of miscellaneous hazardous substances, such as gasoline, diesel fuel, hydraulic fluid, solvents, oils, etc., used to maintain vehicles and motorized equipment during the construction-related activities. Standard conditions associated with grading and building operations would be issued with permits to decrease the hazard to a less than significant impact. Small quantities of publicly available hazardous materials, such as paint or maintenance supplies, may be routinely used within the project site for residential or agricultural maintenance and cleaning. These materials would not be used in sufficient strength or quantity to create a substantial risk to the public or environment.

Significance Level: Less than significant impact.

Mitigation Measures: None required.

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?

Discussion: Hazardous materials such as diesel, maintenance fluids, and paints would be used onsite during construction. Should they be stored onsite, these materials would be stored in secure locations to reduce the potential for upset or accident conditions. The proposed project is a division of land with no physical improvements proposed. Any future construction would likely consist of road improvements to serve a new single-family home and accessory dwelling units which would not be expected to use any substantial quantities of hazardous materials. Therefore, it would not be reasonably foreseeable for the proposed project to create upset or accident conditions that involve the release of hazardous materials into the environment. Impacts would be less than significant.

Significance Level: Less than significant impact.

Mitigation Measures: None required.

c) Emit hazardous emissions or handle hazardous or acutely hazardous materials, substances, or waste within one-quarter mile of an existing or proposed school?

Discussion: There are no schools located within one-quarter mile from the proposed winery buildings. According to Napa County GIS Map (School Layers), the nearest school to the project site (St Helena Unified – La Sagrada Familia Catholic International Home School Academy) is over two (2) miles southeast of the project site in unincorporated Napa County. No impacts would occur.

Significance Level: No impact.

Mitigation Measures: None required.

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?

Discussion: Based on a search of the California Department of Toxic Substances Control database, the project site does not contain any known EPA National Priority List sites, State response sites, voluntary cleanup sites, or any school cleanup sites. No impact would occur as the project site is not on any known list of hazardous materials sites.

Significance Level: No impact.

Mitigation Measures: None required.

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?

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

Significance Level: No impact.

Mitigation Measures: None required.

f) Impair implementation of or physically interfere with an adopted emergency response plan or emergency evacuation plan?

Discussion: The Napa County Emergency Operations Plan (EOP) outlines procedures, including establishing leadership roles and responsibilities of various agency staff, that guide local preparedness, response, recovery, and resource management efforts associated with occurrence of a natural disaster,

significant emergency, or other threat to public safety. The project would not result in closure or permanent obstruction of adjacent public rights-of-way. No component of the implementation of the EOP would otherwise be impaired by the proposed modifications to the use permit. Proposed modifications to the driveway entrances will meet Napa County and California Department of Transportation (Caltrans) standards. Impacts would be less than significant.

Significance Level: Less than significant impact.

Mitigation Measures: None required.

g) Expose people or structures, either directly or indirectly, to a significant risk of loss, injury or death involving wild-land fires?

Discussion: The project is within the High Fire Hazard Severity Zones however, the project consists solely of a land division, which would not have any direct impacts on the project site. It is notable that, the proposed land division would allow for each proposed parcel to have a single-family residence, accessory dwelling unit, guest cottage, and any other associated development improvements at full build out within the AW zoning district. All foreseeable development constructed as a result of the land division will be designed to comply with applicable State and County Fire Codes. These include but are not limited to, a minimum 100-foot defensible space around all structures and a minimum 10-foot defensible space on both sides of the driveway, fire sprinklers in buildings, emergency vehicle access, and adequate on-site water supply dedicated to fire-fighting. The project also identifies site access to be provided from the existing access along Mount Veeder Road for any foreseeable development. The site access is to be accommodated with driveway entrances that meet the Napa County Road and Street Standards (NCRSS) and California Fire Safe Regulations (FSR). Foreseeable access improvements aid in the safe ingress and egress of visitors and emergency personnel to and from the site. By requiring strict adherence to County Building and Fire Codes, and State Fire Safe Regulations, potential impacts would be reduced to less than significant. See Section 20 Wildfire for additional detail.

Significance Level: Less than significant impact.

Mitigation Measures: None required.

10. HYDROLOGY AND WATER QUALITY:

Background information:
The County requires all discretionary permit applications (such as use permits and ECPAs) to complete necessary water analyses in order to document that sufficient water supplies are available for the

proposed project and to implement water saving measures to prepare for periods of limited water supply and to conserve limited groundwater resources.

On June 7, 2022, the Napa County Board of Supervisors provided interim procedures to implement provisions of the Napa County Groundwater Sustainability Plan (GSP) for issuance of new, altered or replacement well permits and discretionary projects that would increase groundwater use. The direction limits a parcel's groundwater allocation to 0.3- acre feet per acre per year, or no net increase in groundwater use if that threshold is exceeded already for parcels located in the GSA Subbasin. For parcels not located in the GSA Subbasin (i.e., generally located in the hillsides), a parcel-specific Water Availability Analysis would suffice to assess potential impacts on groundwater supplies. The one existing project well, located within proposed Parcel A, is not located outside GSA Subbasin/Hillside. Parcel B & C, have not proposed any development, to be included in this project scope.

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[5] 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."[6]

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

---

[5] The County's Water Availability Guidelines (adopted May 2015)

[6] 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.

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).

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

Would the project:

a) Violate any water quality standards or waste discharge requirements or otherwise substantially degrade surface or groundwater quality?

Discussion: The proposed project will not violate any water quality standards or waste discharge requirements. No new or enlarged wastewater treatment or disposal facilities are proposed. Future systems to serve potential development will be reviewed for compliance with the Napa County Code to ensure the systems do not create a significant impact on water quality standards or waste discharge requirements.

Significance Level: Less than significant impact.

Mitigation Measures: None required.

b) Substantially decrease groundwater supplies or interfere substantially with groundwater recharge such that the project may impede sustainable groundwater management of the basin?

Discussion: The proposed project is a land division that includes no development. The parcel location falls within an area defined by the Napa County Water Availability Analysis Guidance Document as 'All Other Areas', which requires parcel specific analysis to determine the water availability of a parcel. Future development on the resulting parcels would likely be a single-family residence, associated accessory structures, access roads and infrastructure. Single-family residences are not typically subject to CEQA, and given the relatively large size of these parcels their groundwater usage would likely be below estimated parcel recharge and a less than significant impact on groundwater supplies or recharge. All future wells for non-discretionary projects, such residential development would be subject to the most current version of the County's WAA guidance document and the Napa County Environmental Health Department.

Significance Level: Less than significant impact.

Mitigation Measures: None required.

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 offsite;

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; or

iv. Impede or redirect flood flows?

Discussion: The project scope consists of a Land Division with no proposed construction/improvements therefore the project would not substantially alter the drainage pattern on site or cause a significant increase in erosion or siltation on or off the project site. The application and associated plans have been reviewed and approved by the Engineering Division. The proposed land division would require for the applicant to 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. Any future development shall comply with applicable Napa County Code regulations, including the conservation regulations, viewshed protection program, and rural design standards intended to preserve the County's scenic and rural character, therefore impacts would be less than significant.

Significance Level: Less than significant impact.

Mitigation Measures: None required.

d) In flood hazard, tsunami, or seiche zones, risk release of pollutants due to project inundation?

Discussion: The proposed project is not located within the designated floodplain area. The parcel is not located in an area that is subject to inundation by tsunamis, seiches, or mudflows. No impacts would occur.

Significance Level: Less than significant impact.

Mitigation Measures: None required.

e) Conflict with or obstruct implementation of a water quality control plan or sustainable groundwater management plan?

Discussion: The project would not conflict or obstruct the implementation of a water quality control plan or sustainable groundwater management plan because the project parcel is not located within a groundwater basin subject to an adopted sustainable groundwater management plan or water quality control plan. No impacts would occur.

Significance Level: Less than significant impact.

Mitigation Measures: None required.

11. LAND USE AND PLANNING:

Would the project:

a) Physically divide an established community?

Discussion: The project would not occur within an established community, nor would it result in the division of an established community, as the project is located in rural unincorporated Napa County surrounded by agriculture, open space, and single-family residential homes on large parcels. The project complies with the Napa County Code and all other applicable regulations.

Significance Level: Less than significant impact.

Mitigation Measures: None required.

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: The subject parcel is located in a AW zoning district, which allows for land divisions creating parcels which legally conform with the minimum parcel size, subject to Tentative Parcel Map approval. The land division does not propose new land uses within the tentative parcel map (**Exhibit A**) and any foreseeable development shall comply with applicable Napa County Code regulations, including the conservation regulations, viewshed protection program, and rural design standards intended to

preserve the County's scenic and rural character, therefore the proposed project shall remain compliant with the physical limitations of the Napa County Zoning Ordinance.

Significance Level: Less than significant impact.

Mitigation Measures: None required.

12. MINERAL RESOURCES:

Would the project:

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?

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

Significance Level: No impact.

Mitigation Measures: None required.

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: See response to 12(a) above.

Significance Level: No impact.

Mitigation Measures: None required.

13. NOISE:

Would the project result in:

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?

Discussion: The project scope solely proposes the division of a parcel into three (3) parcels and does not include any activity that would generate a substantial temporary or permanent increase in ambient noise levels or generate excessive ground-borne vibration or noise levels. The property is located within the AW zoning district and will remain available to the land uses allowed within the AW zoning district. The two (2) undeveloped parcels that will result from this land division have been designed with building envelopes, and it is foreseeable that up to two (2) new single-family residential dwelling unit, accessory structures, guest cottage, and any associated improvements could develop subsequent to this project. Residential development on parcels in excess of 160-acres are not typically associated with sources of noise or vibration that would cause a significant impact on the environment.

Significance Level: Less than significant impact.

Mitigation Measures: None required.

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

Discussion: See response to Subsection 13(a) above.

Significance Level: Less than significant impact.

Mitigation Measures: None required.

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: The project site is not located within the influence area of the Napa County Airport, according to the Airport Land Use Compatibility Plan: the closest airport to the subject parcel is the Napa County Airport located over 10-miles to the southeast. No impact would occur.

Significance Level: No impact.

Mitigation Measures: None required.

14. POPULATION AND HOUSING:

Would the project:

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)?

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

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

Significance Level: Less than significant impact.

Mitigation Measures: None required.

b) Displace substantial numbers of existing people or housing, necessitating the construction of replacement housing elsewhere?

Discussion: This application will not displace any dwelling on the subject property. The proposed project will not displace a substantial number of people and will not necessitate the construction of replacement housing elsewhere. No impact would occur.

Significance Level: No impact.

Mitigation Measures: None required.

15. PUBLIC SERVICES:

Would the project result in:

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?

iii. Schools?

iv. Parks?

v. Other public facilities?

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

Significance Level: Less than significant impact.

Mitigation Measures: None required.

16. RECREATION:

Would the project:

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?

Discussion: 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.

Significance Level: Less than significant impact.

Mitigation Measures: None required.

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: No new public recreational amenities are proposed to be built with, or as a result of, the proposed Tentative Parcel Map application. The proposed project would not result in substantial population growth, resulting in no increase in the use of recreational facilities and requiring no construction or expansion of recreational facilities. The proposed project would have no impact.

Significance Level: No impact.

Mitigation Measures: None required.

17. TRANSPORATION:

Would the project:

a) Conflict with a program, plan, ordinance or policy addressing the circulation system, including transit, roadway, bicycle and pedestrian facilities?

Discussion: The subject property is in unincorporated Napa County and is accessed along Mount Veeder Road, approximately 0.43 miles from the intersection of Mount Veeder Road and Redwood Road. The proposed project consists of a land division and does not include any physical development. However, foreseeable future development on the resulting parcels could include one (1) single-family residence,

one (1) accessory dwelling unit (ADU), and one (1) guest cottage on each parcel. Because two (2) existing single-family residences are located on Parcel A, the maximum foreseeable buildout would include the existing residence when accounting for the three (3) new single-family residences, three (3) ADUs, and three (3) guest cottages, allowed across the subdivision.

Based on the ITE Trip Generation Manual, 11th Edition, a detached single-family residence is estimated to generate approximately 9.43 average daily vehicle trips. At full buildout, the three (3) new single-family residences would generate 28.29 average daily trips (3 × 9.43 trips per day). Traffic generated by accessory dwelling units and guest cottages is expected to be limited and would not substantially increase overall traffic volumes, however even if the accessory dwelling units and guest cottages were to produce identical trip generations, the total daily trip generation for the project would 84.47 average daily trips among the proposed parcels, still under the 110 daily trip significance threshold. The anticipated increase in vehicle trips would be relatively minor and is not expected to adversely affect the operation of Mount Veeder Road, Redwood Canyon Road, or the surrounding local roadway network.

There are no public transit routes, bicycle facilities, or pedestrian facilities on or in the immediate vicinity of the project site. The proposed land division would not remove, obstruct, or alter any existing transit, bicycle, or pedestrian facilities, nor would it interfere with the implementation of any adopted circulation plans, roadway improvements, or transportation policies. Construction associated with future residential development would result in temporary increases in traffic from construction workers, equipment, and material deliveries. These impacts would be short-term, intermittent, and would cease upon completion of construction. Given the limited scale of future development, construction traffic would not substantially affect roadway operations or conflict with adopted circulation plans. Therefore, the proposed project would not conflict with a program, plan, ordinance, or policy addressing the circulation system, including transit, roadway, bicycle, or pedestrian facilities, and impacts would be less than significant.

Significance Level: Less than significant impact.

Mitigation Measures: None required.

b) Would the project conflict or be inconsistent with CEQA Guidelines Section 15064.3, subdivision (b)?

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 County maintains a set of Transportation Impact Study Guidelines (TIS Guidelines) that include VMT analysis requirements for projects based on trip generation, which includes a screening approach that provides a structure to determine what level of VMT analysis may be required for a given project. The TIS Guidelines state that if the net cumulative result of all project modifications after January 1, 2022, would generate less than 110 net new daily passenger vehicle and truck trips the project is presumed to have a less than significant impact for VMT. As noted above, any future proposed single-family residence, accessory dwelling unit, and guest cottage are anticipated to generate approximately 8.46 new daily trips each, well below the screening criteria. The project is a division of land with no physical development.

Therefore, the project would not conflict or be inconsistent with CEQA Guidelines section 15064.3, subdivision (b).

Significance Level: Less than significant impact.

Mitigation Measures: None required.

c) Substantially increase hazards due to geometric design feature (e.g., sharp curves or dangerous intersections) or incompatible uses (e.g., farm equipment)?

Discussion: After implementation of the proposed land division, access to the site would remain unchanged from Mount Veeder Road. The project would result in no significant off-site circulation system operational impacts nor any sight line impacts at the project driveway. Any future proposed site access and parking measures will be reviewed and conditioned by the Napa County Fire Department and Engineering Services Division. The proposed project would not be in conflict with General Plan

Policy CIR-14 as this project is a division of land with no proposed dwellings at this time. Any future development of a single-family home and associated accessory structures will be required to provide adequate parking, as conditioned.

Significance Level: No Impact

Mitigation Measures: None required

d) Result in inadequate emergency access?

Discussion: See response to Subsection 17(c) above.

Significance Level: No Impact.

Mitigation Measures: None Required.

e) Conflict with General Plan Policy CIR-14, which requires new uses to meet their anticipated parking demand, but to avoid providing excess parking which could stimulate unnecessary vehicle trips or activity exceeding the site's capacity?

Discussion: See response to Subsection 17(c) above.

Significance Level: No Impact.

Mitigation Measures: None required.

18. 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:

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:

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: On May 8, 2026, 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. The Yocha Dehe Wintun Nation responded on May 28, 2026, confirming the project is not within their aboriginal territories, declined to comment on the project, and deferred correspondence to the Mishewal Wappo Tribe. The Middletown Rancheria Tribe responded on June 3, 2026, confirming the project is not within their aboriginal territories, declined to comment on the project, and deferred correspondence to the Mishewal Wappo Tribe. The Mishewal Wappo Tribe of Alexander Valley responded June 30, 2026, confirming that the project is within their aboriginal territories and due to the absence of earth disturbing activities, opted to not conduct consultation on the project.

Significance Level: Less than significant.

Mitigation Measures: None required.

19. UTILITIES AND SERVICE SYSTEMS:

Would the project:

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?

Discussion: The project is a land division, and no relocation, construction, or expansion of water, wastewater, storm water, electrical, natural gas or telecommunication facilities is proposed. It is foreseeable that the parcels created as a result to the proposed land division would be developed with single-family residential structure as well as associated accessory structures and infrastructure. Before any of the above facilities could be constructed on the parcels, oversight from the applicable regulatory agency to issue a permit would be required. Review of plans with applicable codes and regulations will ensure that the environmental impact from the addition of any of the above facilities to the resulting parcels will be less than significant.

Significance Level: Less than significant impact.

Mitigation Measures: None required.

b) Have sufficient water supplies available to serve the project and reasonably foreseeable future development during normal, dry and multiple dry years?

Discussion: The proposed project is a land division that includes no development. The parcel location falls within an area defined by the Napa County Water Availability Analysis Guidance Document as 'All Other Areas', which requires parcel specific analysis to determine the water availability of a parcel. Future development on the resulting parcels would likely be a single-family residence, associated accessory structures, access roads and infrastructure. Non-discretionary projects such as a single-family residence are not subject to CEQA, and their water usage is not considered a significant impact on groundwater supplies or recharge when on code-compliant parcels outside of the MST. Any potential future discretionary projects will be required to conduct a Water Availability Analysis prior to project approval.

Significance Level: Less than significant impact.

Mitigation Measures: None required.

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?

Discussion: The proposed project scope solely proposes a land division in the project entitlement, with no earth moving or construction activities included. There is no wastewater provider currently serving the project site or in the immediate future. Therefore, the project shall have no impacts.

Significance Level: Less than significant impact.

Mitigation Measures: None required.

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?

Discussion: The project is a land division and includes no development which would generate solid waste. Future development of single-family residential structures will be served by a landfill with sufficient capacity to meet the project's demands. No impact will occur from the disposal of solid waste generated by the project.

Significance Level: No impact.

Mitigation Measures: None required.

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

Discussion: Future development of the project will be required to comply with all federal, state, and local reduction statutes and regulations related to solid waste.

Significance Level: No impact.

Mitigation Measures: None required.

20. WILDFIRE:

If located in or near state responsibility areas or lands classified as very high fire hazard severity zones, would the project:

a) Substantially impair an adopted emergency response plan or emergency evacuation plan?

Discussion: A majority of the subject site is located within a high fire hazard severity zone and in the Napa County State Responsibility Area (SRA district). Since this project is a land division with no proposed development, there are no project features that would substantially impair an adopted emergency response plan or emergency evacuation plan. Foreseeable future development would be single-family residential structures on parcels in excess of 160-acres, which would reduce the risk of pollutant concentrations or uncontrolled spread of wildfire on occupants. Therefore this project shall have less than significant impacts.

Significance Level: Less than significant impact.

Mitigation Measures: None required.

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?

Discussion: See response to Subsection 20(a) above.

Significance Level: Less than significant impact.

Mitigation Measures: None required.

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?

Discussion: See response to Subsection 20(a) above.

Significance Level: Less than significant impact.

Mitigation Measures: None required.

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: See response to Subsection 20(a) above.

Significance Level: Less than significant impact.

Mitigation Measures: None required.

21. MANDATORY FINDINGS OF SIGNIFICANCE:

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?

Discussion: The proposed project is a land division and includes no actual development. Foreseeable future development would consist of single-family residential structures, associated accessory buildings, access roads and infrastructure. As discussed above the project would have a less than significant impact on wildlife resources. No sensitive resources or biologic areas will be converted or affected by this project. Also as analyzed above, the project would not result in a significant loss of native trees, native vegetation, or important examples of California's history or pre-history.

Significance Level: Less than significant impact.

Mitigation Measures: None Required

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)?

Discussion: As described in the sections above, air quality, transportation/traffic impacts, and population and housing, the proposed project which is a land division with no physical developments proposed at this time. Any future development activities would be related to the construction of a single-family dwelling and associated physical improvements with no cumulatively considerable impacts.

Significance Level: Less than significant impact.

Mitigation Measures: None Required.

c) Does the project have environmental effects which will cause substantial adverse effects on human beings, either directly or indirectly?

Discussion: There are no schools or hospitals housing sensitive receptors within a quarter mile of the subject parcel. Noise from construction that would occur with construction and installation of potential future single-family residential structures would be temporary, limited to daytime hours, and would be subject to best management practices intended to limit fugitive dust and protect storm water quality. The operation of single-family residences would have a less than significant impact on nearby residences due to distance between those residences and the building envelopes.

Significance Level: Less than significant impact.

Mitigation Measures: None required.