

ATTACHMENT A
WALT RANCH EROSION CONTROL PLAN
NAPA COUNTY, CALIFORNIA
Table of Impacts, Mitigation Measures and CEQA Findings

ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACT (SIGNIFICANCE FINDING BEFORE MITIGATION)	MITIGATION MEASURES	SIGNIFICANCE AFTER MITIGATION	FINDINGS OF FACT
4.1 AIR QUALITY			
<p>Impact 4.1-1: Construction activities associated with implementation of the Proposed Project, including land clearing, earthmoving, and movement of vehicles, would have the potential to cause nuisance related to fugitive dust. This is a potentially significant impact.</p> <p>Conversion of the existing landscape to vineyard requires clearing of vegetation and earthmoving activities, which would expose bare soil to wind erosion, thereby potentially generating fugitive dust.</p> <p>The project site is located in a rural area with some nearby sensitive receptors, including a residence in the Circle Oaks subdivision that is located approximately 30 feet south of the project's southeastern boundary and approximately 120 feet from the nearest proposed vineyard block. Therefore, site preparation activities would have the potential to cause air quality impacts to the area.</p> <p>(Draft EIR, pp. 4.1-12 to 4.1-13; Final EIR, pp. 4.1-12 to 4.1-14.)</p>	<p>4.1-1: The owner shall implement a fugitive dust abatement program during the construction of #P11-00205-ECPA, which shall include the following elements:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Cover all trucks hauling soil, sand, and other loose materials or require all trucks to maintain at least two feet of freeboard; this mitigation is included in the BAAQMD- approved CalEEMod. Cover all exposed stockpiles. Sweep Circle Oaks Drive daily (with water sweepers) if visible soil material is carried onto adjacent streets. Limit traffic speeds on unpaved roads to 15 miles per hour (mph); this mitigation is included in the CalEEMod. Suspend excavation and grading activity when winds (instantaneous gusts) exceed 25 mph. Any burning of cleared vegetation shall be conducted according to the rules and regulations of the BAAQMD's Regulation 5 (BAAQMD, 2006). Prior notification to BAAQMD shall be made by submitting an Open Burning Prior Notification Form to BAAQMD's office in San Francisco. <p>Prior to approval of P11-00205-ECPA, the above measures shall be incorporated into the ECP narrative and applicable plan sheets.</p>	Less-than-significant	<p>Finding: Compliance with MM 4.1-1, which has been required or incorporated into the Project, will reduce this impact to a less-than-significant level by requiring a fugitive dust abatement program during construction. The Board hereby directs that this mitigation measure be adopted. Pursuant to Public Resources Code Section 21081 (a) and CEQA Guidelines Section 15091 (a), the Board hereby finds that changes or alterations have been required in, or incorporated into, the Project which avoid or substantially lessen the significant environmental effects to a less-than-significant level.</p> <p>Explanation/Facts in Support of Finding: MM 4.1-1 is consistent with the BAAQMD recommended measures and would be in addition to the permanent erosion control measures specified in #P11-00205-ECPA. Implementation of MM4.1-1 would avoid the creation of fugitive dust (PM₁₀ and PM_{2.5}) emissions during construction of the vineyard by eliminating uncovered stockpiles and controlling traffic speeds and reduce impacts to a less-than-significant level.</p> <p>(See Final EIR, pp. 4.1-12 to 4.1-14; Final EIR Responses to Comments O10-4, O10-5, O11-4, O11-5, O11-47, O21-126, I029-9, I071-14, I071-15.)</p>
<p>Impact 4.1-2: Construction of Proposed Project would result in regional emissions from operation of construction equipment. This is a potentially significant impact.</p> <p>Results of the CalEEMod model indicate that construction of the Proposed Project would not exceed</p>	<p>4.1-2: The owner shall implement the required basic construction mitigation measures as recommended by the BAAQMD and mitigation measures used in the CalEEMod during the construction of the Proposed Project, which shall include the following elements:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Idling times shall be minimized either by shutting equipment off when not in use or 	Less-than-significant	<p>Finding: Compliance with MM 4.1-2, which has been required or incorporated into the project, will further reduce this less than significant impact. The Board hereby directs that this mitigation measure be adopted. Pursuant to Public Resources Code Section 21081 (a) and CEQA Guidelines Section 15091 (a), the Board hereby finds that changes or alterations have been required in, or incorporated into, the Project which avoid or substantially</p>

ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACT (SIGNIFICANCE FINDING BEFORE MITIGATION)	MITIGATION MEASURES	SIGNIFICANCE AFTER MITIGATION	FINDINGS OF FACT
<p>any of the BAAQMD significance thresholds. This is a less than significant impact.</p> <p>(Draft EIR pp. 4.1-13 to 4.1-17.)</p>	<p>reducing the maximum idling time to five minutes (as required by the California airborne toxics control measure Title 13, Section 2485 of the California Code of Regulations [CCR]). Clear signage shall be provided for construction workers at all access points.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> All construction equipment shall be maintained and properly tuned in accordance with manufacturer's specifications. All equipment shall be checked by a certified mechanic and determined to be running in proper condition prior to operation. Post a publicly visible sign with the telephone number and person to contact at Napa County regarding dust complaints. This person shall respond and take corrective action within 48 hours. The Air District's phone number shall also be visible to ensure compliance with applicable regulations. The owner shall equip all construction equipment with a horsepower rating greater than 50 with a diesel particulate filter; this mitigation is included in the CalEEMod. <p>Prior to approval of P11-00205-ECPA, the above measures shall be incorporated into the ECP narrative and applicable plan sheets. Signage shall be installed and documentation from a certified mechanic that construction equipment has been checked and particulate filters installed shall be submitted to the County prior to the commencement of vegetation removal and grading.</p>		<p>lessen the significant environmental effects to further reduce this less than significant impact.</p> <p>Explanation/Facts in Support of Finding: Construction emissions were estimated using the CalEEMod model. Results of this modeling effort indicate that construction of the Proposed Project would not exceed any of the BAAQMD significance thresholds. Nevertheless, BAAQMD recommends that the basic construction measures be implemented in all new construction projects, which will reduce emissions to even lower levels. This less than significant impact will be further reduced through implementation of MM 4.1-2.</p> <p>(Final EIR Response to Comment O10-4, O10-5, O10-7, O11-4, O11-5, O21-126.)</p>
4.2 BIOLOGICAL RESOURCES			
<p>Impact 4.2-1: Approximately 166.8 acres of the California Annual Grassland Alliance were mapped on the Walt Ranch property. Approximately 83.94 acres (50.31 percent) of those acres are proposed to be converted to vineyard. However, approximately 4.45 acres meet the criteria for being considered native grasslands within the proposed blocks (EIR Figure 4.2-2a). This area was defined based on portions of the California Annual Grassland Alliance that contain ten percent or higher of native grass species. The conversion of sensitive grassland vegetation</p>	<p>4.2-1: Prior to the approval of #P11-00205-ECPA, the plan shall be modified to include the following (any associated project features that become unnecessary as a result of the avoidance, such as proposed roads, shall also be reflected in the revised plan): Impacts to native grasslands shall be reduced to a less-than-significant level and result in the greatest quality of native grassland mitigation through a combination of avoidance, preservation, and enhancement. Specifically, mitigation for the removal of an estimated 4.45 acres of native grassland on the property would be accomplished</p>	<p>Less-than-significant</p>	<p>Finding: Compliance with MM 4.2-1, which has been required or incorporated into the project, will reduce impacts to native grasslands to a less-than-significant level. The Board hereby directs that this mitigation measure be adopted. Pursuant to Public Resources Code Section 21081 (a) and CEQA Guidelines Section 15091 (a), the Board hereby finds that changes or alterations have been required in, or incorporated into, the Project which avoid or substantially lessen the significant environmental effects to a less-than-significant level.</p> <p>Explanation/Facts in Support of Finding: The Project would impact 4.45 acres (45.4 percent) of existing sensitive</p>

ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACT (SIGNIFICANCE FINDING BEFORE MITIGATION)	MITIGATION MEASURES	SIGNIFICANCE AFTER MITIGATION	FINDINGS OF FACT
<p>potentially conflicts with Napa County Policy CON-2, which provides that agricultural projects should preserve existing significant vegetation to the extent feasible. In addition, Policy CON-17 requires no net loss of native grasslands, serpentine grasslands, mixed serpentine chaparral, and other sensitive biotic communities and habitats of limited distribution, through avoidance, restoration, or replacement where feasible. Where avoidance, restoration, or replacement is not feasible, preservation of like habitat at a 2:1 ratio or greater is required. Grasslands in general provide cover for erosion control, important forage and nesting habitat for invertebrates, birds, and mammals, and appropriate vegetative structure for many native plant species. This is a potentially significant impact.</p> <p>(Draft EIR pp. 4.2-81 to 4.2-87; Final EIR 4.2-81 to 4.2-87.)</p>	<p>through a combination of 1) avoidance of high-quality native grasslands within the project area and the immediate vicinity; 2) preservation and conservation of native grasslands having the highest habitat value and species composition; and 3) through the restoration and enhancement of existing non-native grasslands implemented through the Walt Ranch Biological Resources Management Plan (BRMP).</p> <p><u>Avoidance</u> In order to maintain biodiversity of native grasslands on the property, approximately 3.30 acres of native grasslands shall be avoided. To the maximum extent feasible, access road development shall be relocated as necessary to avoid populations of native grasslands. Specifically, avoidance shall occur at the locations detailed in Table 4.2-5 and shown on Figure 4.2-4 (please refer to Section 4.2). These populations shall be avoided with a buffer of not less than 10 feet. Temporary fencing shall be installed around the areas to be avoided, at the outer edge of the buffer, and shall remain in place throughout construction activities.</p> <p>The avoidance proposed in Table 4.2-5, in combination with the native grasslands already outside of the clearing limits, will result in the preservation of approximately 8.65 acres (88.3 percent) of native grasslands mapped on the property. Therefore, the Proposed Project will impact 1.15 acres of native grasslands in the avenue around block 13, the avenue around blocks 16A and 16B2, and in blocks 16A, 16B1, 16B2, and 18A5. These impacted areas shall be mitigated at a 2:1 ratio as discussed below.</p> <p><u>Preservation and Enhancement</u> The direct impact of 1.15 acres of native grasslands shall be mitigated by preserving the remainder of the native grasslands mapped onsite and enhancing existing non-native grassland to in-kind native reference grasslands at a 2:1 ratio (2.30 acres). The 8.65 acres of native grasslands mapped on the property shall be preserved in perpetuity. All acreage designated for preservation shall be identified as such in a conservation easement with an accredited</p>		<p>native grasslands. MM 4.2-1 will reduce the impact by requiring that native grasslands be avoided in large part and those that are impacted be enhanced and replaced at a 2:1 ratio consistent with General Plan Policy CON-17.</p> <p>(See Final EIR 4.2-81 to 4.2-87; Final EIR Responses to Comments A7-2, O7-2, O10-9, O10-10, O11-16, O13-4, O21-057, O21-069, O22-083, I071-7, I073-9. For further detail on this mitigation measure see BRMP section 5.2)</p>

ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACT (SIGNIFICANCE FINDING BEFORE MITIGATION)	MITIGATION MEASURES	SIGNIFICANCE AFTER MITIGATION	FINDINGS OF FACT
	<p>land trust organization such as the Land Trust of Napa County as the grantee, or other equivalent means of permanent protection acceptable to the Director. Land placed in protection shall be restricted from development and other uses that would potentially degrade the quality of the habitat (including, but not limited to, conversion to other land uses such as agriculture or urban development, and excessive off-road vehicle use that increases erosion), and should otherwise be restricted by the existing goals and policies of Napa County. The areas to be covered by the conservation easement shall be determined by a qualified botanist or biologist, and submitted to Napa County for review and approval. The conservation easement shall be prepared in a form acceptable to County Counsel and entered into and recorded with the Napa County Recorder's office prior to any ground disturbing activities, grading or vegetation removal, or within 12 months of project approval, whichever occurs first.</p> <p>Any request by the permittee for an extension of time to record the conservation easement shall be considered by the Planning Director and shall be submitted to Napa County prior to the 12 month deadline, and shall provide sufficient justification for the extension.</p> <p>Replacement of native grasslands shall occur on 2.30 acres on the property, and shall be designated in the Walt Ranch BRMP. In order to provide for habitat continuity, the 2.30 acres of native grassland replacement shall occur in suitable areas in proximity to native grassland areas to the maximum extent feasible. This may include, but is not limited to, areas near vineyard blocks 13, 16, 19, or 29. Replacement plantings shall be consistent with the dominant native grassland type (blue wildrye, purple needle grass, and/or California fescue) that was impacted. Any new transplants for replacement shall be propagated from seed found on site. Replanting areas for native grasslands shall be protected with a buffer of not less than 10 feet. Temporary fencing shall be installed around the areas to be avoided, at the outer edge of the buffer, and shall remain in place throughout construction</p>		

ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACT (SIGNIFICANCE FINDING BEFORE MITIGATION)	MITIGATION MEASURES	SIGNIFICANCE AFTER MITIGATION	FINDINGS OF FACT
	<p>activities.</p> <p>Prior to ground disturbing activities associated with the Proposed Project, the Walt Ranch BRMP shall be developed by a qualified professional biologist, and submitted to Napa County for review and approval. The Walt Ranch BRMP shall cover multiple sensitive habitat types, sensitive or special-status species, and other biological considerations on the property, as discussed elsewhere in Section 4.2.6 of this EIR. Required performance criteria to be included in the Walt Ranch BRMP are as follows:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Management goals: Goals shall include habitat enhancement criteria, such as increased native grass cover, native plant diversity, and wildlife values. If in the event that population totals of the sensitive resources identified within this EIR are determined to have changed during preconstruction surveys, the Applicant and/or the Applicant's representative shall provide an assessment sufficiently explaining the reason(s) resources are no longer present or are in increased or reduced numbers. The assessment shall be prepared by a qualified biologist, subject to review and approval by the Director; • Identification of suitable habitat: The BRMP shall clearly identify sufficient areas of suitable habitat for each species subject for replanting. In the event the property lacks adequate suitable habitat area, equivalent additional resources shall be avoided in order to meet the specified avoidance criteria; • Restoration and enhancement techniques: Identification of transplanting and mitigation planting techniques for various species and habitat types covered by the BRMP; • Implementation schedule: restoration, enhancement, and planting shall begin during the year following ground disturbance; • Planting goals: A qualified biologist shall work with vineyard personnel to ensure that the spacing of plantings and other requirements of the overall BRMP are met; 		

ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACT (SIGNIFICANCE FINDING BEFORE MITIGATION)	MITIGATION MEASURES	SIGNIFICANCE AFTER MITIGATION	FINDINGS OF FACT
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Monitoring criteria: Restoration and enhancement areas shall be monitored by a qualified botanist or biologist annually for a minimum of five years. As part of the first year monitoring report, each area planted to offset that years' impacts, the final replacement total, exact location, and size of the replacement plantings shall be recorded; Reporting criteria: Annual monitoring reports shall be submitted to Napa County by January 1 of each year for five years after the successful completion of the replanting efforts and plan implementation; and Success criteria: Restoration and enhancement areas must have at least an 80 percent success rate after five years. 		
<p>Impact 4.2-2: Development of the Project would impact some sensitive biotic communities or habitats of limited distribution. This is a potentially significant impact.</p> <p>The Project would convert portions of the following designated Biotic Communities of Limited Distribution or oak woodlands to vineyard:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Carex spp. – Juncus spp. – Wet Meadow Grasses NFD Super Alliance. The Proposed Project would impact (0.42 acres) (16.43 percent) of this habitat on the property. <p><u>Oak Woodlands</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Black Oak Alliance. The Proposed Project would impact 6.26 acres (33.86 percent) of this habitat on the property. California Buckeye/Poison Oak/Moss Woodland Alliance. The Proposed Project would impact 0.085 acres (53.13 percent) of this habitat type on the property. Valley Oak (California Bay – Coast 	<p>4.2-2: Prior to the approval of #P11-00205- ECPA, the plan shall be modified to include the following (any associated project features that become unnecessary as a result of the avoidance, such as proposed roads, shall also be reflected in the revised plan). All features requiring avoidance shall be field verified by a qualified professional biologist prior to ground disturbing activities, including the placement of construction fencing delineating the areas to be avoided:</p> <p>The Carex spp. – Juncus spp. – Wet Meadow Grasses NFD Super Alliance is only located in Block 16. This habitat type shall be avoided in its entirety. Therefore, the portion of Block 16 that contains the Carex spp. – Juncus spp. – Wet Meadow Grasses NFD Super Alliance shall be removed from the Proposed Project. This will ensure 100 percent avoidance of this sensitive habitat.</p> <p>The California Buckeye/Poison Oak/Moss Woodland Alliance is only located in Block 33. This habitat type should be avoided in its entirety, as shown on Figure 4.2-5. Therefore, the portion of Block 33 that is the California Buckeye/Poison Oak/Moss Woodland habitat type shall be removed from the Proposed Project. This will ensure 100 percent avoidance of this sensitive habitat. The total acreage of this habitat type (0.16 acres) on the property shall be placed in permanent protection through the recordation of a</p>	<p>Less-than-significant</p>	<p>Finding: Compliance with MM 4.2-2, which has been required or incorporated into the project, will reduce impacts to sensitive habitats by avoidance of the proposed vineyard blocks. The Board hereby directs that this mitigation measure be adopted. Pursuant to Public Resources Code Section 21081 (a) and CEQA Guidelines Section 15091 (a), the Board hereby finds that changes or alterations have been required in, or incorporated into, the Project which avoid or substantially lessen the significant environmental effects to a less-than-significant level.</p> <p>Explanation/Facts in Support of Finding: The Project would convert portions of Sensitive Biotic Communities to vineyard. MM 4.2-2 requires avoidance of these Sensitive Biotic Communities, in part or in their entirety. Areas chosen for avoidance have been targeted to also protect other important biological resources, such as specimen trees, riparian corridors, and habitat for western pond turtle. After avoidance of the proposed vineyard blocks described in MM 4.2-2, the impacts to sensitive habitats are reduced to a less-than-significant level and the Project is consistent with General Plan Policy CON-17 and Policy CON-24.</p> <p>(See Final EIR, pp. 4.2-87 to 4.2-92; Final EIR Response 6; Final EIR Responses to Comments A7-3, O7-4, O10-9, O11-16, O11-41, O12-1, O12-5, O12-6, O21-057, O22-002, O22-005, I073-9, I142-2, I142-4. For further details regarding the implementation of this measure, see BRMP chapter 5.4.)</p>

ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACT (SIGNIFICANCE FINDING BEFORE MITIGATION)	MITIGATION MEASURES	SIGNIFICANCE AFTER MITIGATION	FINDINGS OF FACT
<p>Live Oak – Walnut – Ash) Riparian Forest NFD Association. The Proposed Project would impact 6.34 acres (20.58 percent) of this habitat type on the property.</p> <p>(DEIR pp. 4.2-87 to 4.2-89; Final EIR, pp. 4.2-87 to 4.2-92; Final EIR, Response 6.)</p>	<p>conservation easement approved by the Director, held by an accredited land trust organization, prior to any ground disturbing activities, grading or vegetation removal, or within 12 months of project approval, whichever occurs first.</p> <p>Any request by the permittee for an extension of time to record the conservation easement shall be considered by the Planning Director and shall be submitted to Napa County prior to the 12 month deadline, and shall provide sufficient justification for the extension.</p> <p>Valley Oak (California Bay – Coast Live Oak – Walnut – Ash) Riparian Forest NFD Association is located in select areas throughout the property, associated with streams and creeks. The portions of vineyard blocks and avenues 21B, 29A1, 29A2, 29B2, 30A, 42, 43, 45B, 57B, and 58A that contain this sensitive habitat type should be removed from the Proposed Project, resulting in 6.3 acres of gross area removed from the Proposed Project. Avoiding these areas will also protect upland habitat for the western pond turtle (discussed further in Impact 4.2-10) and wildlife corridors along riparian areas. After mitigation, 30.8 acres (100 percent) of this habitat type will be preserved on the property.</p> <p>Approximately 2.5 acres of Black Oak Alliance habitat will be avoided in the following vineyard blocks and surrounding avenues: 12, 15B, 16B1, 16B2, 17A, 17B, 31A, 31B, 37A, 37C, 37D, 43, and 60A3, as shown on Figure 4.2-5. The blocks chosen for avoidance will provide additional habitat continuity benefits and will also protect certain specimen trees, in addition to conserving Black Oak Alliance. Specimen trees are also discussed in Impact 4.2-16 below. After mitigation, 35.8 acres of this habitat type will be impacted by the project, and 281.7 acres (88.7 percent) will remain on the property. These impacts shall be mitigated by preserving Black Oak Alliance habitat elsewhere on the property at a 2:1 ratio. This will result in 71.6 acres of Black Oak Alliance preserved in permanent protection on the property. Protection shall be achieved through the recordation of a conservation easement approved by the Director, held by an accredited land trust</p>		

ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACT (SIGNIFICANCE FINDING BEFORE MITIGATION)	MITIGATION MEASURES	SIGNIFICANCE AFTER MITIGATION	FINDINGS OF FACT
	<p>organization, prior to any ground disturbing activities, grading or vegetation removal, or within 12 months of project approval, whichever occurs first.</p> <p>Approximately 3.6 acres of Blue Oak Alliance will be avoided in the following vineyard blocks and surrounding avenues: 28, 29B1, 29B2, 37A, 37D, and 47A1, as shown on Figure 4.2-5. Avoiding these blocks will also protect specimen trees, interspersed Fescue Alliance, and wildlife corridors along creeks and tributaries. After mitigation, 2.6 acres of this habitat type will be impacted on the property. The 2.6 acres that will be impacted shall be mitigated by preserving Blue Oak Alliance habitat elsewhere on the property at a 2:1 ratio. This will result in 5.2 acres of Blue Oak Alliance preserved in permanent protection on the property. Protection shall be achieved through the recordation of a conservation easement approved by the Director, held by an accredited land trust organization, prior to any ground disturbing activities, grading or vegetation removal, or within 12 months of project approval, whichever occurs first.</p> <p>Any request by the permittee for an extension of time to record the conservation easement shall be considered by the Planning Director and shall be submitted to Napa County prior to the 12 month deadline, and shall provide sufficient justification for the extension.</p> <p>Approximately 1.75 acres of Coast Live Oak (Foothill Pine) Alliance will be avoided in vineyard Block 18 and surrounding avenues, as shown on Figure 4.2-5. Avoiding portions of this block chosen for avoidance will provide additional habitat continuity benefits and will also protect specimen trees and western pond turtle habitat, in addition to conserving Coast Live Oak (Foothill Pine) Alliance. After mitigation, 20.1 acres of this habitat type will be impacted by the project, which shall be mitigated by preserving Coast Live Oak (Foothill Pine) Alliance habitat elsewhere on the property at a 2:1 ratio. This will result in 40.2 acres of Coast Live Oak (Foothill Pine) Alliance preserved in permanent protection on the property. Protection shall be achieved through the recordation of a conservation easement approved by the</p>		

ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACT (SIGNIFICANCE FINDING BEFORE MITIGATION)	MITIGATION MEASURES	SIGNIFICANCE AFTER MITIGATION	FINDINGS OF FACT
	<p>Director, held by an accredited land trust organization, prior to any ground disturbing activities, grading or vegetation removal, or within 12 months of project approval, whichever occurs first.</p> <p>Any request by the permittee for an extension of time to record the conservation easement shall be considered by the Planning Director and shall be submitted to Napa County prior to the 12 month deadline, and shall provide sufficient justification for the extension.</p> <p>Approximately 11.25 acres of Coast Live Oak- Blue Oak-(Foothill Pine) NFD Association will be avoided in the following vineyard blocks and surrounding avenues: 1B, 2A and 2B, 5A, 17B, 18A, 19A, 20A, 36A and 36B, 37E and 37F, 45B, 48, 51C, 57B, 62A, 63, 64, and 69, as shown on Figure 4.2-5. The blocks chosen for avoidance will provide additional habitat continuity benefits and will also protect specimen trees, western pond turtle habitat, northern black walnut, and wildlife corridors, in addition to conserving Coast Live Oak-Blue Oak-(Foothill Pine) NFD Association. After mitigation, 100.2 acres of this habitat type will be impacted by the project, which shall be mitigated by preserving Coast Live Oak-Blue Oak-(Foothill Pine) NFD Association habitat elsewhere on the property at a 2:1 ratio. This will result in 200.4 acres of Coast Live Oak-Blue Oak-(Foothill Pine) NFD Association preserved in permanent protection on the property. Protection shall be achieved through the recordation of a conservation easement approved by the Director, held by an accredited land trust organization, prior to any ground disturbing activities, grading or vegetation removal, or within 12 months of project approval, whichever occurs first.</p> <p>Any request by the permittee for an extension of time to record the conservation easement shall be considered by the Planning Director and shall be submitted to Napa County prior to the 12 month deadline, and shall provide sufficient justification for the extension.</p> <p>Approximately 13.01 acres of Mixed Oak (Foothill Pine/Ponderosa Pine) Alliance will be avoided in the</p>		

ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACT (SIGNIFICANCE FINDING BEFORE MITIGATION)	MITIGATION MEASURES	SIGNIFICANCE AFTER MITIGATION	FINDINGS OF FACT
	<p>following vineyard blocks and surrounding avenues: 1B and 1C, 12, 16A, 16B, 16C, 19A, 24, 25A, 37D, 51C, and 55B, as shown on Figure 4.2-5. The blocks chosen for avoidance will provide additional habitat continuity benefits and will also protect specimen trees, notable oak woodland stands, and interspersed native grasslands, in addition to conserving Mixed Oak (Foothill Pine/Ponderosa Pine) Alliance. After mitigation, 103.8 acres of this habitat type will be impacted by the project, which shall be mitigated by preserving Mixed Oak (Foothill Pine/Ponderosa Pine) Alliance habitat elsewhere on the property at a 2:1 ratio. This will result in 207.6 acres of Mixed Oak (Foothill Pine/Ponderosa Pine) Alliance preserved in permanent protection on the property. Protection shall be achieved through the recordation of a conservation easement approved by the Director, held by an accredited land trust organization, prior to any ground disturbing activities, grading or vegetation removal, or within 12 months of project approval, whichever occurs first.</p> <p>Any request by the permittee for an extension of time to record the conservation easement shall be considered by the Planning Director and shall be submitted to Napa County prior to the 12 month deadline, and shall provide sufficient justification for the extension.</p> <p>To the maximum extent feasible, access road development shall be relocated as necessary to avoid sensitive habitats. After avoidance of the proposed vineyard blocks described above, the impacts to sensitive habitats are reduced to a less-than-significant level and the Proposed Project is consistent with General Plan Policy CON-17 and Policy CON-24.</p>		
<p>Impact 4.2-4: Development of the Project could result in impacts to wetlands or waters of the U.S., which could be inconsistent with Policies CON-26, CON-30, and CON-42. This would also conflict with Napa County Code Section 18.108.025 (General provisions – Intermittent/perennial streams).</p>	<p>4.2-4: Project site plans will avoid or mitigate for direct impacts to jurisdictional waters of the U.S. as described below.</p> <p>A Department of the Army nationwide permit (Section 404 permit) shall be obtained from the USACE prior to the discharge of any dredged or fill material within jurisdictional wetlands and other waters of the U.S. If needed, a Streambed</p>	<p>Less-than-significant</p>	<p>Finding: With compliance with MM 4.2-4, which has been required or incorporated into the project, direct impacts to wetlands and waters of the U.S. would be considered less than significant. The Board hereby directs that this mitigation measure be adopted. Pursuant to Public Resources Code Section 21081 (a) and CEQA Guidelines Section 15091 (a), the Board hereby finds that changes or alterations have been required in, or incorporated into, the Project which avoid or substantially lessen the significant environmental effects to a less-than-significant level.</p>

ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACT (SIGNIFICANCE FINDING BEFORE MITIGATION)	MITIGATION MEASURES	SIGNIFICANCE AFTER MITIGATION	FINDINGS OF FACT
<p>The jurisdictional features identified on the property consist of 1.6 acres seasonal wetlands, 0.4 acres freshwater seeps, 0.2 acres freshwater marsh, 1.0 acres seasonal volcanic seeps, 0.8 acres riparian wetlands, and 10.8 acres of "other waters" of the project site. Milliken and Capell Creeks are included as part of the seasonal wetland surrounding the creek.</p> <p>The Project was designed to avoid all waters of the U.S., except for short stretches in 24 locations as shown in DEIR Table 4.2-6. Vineyard blocks were designed to facilitate as few stream crossings as possible, and stream crossings are only proposed when necessary for vineyard block access.</p> <p>Activities associated with roads and stream crossings would result in direct impacts to waters of the U.S. and will require permits from the USACE and CDFW.</p> <p>(Draft EIR pp. 4.2-91 to 4.2-96; Final EIR, pp. 4.2-93 to 4.2-98.)</p>	<p>Alteration Agreement (SAA) shall be obtained from CDFW prior to construction activities that impact riparian zones. A Clean Water Act Section 401 Water Quality Certification will be obtained from the Regional Water Quality Control Board (RWQCB) prior to any discharge into waters of the United States. Copies of all approved permits shall be submitted to the County prior to any ground disturbance, vegetation removal, and grading in areas involving waters of the U.S. and/or riparian zones. Direct impacts to waters of the U.S., specifically the 0.25 acres of jurisdictional "other waters" shown in Table 4.2-6, shall be mitigated by creating or restoring waters of the U.S. onsite. Compensatory mitigation shall occur at a minimum of 1:1 ratio and shall be approved by the USACE prior to any discharge into jurisdictional features. Protection shall be achieved through the recordation of a conservation easement approved by the Director, held by an accredited land trust organization, prior to any ground disturbing activities, grading or vegetation removal, or within 12 months of project approval, whichever occurs first.</p> <p>Any request by the permittee for an extension of time to record the conservation easement shall be considered by the Planning Director and shall be submitted to Napa County prior to the 12 month deadline, and shall provide sufficient justification for the extension.</p> <p>Prior to development of Block 31 (which will result in the direct impact of 0.02 acres of wetland as shown in Table 4.2-6), necessary permits by the appropriate agencies will be obtained to remove the isolated wetland inside the proposed block, and mitigation at a minimum of 1:1 will be applied to the Capell Creek drainage area on the property. Protection shall be achieved through the recordation of a conservation easement approved by the Director, held by an accredited land trust organization, prior to any ground disturbing activities, grading or vegetation removal, or within 12 months of project approval, whichever occurs first.</p>		<p><u>Explanation/Facts in Support of Finding:</u> A total of approximately 0.02 acres of wetlands and 0.25 acres of jurisdictional "other waters" were identified and mapped within the clearing areas of the project site. A Department of the Army nationwide permit (Section 404 permit) shall be obtained from the USACE prior to the discharge of any dredged or fill material within jurisdictional wetlands and other waters of the U.S. A Clean Water Act Section 401 Water Quality Certification will be obtained from the Regional Water Quality Control Board (RWQCB) prior to any discharge into waters of the United States. To avoid indirect impacts to all other wetlands, avoidance buffers of 50 feet shall be established around each of the wetlands, which include a 24-foot vegetated turnaround avenue and a 26- foot undisturbed filter strip. Vineyard development near streams that meet the Napa County definition of a stream will maintain setbacks in compliance with the Napa County Conservation Regulations and Code 18.108.025. With implementation of MM 4.2-4 (in addition to the other mitigation measures found in the DEIR), impacts to jurisdictional waters of the U.S. will be reduced to a less-than-significant level and ensure compliance with Policies CON-26, CON-30, and CON-42.</p> <p>(See Final EIR, pp. 4.2-93 to 4.2-98; Final EIR Responses to Comments A2-01, A2-03, A7-12, A7-15, O7-3, O7-26, O7-29, O7-30, O7-34; O9-21, O9-22, O9-44, O20-1, O21-17, O21-057, O22-021, O22-023, O22-099, O22-100, O22-101, I046-5, I073-9, I143-8.)</p>

ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACT (SIGNIFICANCE FINDING BEFORE MITIGATION)	MITIGATION MEASURES	SIGNIFICANCE AFTER MITIGATION	FINDINGS OF FACT
	<p>Any request by the permittee for an extension of time to record the conservation easement shall be considered by the Planning Director and shall be submitted to Napa County prior to the 12 month deadline, and shall provide sufficient justification for the extension.</p> <p>To avoid indirect impacts to all other wetlands, avoidance buffers of 50 feet shall be established around each of the wetlands, which include a 24-foot vegetated turnaround avenue and a 26-foot undisturbed filter strip. Temporary orange construction fencing, or other method acceptable to Napa County, shall be installed around all wetlands and any drainage features in the vicinity of and outside of the construction area. Fencing shall be located a minimum of 26 feet from the edges of wetlands as identified by a qualified biologist. All fencing shall be installed prior to the commencement of any earthmoving activities and shall be field verified by Napa County. The fencing shall remain in place until all construction activities in the vicinity have been completed.</p> <p>Vineyard development near streams that meet the Napa County definition of a stream will maintain setbacks in compliance with the Napa County Conservation Regulations and Code 18.108.025 (see Table 4.2-7). For drainages which do not meet the Napa County definition of a stream, 20-foot minimum setbacks shall be maintained from the top of bank. Minimum 50-foot setbacks (which includes a 24-foot vegetated turnaround avenue and a 26-foot undisturbed filter strip) shall be maintained around all wetlands. The proposed BMPs shall be implemented throughout the life of the project. These include cover crop management and integrated pest management, which in addition to the proposed setbacks, would effectively filter sediments, agricultural chemicals, and nutrients to a less-than- significant level. Any changes to the BMPs shall be submitted to the Director for approval prior to implementation.</p> <p>Additional buffers are recommended in two locations to provide extra protection to sensitive habitats and</p>		

ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACT (SIGNIFICANCE FINDING BEFORE MITIGATION)	MITIGATION MEASURES	SIGNIFICANCE AFTER MITIGATION	FINDINGS OF FACT
	<p>species. The buffer around a portion of the wetland in Block 5A3 should be increased by 25 feet as shown on Figure 4.2-6 in order to provide additional protection to the wetland and the population of Gairdner's yampah immediately adjacent to it. In addition, the buffer surrounding the drainage in the south of Block 8 should be expanded by 50 feet, as shown on Figure 4.2-6 (please refer to the figure in Section 4.2). Temporary fencing shall be installed around the areas to be avoided, at the outer edge of the buffer, and shall remain in place throughout construction activities.</p> <p>Construction activities, including, but not limited to earthmoving and staging activities, within 50 feet of any USACE jurisdictional features shall be conducted during the dry season (April 1 to September 15 or October 15) to minimize impacts related to erosion, water quality, and aquatic resources, and activities shall be conducted consistent with Mitigation Measure 4.2-10 to protect western pond turtle and Mitigation Measure 4.2-11 for California red-legged frog (CRLF). All disturbed areas shall be seeded and mulched to prevent erosion and sediment deposit into wetlands and waters of the U.S.</p> <p>Staging areas shall be located within approved clearing limits and a minimum distance of 100 feet away from the areas of jurisdictional waters that are fenced off and the ECP (P11-00205- ECPA) shall be modified to indicate this prior to approval. Temporary stockpiling of excavated or imported material shall occur only in approved construction staging areas within the gross acres allocated for vineyard development (i.e., approved vineyard blocks and associated acreage). Excess excavated soil shall be used onsite or disposed of at an approved facility or site. Stockpiles that are to remain on the site through the wet season shall be protected to prevent erosion (e.g. with tarps, silt fences, or straw bales) prior to September 15 or October 15 of each year.</p> <p>Standard precautions shall be employed by the construction contractor to prevent the accidental release of fuel, oil, lubricant, or other hazardous materials associated with construction activities into jurisdictional features. A contaminant program shall be developed and implemented in the event of</p>		

ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACT (SIGNIFICANCE FINDING BEFORE MITIGATION)	MITIGATION MEASURES	SIGNIFICANCE AFTER MITIGATION	FINDINGS OF FACT
<p>Impact 4.2-5: Development of the Proposed Project would have the potential to affect populations of non-hybridized northern California black walnut (<i>Juglans hindsii</i>; CNPS 1B.2) within the project area. This would conflict with General Plan Goal CON-3 and related Policies.</p> <p>The stand of northern California black walnut on the Walt Ranch property and individual trees persisting within the Circle Oaks community comprise the largest and highest quality natural stand of northern California black walnut trees in California documented prior to 1850.</p> <p>Applicant has proposed removing seven black walnut trees that occur outside the wetland corridor in Block 37, in woodland on the western edge of the grassland.</p> <p>(Draft EIR pp. 4.2-96 to 4.2-99; Final EIR pp. 4.2-98 to 4.2-100; Final EIR Response 6.)</p>	<p>release of hazardous materials (as detailed in Mitigation Measure 4.5-1).</p> <p>4.2-5: As part of the Walt Ranch Biological Resources Management Plan (BRMP) required in Mitigation Measure 4.2-1, the following measures will be taken to ensure a less-than-significant impact to northern California black walnut:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • An untagged black walnut stump with sprouts that obviously was rootstock for English walnut, located north of the road on the eastern edge of the grassland, may be removed. This tree is in poor health and was not producing nuts in 2009. • If feasible, the three trees on the western edge of the grassland (tag numbers 8628, 8268, and 8795) should not be removed unless they are demonstrated to the satisfaction of the Director that they are of hybrid origin. • If it is determined that the trees must be removed, and they are determined by the County not to be of hybrid origin, walnuts should be collected prior to removing the trees. Walnuts collected from these trees should then be distributed randomly throughout the native walnut preserved area shown in Figure 4.2-7. • If the three trees are demonstrated to be of hybrid origin, no mitigation would be necessary for their removal. • No additional northern California black walnut trees shall be removed from the property. • The Applicant is encouraged to remove the grafted English walnut stand adjacent to the northern California black walnut stand to minimize hybridization. • Prior to construction in Block 37, temporary construction fencing shall be placed along the avoidance area shown in Figure 4.2-7 (please refer to the figure in Section 4.2). The temporary fencing shall remain throughout construction activities. 	<p>Less-than-significant</p>	<p>Finding: With compliance with MM 4.2-5, which has been required or incorporated into the project, impacts to northern California black walnut would be considered less than significant. The Board hereby directs that this mitigation measure be adopted. Pursuant to Public Resources Code Section 21081 (a) and CEQA Guidelines Section 15091 (a), the Board hereby finds that changes or alterations have been required in, or incorporated into, the Project which avoid or substantially lessen the significant environmental effects to a less-than-significant level.</p> <p>Explanation/Facts in Support of Finding: Applicant has proposed removing seven black walnut trees that occur outside the wetland corridor in Block 37, in woodland on the western edge of the grassland. In order to reduce impacts to less-than-significant levels, MM 4.2-5 requires that the three black walnut trees proposed for removal (tag number 8628, 8268, and 8795) are tested prior to removal to determine if they are of hybrid origin. All of the remaining northern California black walnut trees shall be avoided with a buffer of at least 200 feet. These measures will reduce the impacts to black walnuts to a less-than-significant level.</p> <p>(See Final EIR pp. 4.2-98 to 4.2-100; Final EIR Response 6; Final EIR Responses to Comments O7-5, O7-36, O12-3, O21-057, I073-9. For further details regarding implementation of this measure, see BRMP section 5.3.1.)</p>

ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACT (SIGNIFICANCE FINDING BEFORE MITIGATION)	MITIGATION MEASURES	SIGNIFICANCE AFTER MITIGATION	FINDINGS OF FACT
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> The area shown in Figure 4.2-7 shall be avoided in permanent protection in order to provide sufficient habitat for potential future regrowth and expansion of the population of northern California black walnut trees. Protection shall be achieved through the recordation of a conservation easement approved by the Director, held by an accredited land trust organization, prior to any ground disturbing activities, grading or vegetation removal, or within 12 months of project approval, whichever occurs first. Any request by the permittee for an extension of time to record the conservation easement shall be considered by the Planning Director and shall be submitted to Napa County prior to the 12 month deadline, and shall provide sufficient justification for the extension. 		
<p>Impact 4.2-6: Development of the Project could interfere with existing wildlife movement corridors and could conflict with General Plan Policy CON-18, which relates to wildlife movement.</p> <p>Installation of wildlife exclusion fencing surrounding clusters of vineyard blocks would result in impacts to animal movement. Project design ensures there are spaces for animal passage between fenced clusters, reducing impacts to wildlife movement corridors.</p> <p>Proposed stream and wetland corridor buffers (protected via implementation of MM 4.2-4) on the project site would allow wildlife movement between contiguous habitats within the project parcel and adjacent undeveloped land.</p> <p>(Draft EIR pp. 4.2-99 to 4.2-101; Final EIR pp. 4.2-102 to 4.2-103; Final EIR Response 7.)</p>	<p>4.2-6: After implementation of avoidance measures required in Mitigation Measures 4.2- 1, 4.2-2, 4.2-7, 4.2-8, and 4.2-9, some deer fencing proposed in #P11-00205-ECPA may not be necessary due to alterations in vineyard layout. Prior to the approval of P11-00205- ECPA, the plan shall be modified so that proposed vineyard blocks shall be fenced individually or in small clusters, with corridors of no less than 100 feet in width.</p>	Less-than-significant	<p>Finding: With implementation of MM 4.2-6, along with avoidance measures in MMs 4.2-1, 4.2-2, 4.2-7, 4.2-8 and 4.2-9, all of which have been required or incorporated into the Project, impacts to existing wildlife movement corridors would be considered less than significant. The Board hereby directs that this mitigation measure be adopted. Pursuant to Public Resources Code Section 21081 (a) and CEQA Guidelines Section 15091 (a), the Board hereby finds that changes or alterations have been required in, or incorporated into, the Project which avoid or substantially lessen the significant environmental effects to a less-than-significant level.</p> <p>Explanation/Facts in Support of Finding: Deer fencing surrounding clusters of vineyard blocks would impact animal movement as a consequence of installation of wildlife exclusion fencing. Implementation of MM 4.2-6 (along with avoidance measures in MMs 4.2-1, 4.2-2, 4.2-7, 4.2-8 and 4.2-9) would ensure that impacts to wildlife corridors are minimized by requiring that 100 foot minimum corridors are maintained between deer fencing in accordance with General Plan Policy CON-18. With mitigation, this impact would be less than significant.</p> <p>(See Final EIR pp. 4.2-102 to 4.2-103; Final EIR Response 7; Final EIR Responses to Comments A7-15, O11-49, O11-51, O11-52, O11-53, O11-59, O12-4, O21-049, O21-050, O21-051, O21-052, O21-53, O21-057, O21-058, I073-9, I109-2.)</p>
<p>Impact 4.2-7: Development of the Proposed Project would have the potential to affect</p>	<p>4.2-7: Prior to the approval of #P11-00205-ECPA, the plan shall be modified to include the following (any</p>	Less-than-significant	<p>Finding: Implementation of MM 4.2-7, which has been required or incorporated into the Project, would reduce impacts to holly-</p>

ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACT (SIGNIFICANCE FINDING BEFORE MITIGATION)	MITIGATION MEASURES	SIGNIFICANCE AFTER MITIGATION	FINDINGS OF FACT
<p>populations of holly-leaved ceanothus (CEPU2; CNPS 1B.2) within the project area, which is a potentially significant impact. This could conflict with General Plan Goal CON-3, Policy CON-17, and related Policies.</p> <p>As proposed, the vineyard development would result in the removal of approximately 24.84 acres (37.5 percent) of the holly-leaf ceanothus on the property. Although the project design will avoid over 41.41 acres CEPU2 habitat on the Walt Ranch property, and will result in retention of approximately 62.5 percent of the CEPU2, mitigation is required to reduce this impact.</p> <p>(Draft EIR pp. 4.2-101 to 4.2-105; Final EIR Response 8)</p>	<p>associated project features that become unnecessary as a result of the avoidance, such as proposed roads, shall also be reflected in the revised plan):</p> <p>Impacts to CEPU2 would be reduced to a less- than-significant level through a combination of avoidance, preservation, and replanting. Specifically, the mitigation for the removal of an estimated 24.84 acres of holly-leaf ceanothus would be accomplished through a combination of 1) avoidance of high-quality ceanothus populations within the project area; 2) preservation and conservation of CEPU2 with the highest density and greatest health; and 3) through the restoration and enhancement of CEPU2 elsewhere on the property as part of the Walt Ranch Biological Resources Management Plan (BRMP).</p> <p>Avoidance In order to maintain the health and viability of the holly-leaf ceanothus populations on the Walt Ranch property, approximately 11.94 acres of CEPU2 shall be avoided in order to protect 80 percent of the population on the property. Proposed avoidance locations are detailed in Table 4.2-8 and shown on Figure 4.2-8 (please refer to Section 4.2). The locations shown in Figure 4.2-8 include a 25 foot buffer to protect the populations. Temporary fencing shall be installed around the areas to be avoided, at the outer edge of the buffer, and shall remain in place throughout construction activities. To the maximum extent feasible, access road development shall be relocated as necessary to avoid populations of CEPU2; any acreage that is impacted in order to access blocks shall be mitigated in the final Walt Ranch BRMP.</p> <p>Some of the avoidance proposed in Table 4.2-8 has been targeted to preserve areas where holly-leaf ceanothus and narrow-anthered brodiaea co-occur (narrow-anthered brodiaea is discussed in Impact 4.2-8, below). Therefore, some of the avoidance areas proposed in Table 4.2-8 are also recommended for avoidance in Table 4.2-9, below.</p> <p>The avoidance proposed in Table 4.2-8, in combination with the populations of CEPU2 already outside of clearing limits, will result in the preservation of approximately 53.35 acres (80.52 percent) of CEPU2 on the property. Therefore, the Proposed Project will impact</p>		<p>leaf ceanothus to a less-than-significant level through a combination of avoidance, preservation and replanting. The Board hereby directs that this mitigation measure be adopted. Pursuant to Public Resources Code Section 21081 (a) and CEQA Guidelines Section 15091 (a), the Board hereby finds that changes or alterations have been required in, or incorporated into, the Project which avoid or substantially lessen the significant environmental effects to a less-than-significant level.</p> <p>Explanation/Facts in Support of Finding: Avoidance measures will result in 53.35 acres of CEPU2 on the property to be preserved in perpetuity. As such, the Project will only impact 12.90 acres of holly-leave ceanothus, which will be mitigated at a 1:1 ratio. After implementation of MM 4.2-7, impacts to holly-leaf ceanothus are less than significant.</p> <p>(See Final EIR Response 8; Final EIR Responses to Comments O7-6, O7-10, O12-4, O13-1, O13-2, O21-057, I073-9. For further details regarding implementation of this measure, see BRMP section 5.3.2.)</p>

ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACT (SIGNIFICANCE FINDING BEFORE MITIGATION)	MITIGATION MEASURES	SIGNIFICANCE AFTER MITIGATION	FINDINGS OF FACT
	<p>12.90 acres of holly-leaf ceanothus, which shall be mitigated at a 1:1 ratio as discussed below.</p> <p><u>Preservation and Replanting</u></p> <p>The 53.35 acres of preserved CEPU2 on the property shall be preserved in perpetuity. All acreage designated for preservation shall be identified as such in a conservation easement with an accredited land trust organization such as the Land Trust of Napa County as the grantee, or other equivalent means of permanent protection acceptable to the Director. Land placed in protection shall be restricted from development and other uses that would potentially degrade the quality of the habitat (including, but not limited to, conversion to other land uses such as agriculture or urban development, and excessive off-road vehicle use that increases erosion), and should otherwise be restricted by the existing goals and policies of Napa County. The areas to be covered by the conservation easement shall be determined by a qualified botanist or biologist, and submitted to Napa County for review and approval. The conservation easement shall be prepared in a form acceptable to County Counsel and entered into and recorded with the Napa County Recorder's office prior to any ground disturbing activities, grading or vegetation removal, or within 12 months of project approval, whichever occurs first.</p> <p>Any request by the permittee for an extension of time to record the conservation easement shall be considered by the Planning Director and shall be submitted to Napa County prior to the 12 month deadline, and shall provide sufficient justification for the extension.</p> <p>The direct impact of 12.90 acres of holly-leaf ceanothus should be mitigated by preserving the remainder of the CEPU2 population onsite and replanting at a 1:1 ratio (12.90 acres). Mitigation replanting shall be designated in the Walt Ranch BRMP. In order to provide for habitat continuity and population viability, the replanting areas shall occur within the Milliken Reservoir watershed within areas in close proximity to existing populations of holly-leaf ceanothus. The density of mitigation replanting shall be determined by the qualified biologist during preconstruction surveys and shall be similar to the density that is impacted by the project after avoidance mitigation.</p>		

ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACT (SIGNIFICANCE FINDING BEFORE MITIGATION)	MITIGATION MEASURES	SIGNIFICANCE AFTER MITIGATION	FINDINGS OF FACT
	<p>Additional measures, specific to CEPU2, that shall be included in the Walt Ranch BRMP include:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Transplants shall be planted in suitable areas ecologically similar to the original site as determined by a qualified biologist and approved by Napa County. • A 25-foot buffer shall be established around preserved populations and replanting sites. This buffer shall be flagged in the field by the qualified biologist and inspected by Napa County prior to project commencement. Temporary fencing shall be installed around the areas to be avoided, at the outer edge of the buffer, and shall remain in place throughout construction activities. • A qualified biologist or botanist will monitor the BRMP area annually for a minimum of five years to ensure at least an 80 percent success rate for preservation and replanting of CEPU2. • Annual monitoring reports shall be submitted to Napa County by January 1 of each year for five years after the successful completion of the replanting efforts and plan implementation. 		
<p>Impact 4.2-8: Development of the Project would have the potential to affect populations of narrow-anthered brodiaea (BRLE; CNPS 1B.2) within the project area, which is a potentially significant impact. This could conflict with General Plan Goal CON-3, Policy CON-17, and related Policies.</p> <p>The Project would result in the removal of approximately 26.4 acres (63.1 percent) of the total 41.8 acres of BRLE habitat on the property. Approximately 15.4 acres of narrow-anthered brodiaea exist outside the boundaries of the proposed clearing areas would be retained on the property.</p> <p>(Draft EIR pp. 4.2-105 to 4.2-110; Final EIR Response 8.)</p>	<p>4.2-8: Prior to the approval of #P11-00205-ECPA, the plan shall be modified to include the following (any associated project features that become unnecessary as a result of the avoidance, such as proposed roads, shall also be reflected in the revised plan):</p> <p>Impacts to BRLE would be reduced to a less-than-significant level through a combination of avoidance, preservation, and replanting. Specifically, the mitigation for the removal of an estimated 26.4 acres of narrow-anthered brodiaea would be accomplished through 1) avoidance of high-quality BRLE populations within the project area; 2) preservation and conservation of narrow-anthered brodiaea with the highest density and greatest health; and 3) through the restoration and enhancement of BRLE elsewhere on the property as part of the Walt Ranch Biological Resources Management Plan (BRMP).</p>	<p>Less-than-significant</p>	<p>Finding: Implementation of MM 4.2-8, which has been required or incorporated into the Project, would reduce impacts to BRLE to a less-than-significant level through a combination of avoidance, preservation and replanting. The Board hereby directs that this mitigation measure be adopted. Pursuant to Public Resources Code Section 21081 (a) and CEQA Guidelines Section 15091 (a), the Board hereby finds that changes or alterations have been required in, or incorporated into, the Project which avoid or substantially lessen the significant environmental effects to a less-than-significant level.</p> <p>Explanation/Facts in Support of Finding: The Project would result in The Project would result in the removal of approximately 26.4 acres of BRLE habitat. Avoidance under MM 4.2-8, in combination with the populations of BRLE already outside of the clearing limits, would result in the preservation of approximately 33.2 acres (79.5 percent) of BRLE on the property. The remaining 8.63 impacted acres would be mitigated at a 1:1 ratio. After implementation of MM 4.2-8, impacts to narrow-anthered brodiaea will be less than</p>

ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACT (SIGNIFICANCE FINDING BEFORE MITIGATION)	MITIGATION MEASURES	SIGNIFICANCE AFTER MITIGATION	FINDINGS OF FACT
	<p><u>Avoidance</u></p> <p>In order to maintain the health and viability of the narrow-anthered brodiaea populations on the Walt Ranch property, approximately 17.74 acres of BRLE shall be avoided in order to protect approximately 80 percent of the population on the property. Proposed avoidance locations are detailed in Table 4.2-9 and shown on Figure 4.2-9 (please refer to Section 4.2). The locations shown in Figure 4.2-9 include a 25 foot buffer to protect the populations. To the maximum extent feasible, access road development shall be relocated as necessary to avoid populations of BRLE; any acreage that is impacted in order to access blocks shall be mitigated in the Walt Ranch BRMP.</p> <p>Some of the avoidance proposed in Table 4.2-9 has been targeted to preserve areas where hollyleaf ceanothus and narrow-anthered brodiaea co-occur. Therefore, some of the avoidance areas proposed in Table 4.2-9 are also required for avoidance in Table 4.2-8, above.</p> <p>The avoidance proposed in Table 4.2-9, in combination with the populations of BRLE already outside of clearing limits, will result in the preservation of approximately 33.2 acres (79.5 percent) of BRLE on the property. Therefore, the Proposed Project will impact 8.63 acres of narrow-anthered brodiaea, which shall be mitigated at a 1:1 ratio as discussed below.</p> <p><u>Preservation and Replanting</u></p> <p>The 33.2 acres of preserved BRLE shall be preserved on the property in perpetuity. All acreage designated for preservation shall be identified as such in a conservation easement with an accredited land trust organization such as the Land Trust of Napa County as the grantee, or other equivalent means of permanent protection, acceptable to the Director. Land placed in protection shall be restricted from development and other uses that would potentially degrade the quality of the habitat (including, but not limited to, conversion to other land uses such as agriculture or urban development, and excessive off-road vehicle use that increases</p>		<p>significant.</p> <p>(See Final EIR Response 8; Final EIR Responses to Comments O7-7, O7-10, O21-057, O21-068, I073-9. For further details regarding implementation of this measure, see BRMP section 5.3.3.)</p>

ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACT (SIGNIFICANCE FINDING BEFORE MITIGATION)	MITIGATION MEASURES	SIGNIFICANCE AFTER MITIGATION	FINDINGS OF FACT
	<p>erosion), and should otherwise be restricted by the existing goals and policies of Napa County. The areas to be covered by the conservation easement shall be determined by a qualified botanist or biologist, and submitted to Napa County for review and approval. The conservation easement shall be prepared in a form acceptable to County Counsel and entered into and recorded with the Napa County Recorder's office prior to any ground disturbing activities, grading or vegetation removal, or within 12 months of project approval, whichever occurs first.</p> <p>Any request by the permittee for an extension of time to record the conservation easement shall be considered by the Planning Director and shall be submitted to Napa County prior to the 12 month deadline, and shall provide sufficient justification for the extension.</p> <p>The direct impact of 8.63 acres of narrow- anthered brodiaea shall be mitigated by preserving the remainder of the BRLE population onsite and replanting at a 1:1 ratio (8.63 acres) in locations designated in the Walt Ranch BRMP. In order to provide for habitat continuity and population viability, the replanting areas shall occur within the Milliken Creek watershed within areas in close proximity to existing populations of narrow-anthered brodiaea. The density of mitigation replanting shall be determined by the qualified biologist during preconstruction surveys and shall be similar to the density that is impacted by the project after avoidance mitigation.</p> <p>Additional measures, specific to BRLE, that shall be included in the Walt Ranch BRMP include:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Transplants shall be planted in suitable areas ecologically similar to the original site as determined by a qualified biologist and approved by Napa County. • Annual monitoring reports shall be submitted to Napa County by January 1 of each year for five years after the successful completion of the replanting efforts and plan implementation; • A 25-foot buffer shall be established around 		

ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACT (SIGNIFICANCE FINDING BEFORE MITIGATION)	MITIGATION MEASURES	SIGNIFICANCE AFTER MITIGATION	FINDINGS OF FACT
	<p>preserved populations and replanting sites. This buffer shall be flagged in the field by the qualified biologist and inspected by Napa County prior to project commencement. Temporary fencing shall be installed around the areas to be avoided, at the outer edge of the buffer, and shall remain in place throughout construction activities.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> A qualified biologist or botanist will monitor the BRMP area annually for a minimum of five years to ensure at least an 80 percent success rate for preservation and replanting of BRLE. 		
<p>Impact 4.2-9: Development of the Project would have the potential to affect habitat for other special status species on the project site, in conflict with General Plan Goal CON-3 and related Policies, and could result in conflicts with Goal CON-2 that requires the maintenance and enhancement of existing levels of biodiversity.</p> <p>There are approximately five populations of narrow-leaved daisy that were mapped on the property in 2008, three of which will be impacted by the Project.</p> <p>Jepson's leptosiphon is found on 0.8 acres of the property, and approximately 0.09 acres (11.1 percent) will be impacted by the Project.</p> <p>Napa bluecurls occur over 1.54 acres of the property, and approximately 0.3 acres (16.5 percent) will be impacted by the Project.</p> <p>Gairdner's yampah occupies approximately 9.0 acres within the property, and approximately 3.25 acres (36.0 percent) will be impacted by the Project.</p> <p>There are five populations of redwood lily on the property, and one will be impacted by the Project.</p>	<p>4.2-9: Prior to the approval of #P11-00205- ECPA, the plan shall be modified to include the following (any associated project features that become unnecessary as a result of the avoidance, such as proposed roads, shall also be reflected in the revised plan):</p> <p>For all of the species discussed below, buffers of no less than 25 feet shall be established around any preserved or replanted areas. All populations of species designated shall be identified in a conservation easement held by an accredited land trust organization such as the Land Trust of Napa County as the grantee, or other equivalent means of permanent protection, acceptable to the Director. Land placed in protection shall be restricted from development and other uses that would potentially degrade the quality of the habitat (including, but not limited to, conversion to other land uses such as agriculture or urban development, and excessive off-road vehicle use that increases erosion), and should otherwise be restricted by the existing goals and policies of Napa County. The areas to be covered by the conservation easement shall be determined by a qualified botanist or biologist and submitted to Napa County for review and approval. The conservation easement shall be prepared in a form acceptable to County Counsel and entered into and recorded with the Napa County Recorder's office prior to any ground disturbance, grading, or vegetation removal, or with 12 months of project approval, whichever occurs first.</p> <p>Any request by the permittee for an extension of time</p>		<p>Finding: Implementation of MM 4.2-9, which has been required or incorporated into the Project, would reduce impacts to special-status plant species through a combination of avoidance, preservation, and replanting. The Board hereby directs that this mitigation measure be adopted. Pursuant to Public Resources Code Section 21081 (a) and CEQA Guidelines Section 15091 (a), the Board hereby finds that changes or alterations have been required in, or incorporated into, the Project which avoid or substantially lessen the significant environmental effects to a less-than-significant level.</p> <p>Explanation/Facts in Support of Finding: The Project would cause disturbance or loss of special-status plant species present in the development areas. To reduce this potentially significant impact to a less-than-significant level, a combination of avoidance, preservation and replanting will be employed. Prior to development, a botanical survey for narrow-leaved daisy will be conducted to relocate the identified plants on the property.</p> <p>Jepson's leptosiphon shall be preserved by removing portions of vineyard blocks 20A, 48, 55B, and the avenue surrounding 55B. Napa bluecurls will be avoided in their entirety by removing a portion of Block 16. Approximately 1.10 acres of vineyard have been removed from the Project to protect Gairdner's yampah and preservation of existing populations will also serve to preserve other special-status species, as well. Populations of redwood lily will be avoided with a 25 foot buffer and preserved in a deed restriction or conservation easement. Approximately 1.11 acres of vineyard has been removed from the Project to protect Green monardella. After implementation of MM 4.2-9, impacts to special-status plant species are less than significant.</p> <p>(See Final EIR pp. 4.2-111 to 4.2-116; Final EIR Response 8; Final EIR Responses to Comments O7-10, O7-14, O7-17, O7-23, O21-057, I073-9. For further details regarding implementation of this</p>

ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACT (SIGNIFICANCE FINDING BEFORE MITIGATION)	MITIGATION MEASURES	SIGNIFICANCE AFTER MITIGATION	FINDINGS OF FACT
<p>Green monardella has been mapped on 4.5 acres within the property, and approximately 3.4 acres (75.5 percent) will be impacted by the Project.</p> <p>The impact to special-status plant species is a potentially significant impact.</p> <p>(Draft EIR pp. 4.2-110 to 4.2-114; Final EIR pp. 4.2-111 to 4.2-116; Final EIR Response 8.)</p>	<p>to record the conservation easement shall be considered by the Planning Director and shall be submitted to Napa County prior to the 12 month deadline, and shall provide sufficient justification for the extension.</p> <p>All mitigation plantings shall conform to the same five year annual monitoring and 80 percent success criteria standards found in the Walt Ranch BRMP. To the maximum extent feasible, access road development shall be relocated as necessary to avoid impacts to sensitive plant species.</p> <p>Prior to development of the Proposed Project, a botanical survey for narrow-leaved daisy shall be conducted to re-locate the identified plants on the property. Any plants that are not relocated by the qualified biologist or botanist do not require further mitigation. For any of the six narrow-leaved daisies that are relocated, seeds shall be collected in the fall, between August and September, and a test transplant shall be conducted in winter. Provided that the plant survives after one year of monitoring by a qualified biologist or botanist, the Applicant may proceed with mitigation replanting for narrow-leaved daisy. If the mitigation transplant does not survive, the Applicant shall protect the three isolated populations in Block 16.</p> <p>Provided that mitigation is successful, the one isolated population of narrow-leaved daisy that occurs in Block 16 may be removed for vineyard development under the Proposed Project without impacting overall population viability. The five populations outside of vineyard blocks (located north of Block 10, just east of Block 16B2, east of Block 1A, within a portion of 2A2 avoided per WPT mitigation, and just south of Block 16A2) shall be preserved. The three impacted populations shall be mitigated through replanting and seed collection in a protected and appropriate habitat elsewhere on the property, as determined by a qualified botanist. The replanting areas shall be designated in the Walt Ranch BRMP.</p> <p>All eight populations designated for preservation</p>		<p>measure, see BRMP section 5.3.)</p>

ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACT (SIGNIFICANCE FINDING BEFORE MITIGATION)	MITIGATION MEASURES	SIGNIFICANCE AFTER MITIGATION	FINDINGS OF FACT
	<p>shall be identified in a conservation easement held by an accredited land trust organization, or other equivalent means of permanent protection, subject to approval by the Director. Land placed in protection shall be restricted from development and other uses that would potentially degrade the quality of the habitat (including, but not limited to, conversion to other land uses such as agriculture or urban development, and excessive off-road vehicle use that increases erosion), and should otherwise be restricted by the existing goals and policies of Napa County. The areas to be covered by the conservation easement shall be determined by a qualified botanist or biologist, and submitted to Napa County for review and approval. The conservation easement shall be prepared in a form acceptable to County Counsel and entered into and recorded with the Napa County Recorder's office prior to any ground disturbing activities, grading or vegetation removal, or within 12 months of project approval, whichever occurs first.</p> <p>Any request by the permittee for an extension of time to record the conservation easement shall be considered by the Planning Director and shall be submitted to Napa County prior to the 12 month deadline, and shall provide sufficient justification for the extension.</p> <p>Additional measures, specific to narrow-leaved daisy, that shall be included in the Walt Ranch BRMP include:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Transplants shall be planted in suitable areas ecologically similar to the original site as determined by a qualified biologist and approved by Napa County. • A 25-foot buffer shall be established around preserved populations and replanting sites. Temporary fencing shall be installed around the areas to be avoided, at the outer edge of the buffer, and shall remain in place throughout construction activities. A minimum of approximately a two-foot diameter by one foot deep plug of soil should be transported intact 		

ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACT (SIGNIFICANCE FINDING BEFORE MITIGATION)	MITIGATION MEASURES	SIGNIFICANCE AFTER MITIGATION	FINDINGS OF FACT
	<p>with the plant.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Transplanting of narrow-leaved daisy shall occur between November and January. • A qualified biologist or botanist will monitor the BRMP area annually for a minimum of five years to ensure at least an 80 percent success rate for preservation and replanting of narrow-leaved daisy. • Annual monitoring reports shall be submitted to Napa County by January 1 of each year for five years after the successful completion of the replanting efforts and plan implementation. <p>All populations of Jepson's leptosiphon shall be preserved by removing portions of the following vineyard blocks from the Proposed Project: 20A, 48, 55B, and the avenue surrounding 55B. The populations shall be protected with a 50 foot buffer. Temporary fencing shall be installed around the areas to be avoided, at the outer edge of the buffer, and shall remain in place throughout construction activities. These areas provide additional benefits by preserving western pond turtle upland habitat (discussed further in Impact 4.2-10) and Gairdner's yampah habitat. Therefore, 0.8 acres of vineyard will be required to be removed from the Proposed Project to protect Jepson's leptosiphon, which will result in 100 percent avoidance on the property.</p> <p>Approximately 1.54 acres of Napa bluecurls occurs in one isolated wetland near Block 16. The other isolated population is located outside of the proposed clearing limits. The Proposed Project would impact 0.3 acres (16.5 percent) of the Napa bluecurls on the property. Due to the rarity and extremely limited range of this species, Napa bluecurls shall be avoided in their entirety. Preserving the 0.3-acre population by removing this portion of Block 16 shall result in 100 percent avoidance of this species. Temporary fencing shall be installed around the areas to be avoided, at the outer edge of the buffer, and shall remain in place throughout construction activities. Prior to the issuance of any grading plans, the Erosion Control Plan shall be modified to remove the above referenced areas from development.</p>		

ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACT (SIGNIFICANCE FINDING BEFORE MITIGATION)	MITIGATION MEASURES	SIGNIFICANCE AFTER MITIGATION	FINDINGS OF FACT
	<p>Populations of Gairdner's yampah occur throughout the property and within several proposed vineyard areas (see Figure 4.2-3). Not all populations on the property were mapped. Populations shall be preserved in vineyard blocks 51C; 5A1, 5A3, and 8A (will also provide for additional stream and wetland buffers, as well as brodiaea and ceanothus protection); 16A and 16C1 (will also protect Napa bluecurls); 17B (will protect specimen trees); 20A (will protect Jepson's leptosiphon); 36A, 37F, and 37G (will also protect black walnut habitat); and 2A, 34A1, 34A2, 43, 45A, and 49 (will also protect western pond turtle upland habitat). Therefore, approximately 1.10 acres of vineyard have been removed from the Proposed Project to protect Gairdner's yampah, and a total of 6.85 acres (76.1 percent) will be preserved on the property. Prior to any ground disturbing activities, grading or vegetation removal, the temporary fencing shall be installed around the areas to be avoided, at the outer edge of the buffer, and shall remain in place throughout construction activities.</p> <p>As stated above, this plant occurs throughout the property, and mapping focused predominantly within proposed vineyard blocks; therefore, it is likely that additional populations exist outside of the clearing limits and greater than 80 percent avoidance has been achieved. Preservation of existing appropriate habitats for natural regeneration and persistence of existing perennial populations is sufficient to maintain this species on site.</p> <p>There are five populations of redwood lily on the property. All populations shall be avoided with a 25 foot buffer and preserved in the conservation easement on the property. Prior to any ground disturbing activities, grading or vegetation removal, the temporary fencing shall be installed around the areas to be avoided, at the outer edge of the buffer, and shall remain in place throughout construction activities.</p> <p>All five populations of redwood lily designated for preservation shall be identified in a conservation</p>		

ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACT (SIGNIFICANCE FINDING BEFORE MITIGATION)	MITIGATION MEASURES	SIGNIFICANCE AFTER MITIGATION	FINDINGS OF FACT
	<p>easement held by an accredited organization, or other equivalent means of permanent protection, subject to approval by the Director. Land placed in protection shall be restricted from development and other uses that would potentially degrade the quality of the habitat (including, but not limited to, conversion to other land uses such as agriculture or urban development, and excessive off-road vehicle use that increases erosion), and should otherwise be restricted by the existing goals and policies of Napa County. The areas to be covered by the conservation easement shall be determined by a qualified botanist or biologist, and submitted to Napa County for review and approval. The conservation easement shall be prepared in a form acceptable to County Counsel and entered into and recorded with the Napa County Recorder's office prior to any ground disturbing activities, grading or vegetation removal, or within six months of project approval, whichever occurs first.</p> <p>Green monardella occurs in Blocks 16A, 16B1, and 16B2, as well as areas outside of clearing limits just northwest of Block 16A. The green monardella that overlaps with native grassland in Block 16B1, 16B2, and the avenues outside these blocks shall be avoided. Prior to any ground disturbing activities, grading or vegetation removal, the temporary fencing shall be installed around the areas to be avoided, at the outer edge of the buffer, and shall remain in place throughout construction activities.</p> <p>Therefore, approximately 1.11 acres of vineyard has been removed from the Proposed Project to protect this species. This will result in a total of 2.20 acres (48.8 percent) of green monardella preserved on the property. Preservation of existing appropriate habitats for natural regeneration and persistence of existing perennial populations is sufficient to maintain this species on site, and replanting is not required.</p>		
<p>Impact 4.2-10: Western pond turtles were observed in Capell and Milliken Creeks and their tributaries on many occasions by biological survey personnel (WRA, 2007; AES, 2009). This species utilizes upland</p>	<p>4.2-10: Prior to the approval of #P11-00205-ECPA, the plan shall be modified to include the following (any associated project features that become unnecessary as a result of the avoidance, such as proposed roads, shall also be reflected in</p>	<p>Less-than-significant</p>	<p>Finding: Implementation of MM 4.2-10 (along with riparian buffers required under MM 4.2-4), which has been required or incorporated into the Project, would reduce potential impacts on western pond turtles to less-than-significant levels through a combination of avoidance and preservation of prime nesting and upland habitat. The Board hereby directs that this mitigation</p>

ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACT (SIGNIFICANCE FINDING BEFORE MITIGATION)	MITIGATION MEASURES	SIGNIFICANCE AFTER MITIGATION	FINDINGS OF FACT
<p>habitats in proximity to suitable aquatic habitats to lay eggs and take refuge from flooding or dry conditions. Suitable nesting and refuge habitat is present in the grassland and woodland habitats in proximity to occupied aquatic habitats. Development of the project would have the potential to affect western pond turtles. This is a potentially significant impact.</p> <p>Based on turtle observations and habitat on the project site it is estimated that approximately 531 acres of western pond turtle habitat occur on the 2,300-acre project site. Approximately 4.5 acres of nesting habitat (or 21.7 percent) are located within portions of proposed vineyard Blocks 18, 19, 20, 21, 42, 45, and 69 would be lost as a result of the Project as currently proposed. A total of 44.6 acres (8.4 percent) of upland nest habitat for western pond turtle is contained within the proposed vineyard blocks. Therefore, 91.6 percent of western pond turtle habitat would be retained within the site.</p> <p>Localized increase in soil erosion from certain blocks could have an impact on wildlife that utilize aquatic habitat in the vicinity of those vineyard blocks. This would be a significant impact.</p> <p>(Draft EIR pp. 4.2-114 to 4.2-118; Final EIR pp. 4.2-116 to 4.2-118; Final EIR Response 8.)</p>	<p>the revised plan):</p> <p>Impacts to western pond turtle would be reduced to a less-than-significant level through a combination of avoidance and preservation of prime nesting and upland habitat. This is accomplished in through the stream setbacks provided in the project design and in Mitigation Measure 4.2-4, as well as the additional avoidance measures discussed below.</p> <p><u>Avoidance and Preservation</u></p> <p>In order to maintain sufficient nesting habitat for western pond turtle populations on the Walt Ranch property, approximately 4.07 acres of nesting habitat shall be avoided in Blocks 18A1, 18A2, 18A3, 18A5, 19B, 21B, 42, 45A, 45B, and 69, as well as in the vineyard avenues surrounding those blocks. These avoidance locations shall occur at the locations shown on Figure 4.2-10. This avoidance, in combination with other nesting habitat outside of clearing limits, will result in the preservation of approximately 20.27 acres (97.93 percent) of the western pond turtle nesting habitat on the property.</p> <p>Upland habitat is also important for natural species behaviors. Portions of vineyard blocks 29B2, 30A, 42, 43, 45B, 57B, and 58A shall be removed from the Proposed Project in order to provide continuous tracts of western pond turtle upland habitat in the Capell Creek watershed. These areas will also protect the sensitive Valley Oak (California Bay – Coast Live Oak – Walnut – Ash) Riparian Forest NFD habitat type. In the central portion of the property, portions of Block 18A3, 18A5, 34A2, 48, 52, and 69 will be avoided in order to provide a larger corridor of unbroken upland habitat. Block 34A2 will also protect Gairdner's yampah, while Block 48 will also protect populations of Jepson's leptosiphon. In the Milliken Creek watershed, portions of blocks 1B, 1C, 2A1, 2A2, 2B1, 2B2, 8C, 9A4, and 24 will be removed. Approximately 16.9 acres of western pond turtle upland habitat has been removed from the Proposed Project. The avoidance shown in Figure 4.2-10, in combination with the other upland habitat outside of clearing limits, will result in the preservation of 486.56 acres (95.44 percent) of western pond turtle upland</p>		<p>measure be adopted. Pursuant to Public Resources Code Section 21081 (a) and CEQA Guidelines Section 15091 (a), the Board hereby finds that changes or alterations have been required in, or incorporated into, the Project which avoid or substantially lessen the significant environmental effects to a less-than-significant level.</p> <p>Explanation/Facts in Support of Finding: The avoidance specific nesting habitat and upland habitat locations required under MM 4.2-10, in combination with nesting habitat and upland habitat outside of clearing limits, would result in the preservation of more than 95 percent of such western pond turtle habitat, respectively, on the property. Riparian buffers and setbacks as required under MM 4.2-4 have been shown to intercept and trap as much a 75 to 100 percent of sediment in runoff (Grismer, 2006). Therefore, impacts to western pond turtle as a result of sedimentation would be less than significant. In addition to avoiding sensitive habitats, MM 4.2-10 requires various additional mitigation measures that will ensure a less than significant impact to the western pond turtle.</p> <p>(See Final EIR pp. 4.2-116 to 4.2-118; Final EIR Response 8; Final EIR Responses to Comments O12-4, O21-025, O21-26, O21-27, O21-30, O21-057, O22-083, O22-109, O22-114, I073-9.)</p>

ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACT (SIGNIFICANCE FINDING BEFORE MITIGATION)	MITIGATION MEASURES	SIGNIFICANCE AFTER MITIGATION	FINDINGS OF FACT
	<p>habitat on the property.</p> <p>Prior to the issuance of any grading plans, the Erosion Control Plan shall be modified to remove the above referenced nesting and upland habitat areas for the western pond turtle from development.</p> <p>The above referenced nesting and upland habitat areas for the western pond turtle designated for preservation shall be identified in a conservation easement held by an accredited land trust organization, or other equivalent means of permanent protection, subject to approval by the Director. Land placed in protection shall be restricted from development and other uses that would potentially degrade the quality of the habitat (including, but not limited to, conversion to other land uses such as agriculture or urban development, and excessive off-road vehicle use that increases erosion), and should otherwise be restricted by the existing goals and policies of Napa County. The areas to be covered by the conservation easement shall be determined by a qualified botanist or biologist, and submitted to Napa County for review and approval. The conservation easement shall be prepared in a form acceptable to County Counsel and entered into and recorded with the Napa County Recorder's office prior to any ground disturbing activities, grading or vegetation removal, or within 12 months of project approval, whichever occurs first.</p> <p>Any request by the permittee for an extension of time to record the conservation easement shall be considered by the Planning Director and shall be submitted to Napa County prior to the 12 month deadline, and shall provide sufficient justification for the extension.</p> <p><u>Other Protective Measures</u></p> <p>In addition to avoiding sensitive habitats as discussed above, various additional mitigation measures will ensure a less-than-significant impact to this species:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • A preconstruction survey shall be conducted by a qualified biologist within two weeks prior to 		

ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACT (SIGNIFICANCE FINDING BEFORE MITIGATION)	MITIGATION MEASURES	SIGNIFICANCE AFTER MITIGATION	FINDINGS OF FACT
	<p>commencement of any groundbreaking activities within 100 feet of Capell and Milliken Creeks and their tributaries.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Prior to groundbreaking activities, all construction personnel will receive training on western pond turtle. During the training, the biologist shall designate a representative to check for presence of western pond turtle beneath all construction equipment prior to daily construction activities. The representative shall be informed as to the location that any western pond turtle be relocated should one be observed. • Construction and vineyard activities involving loud equipment should be minimized to the extent feasible from February through November within 100 feet of aquatic habitat where the turtles are found. Some habituation to noise is more likely if the noise is sustained (background) rather than in irregular bursts. • Human disturbance within potential habitat should be minimized late afternoon through early evening from May through July to avoid disturbing egg laying activities. • The use of BMPs as required in Mitigation Measures 4.5-1, 4.5-2, 4.5-3, and 4.5-4, as well as the use of Integrated Pest Management (IPM), will minimize agrichemical drift into turtle habitat. • Turtle exclusion fencing will be installed from May through July around all grading and construction activities within or bordering nesting habitat to prevent impacts. From October through March, a turtle exclusion fence shall be installed around all activities within or bordering overwintering habitat to prevent impacts and the fencing shall be field verified by Napa County annually throughout the construction period. The fence shall be constructed from silt fencing to avoid turtle injury and entrapment. 		
<p>Impact 4.2-11: Development and operation of the Proposed Project would have the potential to affect special status amphibian species, including two species of frogs in the region, California red-legged frog (CRLF) and foothill yellow-legged frog</p>	<p>4.2-11: The wetland and stream setbacks and mitigation provided in Mitigation Measure 4.2-4 and Mitigation Measure 4.2-10, in combination with the overall avoidance in the project design, will reduce impacts to a less-than-significant level. In addition, the applicant shall implement the following</p>	<p>Less-than-significant</p>	<p>Finding: Implementation of the wetland and stream setbacks provided in MM 4.2-4 and MM 4.2-10, in combination with the overall avoidance in the project design, which have been required or incorporated into the Project, will reduce impacts to a less- than-significant level. The Board hereby directs that this mitigation measure be adopted. Pursuant to Public Resources</p>

ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACT (SIGNIFICANCE FINDING BEFORE MITIGATION)	MITIGATION MEASURES	SIGNIFICANCE AFTER MITIGATION	FINDINGS OF FACT
<p>(FYLF). This is a potentially significant impact.</p> <p>Impacts related to the construction and operation of this project could result in chemical runoff and habitat degradation.</p> <p>(Draft EIR pp. 4.2-118 to 4.2-119; Final EIR pp. 4.2-120 to 4.2-121; Final EIR Response 8.)</p>	<p>measures to ensure that bullfrogs do not become established in the four proposed groundwater reservoirs:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Project applicant shall conduct appropriately timed surveys each year to determine if bullfrogs have become established in any of the onsite reservoirs. If any bullfrog adults, eggs, and/or tadpoles are detected at any time, they shall be managed promptly as to prevent colonization. All surveys and direct removal efforts (of adult bullfrogs only) must be made by a person knowledgeable in species identification using a method approved by CDFW. Direct removal efforts of egg masses, larva, or sub-adult life stages shall be conducted by a qualified biologist only. Copies of the annual surveys and recommended measures shall be provided to the Director, within 30 days of completion. • If bullfrogs are detected, the applicant shall implement direct removal efforts until adults and/or sub-adults can no longer be detected and are believed to be gone for the season. Bullfrog management efforts shall target the bullfrog's life history stage: 1) egg mass removal, 2) larval removal, and 3) adult and juvenile frog. These bullfrog control methods remove individuals and break the reproductive cycle. Removal methods include manual take of adults and sub-adults, collecting egg masses, capturing larvae, and draining ponds to strand larvae. • Removal efforts shall occur during the active/breeding season occurring (April – July) with at least three efforts done a few days apart and another two efforts separated by two weeks. Direct removal efforts should be completed with at least two people using a small boat, spotlights, and appropriate tools to capture and contain the bullfrogs. Capture and disposal shall be done in compliance with CDFW codes and regulations using appropriate gear. Bullfrog egg mass removal efforts shall occur late June through August. • Bullfrogs may be taken under the authority of a sport fishing license (California Code of 		<p>Code Section 21081 (a) and CEQA Guidelines Section 15091 (a), the Board hereby finds that changes or alterations have been required in, or incorporated into, the Project which avoid or substantially lessen the significant environmental effects to a less-than-significant level.</p> <p>Explanation/Facts in Support of Finding: Using BMPs as proposed, such as cover crop management and integrated pest management, in addition to the proposed setbacks discussed in Impact 4.2-4, would effectively filter sediments, agricultural chemicals, and nutrients to a less-than-significant level. In addition to mitigation required under MM 4.2-4 and 4.2-10, MM 4.2-11 would also protect groundwater reservoirs by ensuring that bullfrogs do not become established in the reservoirs.</p> <p>(See Final EIR pp. 4.2-120 to 4.2-121; Final EIR Response 8; Final EIR Responses to Comments A7-13, O7-22, O12-4, O21-004, O21-005, O21-009, O21-010, O21-011, O21-012, O21-013, O21-014, O21-015, O21-057, O22-107, O22-119, I069-3, I073-9, I077-7, I146-79.)</p>

ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACT (SIGNIFICANCE FINDING BEFORE MITIGATION)	MITIGATION MEASURES	SIGNIFICANCE AFTER MITIGATION	FINDINGS OF FACT
	<p>Regulations, Title 14 (T-14) section 5.05(a)(28)). There is no daily bag limit, possession limit or hour restriction, but bullfrogs can only be taken by hand, hand- held dip net, hook and line, lights, spears, gigs, grabs, paddles, bow and arrow, or hook and line fishing tackle. Alternatively, California Fish and Game Code Section 5501 allows CDFW to issue a permit to destroy fish that are harmful to other wildlife. The regulations have addressed this under Section CCR T-14 226.5 Issuance of Permits to Destroy Harmful Species of Fish in Private Waters for Management Purposes. This allows the CDFW to issue free permits to destroy harmful aquatic species.</p> <p><u>Other Protective Measures</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Prior to groundbreaking activities, all construction personnel will receive training on California red-legged frog. During the training, the biologist shall designate a representative to check for presence of California red-legged frog beneath all construction equipment prior to daily construction activities. • No pile burning shall occur within 300 feet of suitable red-legged or yellow-legged frog habitat. • Frog exclusion fencing (silt fencing or other exclusionary fencing deemed acceptable by a qualified biologist) shall be installed from April through October around all grading and construction activities within or bordering California red-legged frog habitat to prevent impacts. The fence shall be constructed from silt fencing to avoid turtle or red-legged frog injury and entrapment. 		
<p>Impact 4.2-13: Development of the Project would have the potential to affect migratory birds and other birds of prey, including white- tailed kite (<i>Elanus leucurus</i>) and bald eagle (<i>Haliaeetus leucocephalus</i>). This is considered a potentially significant impact.</p> <p>More than 78 percent of various habitat types including but not limited to foraging habitat on the property will be retained onsite; therefore habitat loss that could</p>	<p>4.2-13: The Applicant shall implement the following measures to avoid disturbing any special status species nesting above ground. Vegetation removal conducted during the nesting period shall require a pre-construction survey for active bird nests, conducted by a qualified biologist. A copy of the pre- construction survey shall be submitted to the Director prior to approval of any grading permits within surveyed areas. No known active nests shall be disturbed without a permit or other authorization from USFWS and/or CDFW.</p>		<p>Finding: Compliance with MM 4.2-13, which has been required or incorporated into the Project, will reduce this impact to a less-than-significant level by requiring preconstruction surveys and limited operating periods, as necessary. The Board hereby directs that this mitigation measure be adopted. Pursuant to Public Resources Code Section 21081 (a) and CEQA Guidelines Section 15091 (a), the Board hereby finds that changes or alterations have been required in, or incorporated into, the Project which avoid or substantially lessen the significant environmental effects to a less-than-significant level.</p>

ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACT (SIGNIFICANCE FINDING BEFORE MITIGATION)	MITIGATION MEASURES	SIGNIFICANCE AFTER MITIGATION	FINDINGS OF FACT
<p>result from implementation of the Project will not significantly affect migratory birds or other birds of prey.</p> <p>(Draft EIR pp. 4.2-120 to 4.2-121; Final EIR Response 8.)</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> For earth-disturbing activities occurring during the breeding season (March 1 through September 1), a qualified biologist shall conduct pre-construction surveys of all potential nesting habitat for all birds within 500 feet of earthmoving activities. If active special status bird nests are found during pre-construction surveys 1) a 500- foot no-disturbance buffer will be created around active raptor nests during the breeding season or until it is determined that all young have fledged, and 2) a 250- foot buffer zone will be created around the nests of other special status birds and all other birds that are protected by California Fish and Game Code 3503. These buffer zones are consistent with CDFW avoidance guidelines and CDFW buffers required on other similar ECPA projects; however, they may be modified in coordination with CDFW based on existing conditions at the project site. Temporary fencing shall be installed around the areas to be avoided, at the outer edge of the buffer, and shall remain in place throughout construction activities. If pre-construction surveys indicate that nests are inactive or potential habitat is unoccupied during the construction period, no further mitigation is required. Shrubs and trees that have been determined to be unoccupied by special status birds or that are located 500 feet from active nests may be removed. If vegetation removal activities are delayed or suspended for more than two weeks after the pre-construction survey, the areas shall be resurveyed. 		<p>Explanation/Facts in Support of Finding: Development of the Project would have the potential to affect migratory birds and other birds of prey, including white-tailed kite (<i>Elanus leucurus</i>) and bald eagle (<i>Haliaeetus leucocephalus</i>). Mitigation set forth in MM 4.2-13 requires measures to avoid disturbing any special status species nesting above ground including conducting pre-construction surveys of active bird nests. No known active nests shall be disturbed without a permit or other authorization from USFWS and/or CDFW. Implementation of MM 4.2-13 would reduce potential impacts on migratory birds and other birds of prey to a less-than-significant level.</p> <p>(See Final EIR Response 8; Final EIR Responses to Comments O21-37, O21-038, O21- 039, O21-057, I073-9.)</p>
<p>Impact 4.2-14: Development of the Project would have the potential to affect special-status bat species. This is a potentially significant impact.</p> <p>(Draft EIR p. 4.2-121; Final EIR pp. 4.2- 123 to 4.2-124; Final EIR Response 8.)</p>	<p>4.2-14: Implementation of the following mitigation measures would reduce the potential impact to a less-than-significant level.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> For earth-disturbing activities occurring during the breeding season (March 1 through August 31), a qualified wildlife biologist shall conduct pre-construction surveys of all potential bat-roosting habitat for special status bats within 200 feet of earthmoving activities. Roosting 	<p>Less-than-significant</p>	<p>Finding: Compliance with MM 4.2-14, which has been required or incorporated into the Project, will reduce this impact to a less-than-significant level by requiring preconstruction surveys and limited operating periods, as necessary. The Board hereby directs that this mitigation measure be adopted. Pursuant to Public Resources Code Section 21081 (a) and CEQA Guidelines Section 15091 (a), the Board hereby finds that changes or alterations have been required in, or incorporated into, the Project which avoid or substantially lessen the significant environmental effects to a less-than-significant</p>

ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACT (SIGNIFICANCE FINDING BEFORE MITIGATION)	MITIGATION MEASURES	SIGNIFICANCE AFTER MITIGATION	FINDINGS OF FACT
	<p>habitat surveys shall focus on a) trees slated for removal that have loose bark, or holes/crevices in the trunk and b) rock piles slated for removal that contain crevices. A copy of the pre-construction survey shall be submitted to the Director prior to approval of any ground disturbance, vegetation removal, or grading within surveyed areas.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • If active special status bat roosts are found during pre-construction surveys, the biologists shall submit an avoidance plan to CDFW for review and acceptance. A copy of CDFW acceptance of the avoidance plan shall be submitted to the Director prior to any ground disturbance, vegetation removal or grading within surveyed areas. A no- disturbance buffer (acceptable in size to CDFW) will be created around active bat roosts during the breeding season or until it is determined that all young have become sufficiently volant to change roosts. The avoidance plan shall evaluate the length of time of disturbance, equipment noise, and type of habitat present at the project site. Temporary fencing shall be installed around the areas to be avoided, at the outer edge of the buffer, and shall remain in place throughout construction activities. • If pre-construction surveys indicate that roosts are inactive or potential habitat is unoccupied during the construction period, no further mitigation is required. Trees that have been determined to be unoccupied by special status bats may be removed. • If vegetation removal activities are delayed or suspended for more than two weeks after the pre-construction survey, the areas shall be resurveyed. 		<p>level.</p> <p>Explanation/Facts in Support of Finding: The Project could have direct or indirect effects on special-status bat species. MM 4.2-14 requires preconstruction surveys of all potential bat-roosting habitat for special-status bats within 200 feet of earthmoving activities. If active special-status bat roosts are identified during pre-construction surveys, an avoidance plan must be submitted to CDFW. Limited operating periods and appropriate buffers will be put in place if active roosting sites are identified within 250 feet of project activities. Implementation of MM 4.2-14 would reduce potential impacts to a less-than-significant level.</p> <p>(See Final EIR pp. 4.2-123 to 4.2-124; Final EIR Response 8; Final EIR Responses to Comments A7-5, A7-6, A7-7, O21-057. O22-123, O22-124, I073-9, I114-7.)</p>
<p>Impact 4.2-15: Development of the Project would have potential to affect special-status aquatic species. This is a potentially significant impact. However, after implementation of mitigation measures to protect other aquatic resources and animals, impacts will be less than significant.</p>	<p>4.2-15: See in Mitigation Measure 4.2-4.</p>	<p>Less-than-significant</p>	<p>Finding: After implementation of MM 4.2-4 which has been incorporated into the Project, as set forth above, impacts to special-status aquatic species will be less than significant. The Board hereby directs that this mitigation measure be adopted. Pursuant to Public Resources Code Section 21081 (a) and CEQA Guidelines Section 15091 (a), the Board hereby finds that changes or alterations have been required in, or incorporated into, the Project which avoid or substantially lessen the significant environmental effects to a less-than-significant level.</p>

ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACT (SIGNIFICANCE FINDING BEFORE MITIGATION)	MITIGATION MEASURES	SIGNIFICANCE AFTER MITIGATION	FINDINGS OF FACT
(Draft EIR p. 4.2-122; Final EIR Response 8.)			<p>Explanation: Implementation of mitigation measures to protect other aquatic resources and animals as set forth in MM 4.2-4 will result in less than significant impacts to special-status aquatic species.</p> <p>(See Final EIR Response 8; Final EIR Responses to Comments O21-031, O21-035, O21-057, O22-018, O22-019, O22-069, I073-9.)</p>
<p>Impact 4.2-16: Tree removal that occurs as part of the development of the Proposed Project could result in conflicts with Napa County Code Section 18.108.100, and the General Plan Goals CON-2 and CON-6 and Policies CON-17 and CON-24. This would be considered a potentially significant impact.</p> <p>Development of the Project would remove an estimated 28,616 trees with a dbh greater than six inches (which includes 15,395 oak trees), which represents a loss of 12.1 percent of the trees on the project site. Of the 28,616 trees to be removed, 6,550 (22.9 percent) had a poor condition rating, 12,866 (45 percent) rated average, and 9,200 (32.1 percent) had a good condition rating. Approximately 185.78 acres (11.24 percent) of tree canopy on the property will be impacted by the Project.</p> <p>96 specimen trees, defined as trees that have a dbh of at least 36 inches for the species in the area, will be impacted by Project development.</p> <p>(Draft EIR pp. 4.2-122 to 4.2-125; Final EIR pp. 4.2-124 to 4.2-128; Final EIR Response 6.)</p>	<p>4.2-16: Prior to the approval of #P11-00205-ECPA, the plan shall be modified to include the following (any associated project features that become unnecessary as a result of the avoidance, such as proposed roads, shall also be reflected in the revised plan):</p> <p>As discussed in Mitigation Measure 4.2-2 above, oak woodlands [Black Oak Alliance, Blue Oak Alliance, Coast Live Oak (Foothill Pine) Alliance, Coast Live Oak-Blue Oak-(Foothill Pine) NFD Association, and Mixed Oak (Foothill Pine/Ponderosa Pine) Alliance] and other sensitive woodlands [Valley Oak (California Bay- Coast Live Oak-Walnut-Ash) Riparian Forest NFD Association] will be preserved in permanent protection. This will result in a total of 524.8 acres of woodland in permanent protection.</p> <p>Protected woodlands shall be identified in a conservation easement held by an accredited land trust organization such as the Land Trust of Napa County as the grantee, or other equivalent means of permanent protection, subject to approval by the Director. Land placed in protection shall be restricted from development and other uses that would potentially degrade the quality of the habitat (including, but not limited to, conversion to other land uses such as agriculture or urban development, and excessive off-road vehicle use that increases erosion), and should otherwise be restricted by the existing goals and policies of Napa County. The areas to be covered by the conservation easement shall be determined by a qualified botanist or biologist, and submitted to Napa County for review and approval. The conservation easement shall be prepared in a form acceptable to County</p>	<p>Less-than-significant</p>	<p>Finding: After implementation of MM 4.2-2 to protect sensitive habitats and MM 4.2-16 to conserve remaining trees on the property, which have been required or incorporated into the Project, impacts to the total tree canopy on the property will be less than significant. The Board hereby directs that this mitigation measure be adopted. Pursuant to Public Resources Code Section 21081 (a) and CEQA Guidelines Section 15091 (a), the Board hereby finds that changes or alterations have been required in, or incorporated into, the Project which avoid or substantially lessen the significant environmental effects to a less-than-significant level.</p> <p>Explanation/Facts in Support of Finding: The Project will result in tree removal. Implementation of MM 4.2-2, will ensure that woodlands shall be preserved at a greater than 1:1 ratio on the property. MM 4.2-16 further reduces the impact to trees through a combination of avoidance, replacement and protection in an open space easement.</p> <p>(See Final EIR pp. 4.2-124 to 4.2-128; Final EIR Response 6; Final EIR Comments to Responses A7-4, O7-36, O10-8, O11-42, O11-43, O11-44, O12-2, O21-057, O21-64, I012-4, I069-1, I073-9, I085-4, I137-2, I142-4, I146-60. For further detail on implementation of this mitigation measure see BRMP section 4.2.)</p>

ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACT (SIGNIFICANCE FINDING BEFORE MITIGATION)	MITIGATION MEASURES	SIGNIFICANCE AFTER MITIGATION	FINDINGS OF FACT
	<p>Counsel and entered into and recorded with the Napa County Recorder's office prior to any ground disturbing activities, grading or vegetation removal, or within 12 months of project approval, whichever occurs first.</p> <p>Any request by the permittee for an extension of time to record the conservation easement shall be considered by the Planning Director and shall be submitted to Napa County prior to the 12 month deadline, and shall provide sufficient justification for the extension.</p> <p>In addition, as part of the Walt Ranch Biological Resources Management Plan (BRMP) required in Mitigation Measure 4.2-1, the following measures will be taken to ensure a less-than- significant impact as a result of tree removal:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Implementation of Mitigation Measure 4.4-2 will ensure that woodlands shall be preserved at greater than a 1:1 ratio on the property. Blocks 12 and 19A contain notable oak woodland stands that shall be avoided (Figure 4.2-2). Parts of Block 37 shall be avoided to protect a very rare stand of Northern California black walnut, as shown in Figure 4.2-7 (see Mitigation Measure 4.2-6). To the degree feasible, individual specimen trees (36 inch dbh or above) shall be avoided in the areas adjacent to block boundaries or vineyard avenues. • Seventy-four specimen trees shall be avoided as shown on Figure 4.2-5. These specimen trees have been chosen for preservation because they may be preserved compatibly with vineyard development due to their location on the edge of blocks or adjacent to vineyard avenues. Included in these 74 trees are tagged valley oak specimen trees numbered 28403 and 25644 that occur in Valley Oak (California Bay/Coast Live Oak/Walnut/Ash) Riparian Forest NFD Association, a biotic community that Napa County has identified as particularly rare on the project site, shall be avoided. • Temporary fencing shall be installed around the 		

ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACT (SIGNIFICANCE FINDING BEFORE MITIGATION)	MITIGATION MEASURES	SIGNIFICANCE AFTER MITIGATION	FINDINGS OF FACT
	<p>areas to be avoided, at the outer edge of the buffer, and shall remain in place throughout construction activities.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Thirty-four specimen trees that will be removed for vineyard development shall be mitigated by compensation at a 5:1 ratio (5 replanted seeds or saplings per every 1 specimen tree removed) of the same species, with the ultimate goal of an 80 percent success rate after the end of 5 years of monitoring. In the event it is determined that the site lacks sufficient suitable habitat acreage for replanting, the project area shall be reduced to meet the avoidance criteria. <p>Protected specimen trees shall be identified in a conservation easement held by an accredited land trust organization such as the Land Trust of Napa County as the grantee, or other equivalent means of permanent protection, subject to approval by the Director. Land placed in protection shall be restricted from development and other uses that would potentially degrade the quality of the habitat (including, but not limited to, conversion to other land uses such as agriculture or urban development, and excessive off-road vehicle use that increases erosion), and should otherwise be restricted by the existing goals and policies of Napa County. The areas to be covered by the conservation easement shall be determined by a qualified botanist or biologist, and submitted to Napa County for review and approval. The conservation easement shall be prepared in a form acceptable to County Counsel and entered into and recorded with the Napa County Recorder's office prior to any ground disturbing activities, grading or vegetation removal, or within 12 months of project approval, whichever occurs first.</p> <p>Any request by the permittee for an extension of time to record the conservation easement shall be considered by the Planning Director and shall be submitted to Napa County prior to the 12 month deadline, and shall provide sufficient justification for the extension.</p>		
4.3 CULTURAL RESOURCES			
Impact 4.3-1: Grading activities, planting of new vineyard, and operation of the Proposed Project within the vicinity of the	4.3-1: The following measures will all be taken to minimize impacts to cultural resources:	Less-than-significant	Finding: Implementation of MM 4.3-1, which has been required or incorporated into the Project, will reduce this impact to a less-than-significant level by avoiding the identified resources, and

ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACT (SIGNIFICANCE FINDING BEFORE MITIGATION)	MITIGATION MEASURES	SIGNIFICANCE AFTER MITIGATION	FINDINGS OF FACT
<p>identified cultural, historical, and paleontological resources could negatively impact cultural resources WR-2, WR-3, WR-4, WR-5, CA-NAP-867, and CA-NP-257. This is a potentially significant impact.</p> <p>Six cultural or historical resources within the study area were determined to be eligible for inclusion on the CRHR and considered historical resources within the meaning of CEQA.</p> <p>Portions of WR-5 (rock fence) will be removed from the development of proposed vineyard blocks. Vineyard avenues are proposed to be located contiguous with the existing rock walls.</p> <p>CA-NAP-257 (a midden mound) is eligible for the National Register of Historic Places and may be impacted during development of a proposed vineyard block.</p> <p>The remaining resources lie adjacent to proposed vineyard blocks and therefore could be inadvertently affected by development of the Project.</p> <p>Grading activities and planting of new vineyard within the boundaries of the identified resources could negatively impact cultural resources WR- 2, WR-3, WR-4, WR-5, CA-NAP-867 and CA- NP-257.</p> <p>(Draft EIR pp. 4.3-18 to 4.3-22.)</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> WR-2, WR-3, WR-4, and CA-NAP-867 shall be avoided. All ground disturbing activities during project implementation and operation shall avoid mapped boundaries of the resource. A permanent 16-foot buffer around the perimeters (including vineyard avenues) shall be established. Temporary fencing shall be installed around each area, at the outer edge of the buffer, and shall remain throughout construction activities. No grading or disturbance shall occur within these buffers. WR-5 (rock wall) shall be avoided by all ground disturbing activities during project implementation and operation with a permanent 10-foot buffer around the perimeter (including vineyard avenues), with the exception of the three areas identified in Figure 4.3-1 where rock walls would be opened. The openings shall be limited to 20 feet each and shall provide necessary access consistent with General Plan Policy CC-21. Aside from these three 20-foot openings, the rock wall shall not be disturbed. Prior to the approval of Erosion Control Plan P11-00205-ECPA, the applicant shall revise the plan to clearly delineate the 10-foot buffer around the perimeter of the rock wall. Temporary fencing shall be installed around the rock wall, at the outer edge of the buffer, and shall remain throughout construction activities. Prior to construction of vineyard blocks in the vicinity of CA-NAP-257, a presence and absence test shall be conducted by a qualified archeologist to determine the boundaries of the historical resource. If a proposed vineyard block will impact CA- NAP-257, the block's boundaries will be redrawn to avoid the historic resource. If no vineyard blocks will impact CA-NAP-257, the resource will be fenced off and avoided with a permanent 16-foot buffer. The Applicant shall install and maintain protective fencing along the outside of the buffers to ensure protection during construction, project implementation, and operation. The precise locations of protective fencing shall be 		<p>establishing a buffer to ensure that the resources are not disturbed during Project construction and operation. The Board hereby directs that this mitigation measure be adopted. Pursuant to Public Resources Code Section 21081 (a) and CEQA Guidelines Section 15091 (a), the Board hereby finds that changes or alterations have been required in, or incorporated into, the Project which avoid or substantially lessen the significant environmental effects to a less-than-significant level.</p> <p>Explanation/Facts in Support of Finding: With implementation of MM 4.3-1, there will be no significant impacts to resources WR-2, WR-3, WR-4, and CA-NAP-867 because all ground- disturbing activities during construction and operation will be avoided within a permanent 16-foot buffer zone around the boundary of each resource. Impacts to WR-5 (rock wall) shall be limited to three 20 foot openings. This alteration would not materially alter the historic integrity of the remaining wall. Boundaries of CA-NAP-257 shall be determined prior to construction of vineyard blocks in the vicinity of the historic resource and any impacts would be avoided using a 16-foot buffer. For these reasons, the implementation of Mitigation Measure 4.3-1 would result in less than significant impacts to identified cultural resources.</p> <p>(See Final EIR Response to Comment A6-2; Final EIR Responses to Comments O23-3, O23-4, I073-10.)</p>

ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACT (SIGNIFICANCE FINDING BEFORE MITIGATION)	MITIGATION MEASURES	SIGNIFICANCE AFTER MITIGATION	FINDINGS OF FACT
	<p>inspected and approved by the County prior to the commencement of any ground disturbance, vegetation removal, or grading and shall be maintained and remain in place until all grading, earthmoving, and vineyard development activities are completed.</p> <p>Implementation of this mitigation measure would eliminate the potential impacts or reduce them to less-than-significant levels. In particular, the implementation of this measure would result in avoiding the identified resources, and would establish a buffer to ensure that the resources are not disturbed during project construction and operation. There is one resource that would be disturbed, WR-5 (rock wall). The implementation of this measure, however would limit the impact to the wall to three 20-foot openings. This alteration would not materially alter the historic integrity of the remaining wall. For this reason, the implementation of Mitigation Measure 4.3-1 would avoid significant impacts to WR-5.</p>		
<p>Impact 4.3-2: Planting of new vineyard has the potential to negatively impact previously unknown cultural resources within the project site. There is a possibility that subsurface archaeological deposits may exist within proposed vineyard areas, as archaeological sites may be buried with no surface manifestation, or may be obscured by vegetation. This is a potentially significant impact.</p> <p>(Draft EIR pp. 4.3-22 to 4.3-23.)</p>	<p>4.3-2: In accordance with CEQA Guidelines § 15064.5, subd. (f), should any previously unknown historical or unique archeological resources, such as, but not limited to, obsidian and chert flaked-stone tools or toolmaking debris; shellfish remains, stone milling equipment, concrete, or adobe footings, walls, filled wells or privies, deposits of metal, glass, and/or ceramic refuse be encountered during onsite construction activities, earthwork within 100 feet of these materials shall be immediately stopped, County planning staff shall be immediately notified, and the owner shall consult with a professional archaeologist. The archaeologist shall evaluate the significance of the find and recommend appropriate measures to protect the resource, as necessary, to the Director for consideration. Those measures that are approved by the Director shall be carried out prior to resuming any construction within the area where work had been halted. All significant cultural resource materials recovered shall be subject to scientific analysis, professional museum curation, and a report prepared by the qualified archaeologist according to current professional standards.</p> <p>If an unanticipated discovery is found to meet the eligibility criteria for listing on the CRHR, then the</p>	<p>Less-than-significant</p>	<p>Finding: Compliance with MM4.3-2, which has been required or incorporated into the Project, will reduce this impact to a less than significant level, by requiring a halt to ground-disturbing activities within 100 feet of discovery of such cultural resources. The Board hereby directs that this mitigation measure be adopted. Pursuant to Public Resources Code Section 21081 (a) and CEQA Guidelines Section 15091 (a), the Board hereby finds that changes or alterations have been required in, or incorporated into, the Project which avoid or substantially lessen the significant environmental effects to a less-than-significant level.</p> <p>Explanation/Facts in Support of Finding: The construction and excavation activities associated with development of the Project could unearth previously unknown cultural resources. MM 4.3-2 will require, in compliance with State law, a halt to all ground-disturbing activities in the area where such resources are discovered. If an unanticipated discovery is found to meet the eligibility criteria for listing on the CRHR, then the resource must either be protected in place and the project altered to preserve the resource, or data recovery excavations must be conducted to mitigate the impact of the resource. The professional archeologist shall prepare a Historic Properties Treatment Plan (HPTP) for submittal to the County for approval. MM 4.3-1 will reduce potential impacts to a less-than-significant level.</p>

ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACT (SIGNIFICANCE FINDING BEFORE MITIGATION)	MITIGATION MEASURES	SIGNIFICANCE AFTER MITIGATION	FINDINGS OF FACT
	<p>resource must either be protected in place and the project altered to preserve the resource, or data recovery excavations must be conducted to mitigate the impact of the resource. The professional archeologist shall prepare a Historic Properties Treatment Plan (HPTP) for submittal to the County for approval. The HPTP shall detail how much excavation is required and what excavation methods and other analytical tests would be required to mitigate the impact on the resource if avoidance or preservation in place is not feasible. The HPTP shall provide for reasonable efforts to be made to permit the resource to be preserved in place or left in an undisturbed state. Methods of accomplishing this may include capping or covering the resource with a layer of soil. To the extent that resource cannot feasibly be preserved in place or not left in an undisturbed state, excavation as mitigation shall be restricted to those parts of the resource that would be damaged or destroyed by the project. Excavation as mitigation shall not be required for a unique archaeological resource if the treatment plan determines that testing or studies already completed have adequately recovered the scientifically consequential information from and about the resource. After data recovery excavations are complete, a technical report detailing the results of the excavation and analysis of results shall be prepared by the cultural resources consultant and submitted to the Director. All artifacts and documentation pertaining to the data recovery effort shall be cleaned, cataloged, analyzed, and curated at an approved repository.</p>		(See Final EIR Response to Comment A6-2.)
<p>Impact 4.3-3: Planting of new vineyard blocks could result in the discovery and disturbance of unknown human remains. While unlikely, there is always the possibility that ground disturbing activities such as earth removal, rock removal and trenching for irrigation lines could result in the discovery and disturbance of unknown human remains in the project site by disturbing both surface and subsurface soils.</p> <p>(Draft EIR pp. 4.3-23 to 4.3-24.)</p>	<p>4.3-3: If human remains are encountered, Health & Safety Code § 7050.5 and CEQA Guidelines § 15064.5, subd. (e) state that no further disturbance can occur within the vicinity of the discovery until the county coroner has made a determination of origin and disposition pursuant to Pub. Resources Code § 5097.98. In the event that human remains are discovered, earthwork within 100 feet of the find shall immediately be stopped and the provisions of the California Health and Safety Code Section 7050.5 (b) shall be followed. The construction contractor shall protect discovered human remains remaining in the ground from additional disturbance. The Napa County Coroner shall be contacted within 24 hours of</p>	Less-than-significant	<p>Finding: Compliance with MM 4.3-3, which has been required or incorporated into the project, will reduce this impact to a less than significant level, by requiring a halt to ground-disturbing activities if human remains are discovered, and consultation with the coroner, an archaeologist, and the Most Likely Descendant. The Board hereby directs that this mitigation measure be adopted. Pursuant to Public Resources Code Section 21081 (a) and CEQA Guidelines Section 15091 (a), the Board hereby finds that changes or alterations have been required in, or incorporated into, the Project which avoid or substantially lessen the significant environmental effects to a less-than-significant level.</p> <p>Explanation/Facts in Support of Finding: The construction and excavation activities associated with development of the</p>

ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACT (SIGNIFICANCE FINDING BEFORE MITIGATION)	MITIGATION MEASURES	SIGNIFICANCE AFTER MITIGATION	FINDINGS OF FACT
	<p>the find. Upon recognizing the remains as being Native American in origin, the Coroner shall be responsible for contacting the Native American Heritage Commission (NAHC) within 24 hours so that a Most Likely Descendant (MLD) can be identified, as required under California Pub. Resources Code § 5097.98. The NAHC has various powers and duties to provide for the ultimate disposition of any Native American remains, as does the assigned MLD.</p> <p>If the county coroner determines that the human remains are not Native American and not evidence of a crime, project personnel shall coordinate with a qualified archeologist to develop an appropriate treatment plan. A copy of the treatment plan shall be submitted to the Director for review and approval prior to implementation. This shall include contacting the next-of-kin to solicit input on subsequent disposal of the remains. If there is no next-of- kin, or recommendations by the next-of-kin are considered unacceptable by the property owner, the property owner shall work with the county coroner to reinter the remains in a location outside the project area and where they would be unlikely to be disturbed in the future.</p> <p>Implementation of this mitigation measure would reduce the impact to a less-than-significant level.</p>		<p>Project could unearth previously undiscovered, or unrecorded human remains. MM 4.3-3 will require, in compliance with State law, a halt to all ground-disturbing activities in the area where human remains are discovered. The project applicant shall notify the County Coroner and the NAHC immediately. If the remains are determined to be Native American, a professional archaeologist will investigate the site and consult with the Most Likely Descendant (MLD) to determine proper treatment and disposition of the remains; and take appropriate steps to ensure that additional human remains are not disturbed. MM 4.3-3 will reduce potential impacts to a less-than-significant level.</p> <p>(See Final EIR Response to Comment A6-2.)</p>
<p>Impact 4.3-4: Construction of the Proposed Project has the potential to destroy unknown, unique paleontological and geological resources. This is a potentially significant impact. No unique paleontological or geological resources are known to exist within the project site. Therefore, no impacts are expected. However, there is a possibility that unknown paleontological resources would be encountered during construction activities. Continued construction upon exposed paleontological materials would likely cause destruction of these resources.</p> <p>(Draft EIR pp. 4.3-24 to 4.3-25.)</p>	<p>4.3-4: In the event that any paleontological resources are discovered during construction- related earth-moving activities, all work within 50 feet of the resources shall be immediately halted and a qualified paleontologist shall be consulted to assess the significance of the find. If any find is determined to be significant by the qualified professional under the criteria of the SVP, then appropriate agency and project representatives and the qualified paleontologist shall meet to determine the appropriate course of action. All significant cultural or paleontological materials recovered shall be subject to scientific analysis, professional museum curation, and a report prepared by the qualified paleontologist according to current professional standards</p>	<p>Less-than-significant</p>	<p>Finding: Compliance with MM 4.3-4, which has been required or incorporated into the Project, will reduce this impact to a less-than-significant level by requiring all work within 50 feet of the discovered resource be halted and a qualified paleontologist be consulted to assess significance of the find. The Board hereby directs that this mitigation measure be adopted. Pursuant to Public Resources Code Section 21081 (a) and CEQA Guidelines Section 15091 (a), the Board hereby finds that changes or alterations have been required in, or incorporated into, the Project which avoid or substantially lessen the significant environmental effects to a less-than-significant level.</p> <p>Explanation/Facts in Support of Finding: There are no impacts expected. However, MM 4.3-4 would reduce the impact to a less- than-significant level by ensuring that a qualified paleontologist reviews any discovery that is found during construction or operation of the Project and hat any significant</p>

ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACT (SIGNIFICANCE FINDING BEFORE MITIGATION)	MITIGATION MEASURES	SIGNIFICANCE AFTER MITIGATION	FINDINGS OF FACT
			<p>find is subject to scientific analysis and professional museum curation. MM 4.3-4 will reduce potential impacts to a less-than-significant level.</p> <p>(See Final EIR Response to Comment A6-2.)</p>
4.4 GEOLOGY AND SOILS			
<p>Impact 4.4-2: Development of the Project would involve earthmoving and grading activities that would alter the existing topographic and geologic conditions at the project site. The Project would be located on strata or soil that is unstable, or would potentially become unstable as a result of deep ripping and blasting that will occur as part of the development of the Project. This is a potentially significant impact.</p> <p>If blasting were to occur as part of the construction in unstable geologic units, such as those that top the sandstone cored ridges, it could increase landslide potential on the flanks of those ridges. This would be a significant impact.</p> <p>(Draft EIR pp. 4.4-22 to 4.4-23; Final EIR 4.4-22 to 4.4-23.)</p>	<p>4.4-2: During construction of the Proposed Project, to avoid potential slope instability impacts associated with adverse construction vibrations, blasting shall be limited to only areas of volcanic rock (Gilpin Geosciences, 2013b). No blasting shall occur in Blocks 15, 16, and 68.</p>	Less-than-significant	<p>Finding: Compliance with MM 4.4-2, which has been required or incorporated into the Project, will reduce this impact to a less-than-significant level by limiting blasting to only areas of volcanic rock. The Board hereby directs that this mitigation measure be adopted. Pursuant to Public Resources Code Section 21081 (a) and CEQA Guidelines Section 15091 (a), the Board hereby finds that changes or alterations have been required in, or incorporated into, the Project which avoid or substantially lessen the significant environmental effects to a less-than-significant level.</p> <p>Explanation/Facts in Support of Finding: Blasting in unstable geologic units could increase landslide potential on the project site. MM 4.4-2 would limit blasting to only areas of volcanic rock which will not impact landslides on the property because such areas are characterized by their stable bedrock formation and their low landslide hazard risk. With implementation of MM 4.4-2 impacts will be reduced to less-than-significant levels.</p> <p>(See Final EIR pp. 4.4-22 to 4.4-23; Final EIR Response 9; Final EIR Responses to Comments O9-48, O11-22, O11-23, O11-24, O11-25, O11-26, O11-28, O22-071.)</p>
<p>Impact 4.4-3: The development of the Project would occur on some areas prone to slope failure. This is a potentially significant impact. Life safety would not be a factor in impacts from landslides because there are no proposed load-bearing structures or housing as part of the Project. Nevertheless, the potential for activation of dormant and active slope instability would be a significant impact due to erosion and sedimentation.</p> <p>(Draft EIR pp. 4.4-22 to 4.4-23.)</p>	<p>4.4-3: Prior to approval of #P11-00205-ECPA, the plan shall be modified to include the following measures to avoid potential slope instability and associated sedimentation impacts, per Gilpin Geoscience's recommendations in Table 1 of Appendix F:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. For Blocks 20-22, 28-30, 31B, 34, 36, 37D, 37E, 40, 45, 51B, 52, 55D, and 56-58, grading shall not exceed a depth of 24 inches in order to maintain the current level of stability on the east-facing slopes of the site, and trees on the steeper (greater than 30 percent) slopes of the site shall be left in place where possible. 2. Rock repositories shall be prepared by grubbing and excavating a keyway at the toe of the proposed storage area on areas with slopes greater than 4:1 (horizontal:vertical). The keyway shall extend two feet into firm soil 	Less-than-significant	<p>Finding: Compliance with MM 4.4-3, which has been required or incorporated into the Project, will reduce this impact to a less-than-significant level by implementing geotechnical recommendations designed to avoid potential slope instability and associated sedimentation impacts. The Board hereby directs that this mitigation measure be adopted. Pursuant to Public Resources Code Section 21081 (a) and CEQA Guidelines Section 15091 (a), the Board hereby finds that changes or alterations have been required in, or incorporated into, the Project which avoid or substantially lessen the significant environmental effects to a less-than-significant level.</p> <p>Explanation/Facts in Support of Finding: Development of the Project would occur on some areas prone to slope failure, which has the potential to activate dormant and active slope stability due to erosion and sedimentation. Implementation of MM 4.4-3 would result in consistency with General Plan Conservation Policy CON-6 and Safety Policy SAF-10 in that development, as mitigated, is limited in environmentally</p>

ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACT (SIGNIFICANCE FINDING BEFORE MITIGATION)	MITIGATION MEASURES	SIGNIFICANCE AFTER MITIGATION	FINDINGS OF FACT
	<p>or bedrock at the downslope edge of the keyway.</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 3. Two depressions within Blocks 31B and 37C are proposed as potential rock storage sites, and further subsurface exploration and geotechnical analysis shall be performed to determine the feasibility of these two rock storage areas from a slope stability standpoint. A copy of the geotechnical analysis shall be reviewed and approved by the County prior to any work within Blocks 31B and 37C. 4. For Blocks 5B, 5C, 25, 27, 40, 45A, 45B, 46, 57, and 58, subdrains shall be constructed to reduce saturated conditions that could trigger rockfalls. 5. For Blocks 18A-18D and 28, headcut repair and a rock-lined channel shall be implemented to prevent further channel bank erosion and to repair active slumps. 6. For Block 20, the surface/subsurface drain shall be directed to drain to the east. 7. For Block 22A, there shall be a setback from the active landslide and the surface/subsurface drain shall be directed to drain to the northeast. 8. For Blocks 29, 45A, 45B, and 49, the slope shall be buttressed from toe to mid-slope. A grading permit shall be obtained as necessary from Napa County prior to this work. 9. For Blocks 55A-55D, 59, 60A, and 60N, drainage shall be directed away from the active landslide or scarp. 10. For Block 65, the poor road drainage shall be improved by relocating the road and directing drainage to a protected outlet. 11. Should unstable landslide deposits be encountered and/or localized slope failures occur during construction, the slope shall be restored to a stable configuration using specifications provided by the project's engineering geologist. Napa County approval and/or grading permits will be obtained as necessary. 		<p>sensitive areas (i.e., geologically hazardous areas) and grading on slopes over 15 percent where landslides or other geologic hazards are present has been reduced. Potential impacts to slope stability and associated erosion and sedimentation as a result of the Project would be reduced to a less-than-significant level.</p> <p>(See Final EIR Response 9; Final EIR Responses to Comments O7-28, O9-47, O11-22, O11-23, O11-24, O11-25, O11-26, O11- 28, O11-29, I137-2.)</p>
4.5 HAZARDOUS MATERIALS			

ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACT (SIGNIFICANCE FINDING BEFORE MITIGATION)	MITIGATION MEASURES	SIGNIFICANCE AFTER MITIGATION	FINDINGS OF FACT
<p>Impact 4.5-1: The Proposed Project would include the storage of hazardous materials, including common vineyard-related materials. However, no pesticide storage will occur on-site and all hazardous pesticides will be brought to and from the project site as they are needed (DEIR Appendix N). Construction and operation of the Proposed Project would create incidental spills or container leakage, or rupture and spillage when fueling agricultural equipment, which could result in hazards to the public or environment. Depending on the relative hazard of the material, if a spill were to occur of significant quantity, the accidental release could pose both a hazard to construction employees as well as to the environment. If substantial quantities of diesel or unleaded gasoline reach soil or drainage areas, subsurface and/or groundwater quality on and off the project site may be degraded. This is a potentially significant impact.</p> <p>(Draft EIR pp. 4.5-7 to 4.5- 8; Final EIR Response 11.)</p>	<p>4.5-1: Prior to the development of the Proposed Project, the property owner shall submit and obtain approval of a Hazardous Materials Business Plan (HMBP) from the PBES Division of Environmental Health and CERS. The HMBP will document all proposed hazardous materials to be used onsite during construction and operation. If storage amounts or the use of hazardous materials change during project operation, the project owner shall update, as necessary, the HMBP. The plan will be on file with the PBES Division of Environmental Health and with CERS. The PBES Division of Environmental Health will review the plan and may conduct inspections to ensure that the HMBP is being followed during project operations. Updates to the HMBP, if warranted, would be made through CERS. The HMBP shall be prepared in accordance with County standards and California 40 CFR, Part 355, Appendix A.</p>	<p>Less-than-significant</p>	<p>Finding: Compliance with MM 4.5-1, which has been required or incorporated into the Project, will reduce this impact to a less-than-significant level by ensuring that the Project follows all SOPs and regulations regarding hazardous use and storage. The Board hereby directs that this mitigation measure be adopted. Pursuant to Public Resources Code Section 21081 (a) and CEQA Guidelines Section 15091 (a), the Board hereby finds that changes or alterations have been required in, or incorporated into, the Project which avoid or substantially lessen the significant environmental effects to a less-than-significant level.</p> <p>Explanation/Facts in Support of Finding: Proper transport, use, storage, and application of the vineyard-related hazardous materials will reduce the potential for spillage or leakage that could negatively impact workers and the environment. MM 4.5-1 requires the preparation of a Hazardous Materials Business Plan to document all proposed hazardous materials to be used onsite during construction and operation. Implementation of the mitigation measure reduces this potentially significant impact to a less-than-significant level.</p> <p>(See Final EIR Response 11; Final EIR Responses to Comments A5-04, O9-8.)</p>
<p>Impact 4.5-2: The Proposed Project has the potential to release hazardous materials into the environment during construction through the use of equipment. This is a potentially significant impact. The most likely possible hazardous materials releases would involve the dripping of fuels, oil, and grease from construction equipment.</p> <p>(Draft EIR pp. 4.5-8 to 4.5-9; Final EIR Response 11.)</p>	<p>4.5-2: Vineyard personnel shall follow the SOPs described below for filling and servicing construction equipment and vehicles. A copy of the SOPs shall be submitted to the County prior to any ground disturbance, vegetation removal, or grading. The SOPs, which are designed to reduce the potential for incidents involving hazardous materials, shall include:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Refueling shall be conducted only with approved pumps, hoses, and nozzles. • Catch-pans shall be placed under equipment to catch potential spills during servicing. • All disconnected hoses shall be placed in containers to collect residual fuel from the hose. • Vehicle engines shall be shut down during refueling. • No smoking, open flames, or welding shall be allowed in refueling or service areas. • Refueling and all construction work shall be 	<p>Less-than-significant</p>	<p>Finding: Compliance with MM 4.5-2, which has been required or incorporated into the Project, will reduce this impact to a less-than-significant level by requiring adherence to SOPs designed to reduce the potential for incidents involving hazardous materials. The Board hereby directs that this mitigation measure be adopted. Pursuant to Public Resources Code Section 21081 (a) and CEQA Guidelines Section 15091 (a), the Board hereby finds that changes or alterations have been required in, or incorporated into, the Project which avoid or substantially lessen the significant environmental effects to a less-than-significant level.</p> <p>Explanation/Facts in Support of Finding: Typical construction management practices limit and often eliminate the effect of accidental releases through use of SOPs as required in MM 4.5-2. Vineyard personnel shall follow written SOPs for filling and servicing construction equipment and vehicles. In the event that contaminated soil and/or groundwater or other hazardous materials are generated or encountered during construction, all work shall be halted in the affected area and disposed of in accordance with appropriate regulations, including Title 22 of the California Code of Regulations and the proper authorities</p>

ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACT (SIGNIFICANCE FINDING BEFORE MITIGATION)	MITIGATION MEASURES	SIGNIFICANCE AFTER MITIGATION	FINDINGS OF FACT
	<p>performed outside of the stream buffer zones to prevent contamination of water in the event of a leak or spill.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Service trucks shall be provided with fire extinguishers and spill containment equipment, such as absorbents. • A spill containment kit that is recommended by the Napa County PBES or local fire department shall be onsite and available to staff if a spill occurs. <p>In the event that soil and/or groundwater are contaminated by hazardous materials or if pre-existing hazardous materials are encountered during construction, all work shall be immediately halted in the affected area, CDEH staff shall be notified, and the type and extent of the contamination shall be determined. Should a spill contaminate soil, the soil shall be put into containers and disposed of in accordance with appropriate regulations, including Title 22 of the California Code of Regulations (CCR) (66262.34(f)). If the size of the spill and containment is beyond the scope of the contractor, CDEH staff shall be immediately notified.</p>		<p>will be notified, as applicable. The potential release of hazardous materials during construction of the Project is reduced to a less-than-significant level with the implementation of MM 4.5-2.</p> <p>(See Final EIR Response 11; Final EIR Responses to Comments A5-04, O9-8.)</p>
<p>Impact 4.5-3: The Proposed Project has the potential to release hazardous materials into the environment during the operation and maintenance of the vineyard. This is a potentially significant impact.</p> <p>Hazardous materials releases from operation and maintenance of the vineyard may occur from dropping, runoff, and/or uncontrolled releases of fuels, oil, grease, pesticides, and fertilizers from farm equipment.</p> <p>The Project would be operated in a manner that is consistent with Napa County PBES requirements.</p> <p>(Draft EIR pp. 4.5-10 to 4.5-11; Final EIR Response 11.)</p>	<p>4.5-3: Chemical mixing and loading areas shall be established outside the proposed stream setbacks and wetland areas and away from any areas that could potentially drain off site or potentially affect surface and groundwater quality. Prior to approval, P11-00205-ECPA shall be revised to identify areas designated for chemical mixing and loading areas. When equipment is cleaned at the existing facility, only rinse water that is free of gasoline residues, pesticides and other chemicals, and waste oils shall be allowed to diffuse back into vineyard areas. Contaminated rinse water will be collected and properly disposed of off-site through methods similar to waste oil management standards provided under Mitigation Measure 4.5-5.</p>	<p>Less-than-significant</p>	<p>Finding: Compliance with MM 4.5-3, which has been required or incorporated into the Project, will reduce this impact to a less-than-significant level by requiring appropriate methods for mixing and cleanup of herbicides and pesticides. The Board hereby directs that this mitigation measure be adopted. Pursuant to Public Resources Code Section 21081 (a) and CEQA Guidelines Section 15091 (a), the Board hereby finds that changes or alterations have been required in, or incorporated into, the Project which avoid or substantially lessen the significant environmental effects to a less-than-significant level.</p> <p>Explanation/Facts in Support of Finding: With implementation of Napa County PBES BMPs, Project IPM strategies, and SOPs as described in MM 4.5-1, MM 4.5-2, and MM 4.5-4, including wind drift reduction measures, it is not likely that significant impacts to soil, watercourses, or groundwater would occur from agricultural chemical application as a result of the Project.</p> <p>Chemical mixing and loading areas will be located away from areas that could potentially affect surface and groundwater</p>

ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACT (SIGNIFICANCE FINDING BEFORE MITIGATION)	MITIGATION MEASURES	SIGNIFICANCE AFTER MITIGATION	FINDINGS OF FACT
			<p>quality. Contaminated rinse water would be collected and properly disposed of using waste oil management standards provided under MM 4.5-5. Impacts after mitigation are less than significant.</p> <p>(See Final EIR Response 11; Final EIR Responses to Comments A5-04, O9-8, O9-24, O22-096, I040-2, I071-15, I130-1.)</p>
<p>Impact 4.5-4: The Project may include the use of pesticides for vineyard maintenance, including midewcides (wetttable sulfur, stylet oil, mettle, flint, pristine, rally, quintec) and herbicides (Roundup, Rely, Goaltender). The potential uncontrolled release of the pesticides would be considered a potentially significant impact. Non-compliance with hazardous materials regulations including improper pesticide use, storage, or disposal can be hazardous to human health and the environment, would result in a potentially significant impact. Pesticides will be used on-site in compliance with the Fish Friendly Farming program, California Sustainable Winegrowing Alliance, and Napa Sustainable Winegrowing Group restrictions, although no pesticides will be stored on-site (DEIR Appendix N).</p> <p>(Draft EIR pp. 4.5-11 to 4.5-12; Final EIR Response 11.)</p>	<p>4.5-4: The owner shall apply for a private applicator certificate and a restricted materials permit from the Napa County Agricultural Commissioner. The owner shall comply with the Napa County Agricultural Commissioner's regulations, such as renewing the private applicator certificate every three years, renewing the restricted materials permits annually, and reporting pesticides use to the Agricultural Commissioner by the 10th of every month following application. All vineyard employees shall be trained annually in the proper use of pesticides.</p> <p>In addition, personnel shall follow the SOPs as described below when applying pesticides to the vineyard. SOPs for pesticide use shall include the following:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Purchase only enough pesticide that would be used per season. • Utilize IPM techniques where feasible, such as for fungicides, the use of a permanent cover crop, beneficial insects, and minimal to no use of pesticides except when found necessary from monitoring. • Store all pesticides in their original containers. Do not remove labels on the containers. • Keep pesticides in a well-ventilated locked area. • The best way to dispose of a small amount of pesticide is to use it. If a pesticide must be disposed of, contact the Napa County Agricultural Commissioner to locate a hazardous waste facility for proper disposal. • Never pour pesticides down the sink, toilet, or stream. 		<p>Finding: Compliance with MM 4.5-4, which has been required or incorporated into the Project, will reduce this impact to a less- than-significant level by requiring the use of SOPs regarding use and application of pesticides, as well as appropriate certification of applicators by the Napa County Agricultural Commission. The Board hereby directs that this mitigation measure be adopted. Pursuant to Public Resources Code Section 21081 (a) and CEQA Guidelines Section 15091 (a), the Board hereby finds that changes or alterations have been required in, or incorporated into, the Project which avoid or substantially lessen the significant environmental effects to a less-than-significant level.</p> <p>Explanation/Facts in Support of Finding: MM 4.5-4 ensures that excess pesticides will not be purchased, keeping potential risks associated with storage to a minimum, and ensures that proper disposal and protection techniques are utilized. Vineyard personnel will also be required to follow SOPs when applying, storing and disposing of pesticides. The risk of significant impacts from agricultural chemical application as a result of the Project is reduced to a less-than-significant level after mitigation.</p> <p>(See Final EIR Response 11; Final EIR Responses to Comments A5- 04, O7-25, O9-8, O22-097, I054-5.)</p>

ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACT (SIGNIFICANCE FINDING BEFORE MITIGATION)	MITIGATION MEASURES	SIGNIFICANCE AFTER MITIGATION	FINDINGS OF FACT
<p>Impact 4.5-5: Operation of the vineyard included under the Proposed Project would generate waste oil in connection with vehicle use and maintenance. The waste oil would be stored onsite and picked up regularly by a certified waste oil recycler. Potential impacts could occur if the waste oils were to leak during storage. Improperly stored waste oil could cause significant impacts to the environment if not contained and disposed of properly.</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Utilize proper personal protection equipment when working with pesticides. <p>4.5-5: Waste oil containers shall be stored in secondary containment that includes an oil- impervious liner or an impervious concrete floor, and berms or retaining walls that fully enclose the containment area. The waste oil containers shall be covered during rain events and shall not be stored within the setbacks described in Impact 4.5-3 above. Waste oil containers shall be labeled "waste oil". The containers shall also be labeled with the following information: accumulation start date; the hazardous properties of the waste (i.e. flammable, corrosive, reactive, toxic, etc.); and the name and address of the facility generating the waste. All waste oil containers shall be transported offsite by a licensed transporter and taken to a Certified waste oil recycling facility.</p>	Less-than-significant	<p>Finding: Compliance with MM 4.5-5, which has been required or incorporated into the Project, will reduce this impact to a less-than-significant level by requiring appropriate methods for storage of waste oil containers. The Board hereby directs that this mitigation measure be adopted. Pursuant to Public Resources Code Section 21081 (a) and CEQA Guidelines Section 15091 (a), the Board hereby finds that changes or alterations have been required in, or incorporated into, the Project which avoid or substantially lessen the significant environmental effects to a less-than-significant level.</p> <p>Explanation/Facts in Support of Finding: With implementation of Napa County PBES BMPs, Project SOPs as described in MM 4.5-1 through 4.5-5, it is not likely that significant impacts to soil, watercourses, or groundwater would occur from the storage and transport of waste oil containers as a result of the Project.</p> <p>Storage areas will be located away from areas that could potentially affect surface and groundwater quality. Impacts after mitigation are less than significant.</p> <p>(See Final EIR Response 11; Final EIR Responses to Comments A5-04, O9-8, O9-24, O22- 096, I040-2, I071-15, I130-1.)</p>
4.6: HYDROLOGY AND WATER QUALITY			
<p>Impact 4.6-1: Development of the Proposed Project would alter the existing drainage pattern of the project site, which is a potentially significant impact.</p> <p>On the Capell Creek watershed side of the property, which is not a sensitive watershed, there would be a small increase in peak discharge and volume of runoff, which could have impacts to downstream bank erosion. This would be a significant impact.</p> <p>(Draft EIR pp. 4.6-31 to 4.6-40; Final EIR pp. 4.6-32 to 4.6-40; Final EIR Response 12.)</p>	<p>4.6-1: Prior to approval of #P11-00205-ECPA, the plan shall be modified to include the following measures to avoid potential runoff increases and associated sedimentation impacts, per RiverSmith Engineering's recommendations in Appendix F of Appendix G:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> For Blocks 1, 3, 17, 19-20, 24, 26, 30, 33-36, 38, 42, 43, 46, 53-63, and 65-68 install a gravel berm on the downslope edge of the turnaround avenue; For Blocks 31, 40 and 64 install a small detention structure or gravel berm on downslope edge of the turnaround avenue; For Block 37, install a gravel berm on the downslope edge of the turnaround avenue, or reduce the area of forest removed; 	Less-than-significant	<p>Finding: Compliance with MM 4.6-1, which has been required or incorporated into the Project, will reduce this impact to a less-than-significant level by requiring measures to avoid potential runoff increases and associated sedimentation impacts such as gravel berms or small detention basins. The Board hereby directs that this mitigation measure be adopted. Pursuant to Public Resources Code Section 21081 (a) and CEQA Guidelines Section 15091 (a), the Board hereby finds that changes or alterations have been required in, or incorporated into, the Project which avoid or substantially lessen the significant environmental effects to a less-than-significant level.</p> <p>Explanation/Facts in Support of Finding: Due to a small increase in peak discharge and volume of runoff, the Project could have impacts to downstream bank erosion in Capell Creek drainages. Project Potential impacts to flooding hazard</p>

ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACT (SIGNIFICANCE FINDING BEFORE MITIGATION)	MITIGATION MEASURES	SIGNIFICANCE AFTER MITIGATION	FINDINGS OF FACT
	<p>4. For Blocks 48-52, install a localized detention structure of appropriate size to reduce predicted increases in runoff to pre- project levels;</p> <p>5. For Block 69, install a gravel berm on the downslope edge of the turnaround avenue or install rock checks in the drainage swales.</p> <p>Prior to the approval of #P11-00205-ECPA, RiverSmith Engineering shall provide specifications of the above measures to the Applicant for inclusion in the ECP.</p> <p>Potential impacts to flooding hazard could result from increases in peak flow and volume of runoff from implementation of the Proposed Project. However, with the implementation of Mitigation Measure 4.6-1, potential impacts to flooding hazards and drainage system capacity would be reduced to a less-than-significant level.</p>		<p>could result from increases in peak flow and volume of runoff from implementation of the Project. MM 4.6-1 will reduce the potential for bank erosion in Capell Creek drainages to a less than significant impact by requiring measures such as gravel berms or small detention basins. Such measures would also reduce potential impacts to flooding hazards and drainage system capacity to a less-than-significant level.</p> <p>(See Final EIR pp. 4.6-32 to 4.6-40; Final EIR Response 12; Final EIR Response to Comment A5-01, A5-03, A5-09, A5-10, A7-14, O7-32, O9-19, O9-42, O9-43, O11-10, O11-11, O20-4, O21-094, O21-096, O21-097, O21-098, O21-099, O22-011, O22- 012, O22-013, O22-014, O22-016, O22-053, O22-054, O22-055, O22-066, O22-073, O22-116, I101-14, I101-15.)</p>
<p>Impact 4.6-2: Development of the Project may alter the water quality on the project site. Increased sediment accumulation and removal of vegetation in riparian habitats has the potential to result in adverse impacts to water temperature. Degradation of water quality could impact chemical and biological conditions and beneficial uses of onsite and receiving waters. However, as discussed in Impact 4.6-1, there will be an overall decrease in volume and rate of runoff from the Milliken Reservoir watershed portion of the project site in post-project conditions. Mitigation Measure 4.6-1 will ensure that impacts to the Capell Creek watershed portion of the project site are less than significant.</p> <p>Mitigation measures are required to further minimize this less than significant impact.</p> <p>(Draft EIR pp. 4.6-40 to 4.6-43; Final EIR pp. 4.6-40 to 4.6-43.)</p>	<p>4.6-2: There are 21 existing stream crossings, listed in Table 3-4 and shown on Figure 3-11 of this Draft EIR that will be upgraded to rock water crossings under the Proposed Project. The Applicant shall not use any of these crossings to transport construction equipment prior to completion of the proposed upgrades.</p>	<p>Less-than-significant</p>	<p>Finding: Compliance with MM 4.6-2, which has been required or incorporated into the Project, will further reduce this less than significant impact by delaying the use of existing stream crossings until completion of proposed upgrades. The Board hereby directs that this mitigation measure be adopted. Pursuant to Public Resources Code Section 21081 (a) and CEQA Guidelines Section 15091 (a), the Board hereby finds that changes or alterations have been required in, or incorporated into, the Project which further reduce the effects of this less than significant impact.</p> <p>Explanation: Impacts to water quality are anticipated to be less than significant. MM 4.6-2 would further reduce impacts to water quality by delaying the use of existing stream crossings until they have been upgraded. Such measures would further reduce this less than significant impact.</p> <p>(See Final EIR pp. 4.6-40 to 4.6-43; Final EIR Response to Comments O20-18, O21-100, O21-103, O22-011, O22-012, O22- 013, I038-3, I044-4, I139-7.)</p>
<p>Impact 4.6-4: The Proposed Project would require the use of local groundwater</p>	<p>4.6-4: The Applicant shall be required (at the Applicant's expense) to provide well monitoring data and analyses of the collected data from a qualified</p>	<p>Less-than-significant</p>	<p>Finding: Compliance with MM 4.6-4, which has been required or incorporated into the Project, will reduce this impact to a less-</p>

ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACT (SIGNIFICANCE FINDING BEFORE MITIGATION)	MITIGATION MEASURES	SIGNIFICANCE AFTER MITIGATION	FINDINGS OF FACT
<p>resources for irrigation purposes, which has the potential to alter local groundwater levels and local groundwater flow directions. The effects to groundwater levels could cause drawdown in offsite wells, and if this drawdown interference were to be substantial, the existing pump in the impacted well might become less efficient; if this were to occur, the existing pump might not be able to maintain its normal operational rate. This would be a significant impact.</p> <p>(Draft EIR pp. 4.6-43 to 4.6-50; Final EIR pp. 4.6-43 to 4.6-52; Final EIR Responses 13 and 15.)</p>	<p>professional Geologist or a Certified Hydrogeologist to Napa County PBES Department on a semi-annual basis during the baseline period, and on a quarterly basis after development work begins at the Walt Ranch property. Refer to Appendix R for a detailed description of the Groundwater Monitoring and Mitigation Plan (GWM&MP). Such data shall include, but not be limited to, static water levels, pumping water levels, instantaneous flow rates, and cumulative pumped volumes for each of the three existing onsite irrigation wells and any other wells used for vineyard irrigation that may be developed in the future on the Walt Ranch property. These wells are each located in separate geographic areas of the project site (Figure 4.6-2); therefore, monitoring of these wells would help to provide data on groundwater conditions generally representative of the entire project site. Once constructed, water level data from onsite dedicated monitoring wells will also be collected. Pumping rates and volumes shall be monitored by the use of a totalizer flow dial (or similar technology) and water levels shall be monitored by the use of an automatically recording pressure transducer (or similar technology). The automatically-recording water approximately every 60 minutes for the first year after new vineyards have been planted to provide sufficient data for the purpose of operational monitoring; the frequency of data collection and recording by the logging device may be increased in the future at the request of Napa County. These data shall be downloaded every month for the first year of project development. This will help to provide a quantity of data that is reasonable to review, as well as capture variations in seasonal groundwater conditions (Refer to Appendix R for the GWM&MP details).</p> <p>As described in Appendix R, data collected by COCWD will be included in the GWM&MP. COCWD, at their request, will be responsible for providing the COCWD specific monitoring data to the qualified professional Geologist or a Certified Hydrogeologist tasked with analyzing those data and reporting those analyses to the Napa County.</p> <p>Water usage shall be minimized by use of best available control technology and best management</p>		<p>than-significant level by requiring a monitoring program and best practices to minimize water usage. The Board hereby directs that this mitigation measure be adopted. Pursuant to Public Resources Code Section 21081 (a) and CEQA Guidelines Section 15091 (a), the Board hereby finds that changes or alterations have been required in, or incorporated into, the Project which avoid or substantially lessen the significant environmental effects to a less-than-significant level.</p> <p>Explanation/Facts in Support of Finding: While it is not anticipated that groundwater levels in nearby offsite wells would be substantially affected by the Project, this impact is still considered potentially significant and subject to mitigation. MM 4.6-4 requires a monitoring program to monitor water levels during each phase of the Project, so that a qualified hydrogeologist can determine the water level drawdown impacts to offsite wells, if any. In event that changed circumstances, or significant new information, or the results of the monitoring data, provide substantial evidence that the Project use of onsite wells and the groundwater systems would significantly affect the groundwater basin, additional mitigation may be imposed. After implementation of monitoring under MM 4.6-4, this impact is considered less than significant.</p> <p>(See Final EIR Final EIR pp. 4.6-43 to 4.6-52; Final EIR Responses 13-15; Final EIR Response to Comment A5-06; Final EIR Responses to Comments A5-07, A7-9, A7-10, A7-11, O1-1, O2-1, O4-1, O9-8, O9-10, O9-11, O9-12, O9-13, O9-14, O9-17, O9-18, O9-32, O9-34, O9-35, O9-36, O9-38, O15-4, O16-1, O19-1, O19-2, O21-111, O22-044, I003-1, I010-2, I020-2, I051-1, I054-6, I061-2, I080-2.)</p>

ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACT (SIGNIFICANCE FINDING BEFORE MITIGATION)	MITIGATION MEASURES	SIGNIFICANCE AFTER MITIGATION	FINDINGS OF FACT
	conservation practices.		
<p>Impact 4.6-5: The Project would require the construction of irrigation pipelines to transport water onsite, the construction of which could create potentially significant impacts to water quality and stream conditions.</p> <p>(Draft EIR pp. 4.6-50 to 4.6-51; Final EIR Response 15.)</p>	<p>4.6-5: In order to ensure preservation of regional water quality and local stream conditions, prior to installation of irrigation infrastructure, the Irrigation Plans for the Proposed Project shall be provided to the County for review and approval and shall include the following measure:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> The construction of irrigation pipeline stream crossings shall only occur within roadways or vineyard avenues. No irrigation pipelines shall cross a stream or creek outside of roadways or vineyard avenues designated in the ECP (Appendix A). The necessary permits by the appropriate agencies will be obtained and copies shall be provided to the County prior to construction of proposed underground or aboveground pipelines where there will be disturbance to the bed and bank of any onsite drainages or streams. 	Less-than-significant	<p>Finding: Compliance with MM 4.6-5, which has been required or incorporated into the Project, will reduce impacts to water quality and streams to a less-than-significant level by ensuring that the irrigation pipeline construction follows the BMPs for road construction included in the ECP. The Board hereby directs that this mitigation measure be adopted. Pursuant to Public Resources Code Section 21081 (a) and CEQA Guidelines Section 15091 (a), the Board hereby finds that changes or alterations have been required in, or incorporated into, the Project which avoid or substantially lessen the significant environmental effects to a less-than-significant level.</p> <p>Explanation/Facts in Support of Finding: Construction of irrigation pipelines could have a potentially significant impact to water quality and stream conditions. MM 4.6-5 would require water line crossings will only cross the bed or bank of onsite creeks in conjunction with a roadway or vineyard avenue and that all necessary permits are obtained prior to construction. This will reduce impacts to water quality and streams to a less-than-significant level.</p> <p>(See Final EIR Response 15; Final EIR Response to Comment O22-068.)</p>
4.7 TRANSPORTATION AND TRAFFIC			
<p>Impact 4.7-1: Construction of the Project would temporarily increase traffic volumes on roadways in the area; however, the increase in construction related traffic would not be substantial and a less-than-significant impact would result.</p> <p>Although impacts to local roadways are less than significant, mitigation measures are presented to further reduce temporary construction-related impacts.</p> <p>(Draft EIR pp. 4.7-3 to 4.7-5; Final EIR pp. 4.7-4 to 4.7-6; Final EIR Responses 16 through 18.)</p>	<p>4.7-1: All construction trips (both equipment and worker trips) shall be scheduled outside of the daily AM and PM peak hours. The applicant shall prepare a schedule for work shifts and equipment transport for review and approval by the Director prior to any ground disturbance, grading or vegetation removal.</p>	Less-than-significant	<p>Finding: Compliance with MM 4.7-1, which has been required or incorporated into the Project, will further reduce this less-than-significant impact by scheduling construction trips outside of the daily AM and PM peak hours. The Board hereby directs that this mitigation measure be adopted. Pursuant to Public Resources Code Section 21081 (a) and CEQA Guidelines Section 15091 (a), the Board hereby finds that changes or alterations have been required in, or incorporated into, the Project which avoid or substantially lessen this less than significant impact.</p> <p>Explanation/Facts in Support of Finding: Increases in traffic due to construction related activity is a less than significant impact. To further reduce this impact, construction activities that would require construction workers and trucks delivering heavy equipment and materials to the project site would be scheduled outside AM and PM peak hours. This will further reduce the less than significant impact resulting from temporary traffic increases due to construction.</p>

ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACT (SIGNIFICANCE FINDING BEFORE MITIGATION)	MITIGATION MEASURES	SIGNIFICANCE AFTER MITIGATION	FINDINGS OF FACT
			(See Final EIR pp. 4.7-4 to 4.7-6; Final EIR Responses 16 through 18; Final EIR Responses to Comments A2-03, O11-32, O21-088, O21-089, O21-091, I047-3, I062-3.)
<p>Impact 4.7-2: Operation of the Project would increase traffic volumes on roadways in the area; however, the increase in traffic would not be substantial and a less-than-significant impact would result.</p> <p>(Draft EIR p. 4.7-5; Final EIR pp. 4.7-6 to 4.7-8; Final EIR Responses 16 through 18.)</p>	<p>4.7-2: Compliance with Mitigation Measure 4.7-1 would reduce operations related traffic impacts by scheduling worker trips outside of the peak AM and PM hours.</p>	Less-than-significant	<p>Finding: Compliance with MM 4.7-2, which has been required or incorporated into the Project, will further reduce this less-than-significant impact by scheduling vineyard worker trips outside of the daily AM and PM peak hours. The Board hereby directs that this mitigation measure be adopted. Pursuant to Public Resources Code Section 21081 (a) and CEQA Guidelines Section 15091 (a), the Board hereby finds that changes or alterations have been required in, or incorporated into, the Project which avoid or substantially lessen this less than significant impact.</p> <p>Explanation/Facts in Support of Finding: Operation of the Project would result in increased traffic volumes on local roadways. This will be a seasonal increase beginning in December and ending in March, which is not anticipated to create impacts to the existing traffic load and capacity of the street system. This is a less than significant impact and implementation of MM 4.7-2 would further reduce this impact.</p> <p>(See Final EIR pp. 4.7-6 to 4.7-8; Final EIR Responses 16 through 18; Final EIR Responses to Comments A2-03, O21-088, O21-089, O21-091, O21-093, I062-3.)</p>
<p>Impact 4.7-3: Installation of the Project would increase potential conflicts between vehicles on area roadways given the additional vehicles that would be entering and exiting the project site. However, traffic volumes are not expected to increase substantially as discussed in Impacts 4.7-1 and 4.7-2. The width of the roadways to and from the project site can accommodate a variety of vehicle types, including construction related equipment, and the available sight distance for drivers at the project site access road is not unduly restricted. Therefore, this would be a less than significant impact.</p> <p>(Draft EIR p. 4.7-6; Final EIR Responses 16 through 18.)</p>	<p>4.7-3: Advance warning signs (e.g., "Intersection Ahead" and/or "Truck Crossing Ahead") shall be posted on Circle Oaks Drive and Country Club Lane consistent with Napa County sign placement standards to alert motorists of an intersection ahead with turning vehicles. The signs shall be installed in compliance with County road standards, subject to an Encroachment Permit issued by the County, with the costs to be paid by the applicant.</p>	Less-than-significant	<p>Finding: Compliance with MM 4.7-3, which has been required or incorporated into the Project, will further reduce this less-than-significant impact by installing advance warning signs in identified locations. The Board hereby directs that this mitigation measure be adopted. Pursuant to Public Resources Code Section 21081 (a) and CEQA Guidelines Section 15091 (a), the Board hereby finds that changes or alterations have been required in, or incorporated into, the Project which avoid or substantially lessen this less than significant impact.</p> <p>Explanation/Facts in Support of Finding: The existing roadways to and from the project site are wide enough to accommodate a variety of vehicle types including construction equipment with safe sight distances for drivers. This is a less than significant impact and implementation of MM 4.7-3 would further reduce this impact.</p> <p>(See Final EIR Responses 16 through 18; Final EIR Responses to Comments O11-38, O21-091, I122-7, I129-2.)</p>
<p>Impact 4.7-4: Construction traffic and</p>	<p>4.7-4: The following measures shall be followed</p>	Less-than-	<p>Finding: Compliance with MM 4.7-4, which has been required or</p>

ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACT (SIGNIFICANCE FINDING BEFORE MITIGATION)	MITIGATION MEASURES	SIGNIFICANCE AFTER MITIGATION	FINDINGS OF FACT
<p>subsequent operational traffic of the Project could increase wear-and-tear of area roads. This would be a potentially significant impact.</p> <p>Although large volumes of heavy loaded trucks are associated with construction and operation of the Project, such trucks would be legally loaded. Roads in the vicinity, such as SR-121 are designed and constructed to accommodate a mix of vehicle types, including heavy trucks. Local roadways, such as Circle Oaks Drive, while generally not designed to withstand substantial or continuous traffic would not be impacted as vehicle trips on local roads are not anticipated to be heavy trucks. Therefore, potential wear-and-tear of area roadways is a less than significant impact.</p> <p>(Draft EIR pp. 4.7-6 to 4.7-7; Final EIR pp. 4.7-8 to 4.7-9; Final EIR Responses 16 through 18.)</p>	<p>during construction activities:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Heavy truck construction traffic shall comply with the CVC sections related to vehicle weight and width. Any extra-legal loads needed for specialized deliveries shall be subject to special permit requirements from Napa County. Project applicant shall obtain any necessary Caltrans traffic permits for movement of equipment. Circle Oaks Drive shall be assessed by an independent third party consultant prior to the start of construction and following the completion of construction. The consultant shall be a licensed geotechnical engineer under contract with the County, with costs paid for by the applicant. If the third party determines that roadway deterioration, or deterioration of infrastructure located underneath Circle Oaks Drive, has occurred as a result of construction traffic, the applicant shall pay to have the roadway resurfaced to restore the pavement to at least pre-construction condition, unless the resurfacing is already expected to occur within a year or sooner in conjunction with other planned or proposed roadway improvements, and shall repair the identified damage to sub-surface 	<p>significant</p>	<p>incorporated into the Project, will further reduce this less-than-significant impact by requiring compliance with regulations in the California Vehicle Code, particularly legal weight and width limits, intended to minimize adverse impacts to roadways. The Board hereby directs that this mitigation measure be adopted. Pursuant to Public Resources Code Section 21081 (a) and CEQA Guidelines Section 15091 (a), the Board hereby finds that changes or alterations have been required in, or incorporated into, the Project which avoid or substantially lessen this less than significant impact.</p> <p>Explanation/Facts in Support of Finding: The existing roadways to and from the project site are designed to withstand the level of traffic anticipated from the construction and operation of the Project. In the event there is deterioration to Circle Oaks Drive, it will be remediated at the cost of applicant. Therefore, implementation of MM 4.7-4 would further reduce this less than significant impact.</p> <p>(See Final EIR pp. 4.7-8 to 4.7-9; Final EIR Responses 16 through 18; Final EIR Responses to Comments O9-9, O11-34, O21-091, O21-092, I122-6, I139-9.)</p>
4.8: NOISE			
<p>Impact 4.8-1: Construction of the Project would expose persons to noise levels in excess of standards established in the General Plan or County noise ordinance, or applicable standards of other agencies. This is a significant impact.</p> <p>Operation of the Project would not expose persons to noise levels in excess of the County General Plan or noise ordinance, and is covered under the right-to-farm ordinance. This is a less than significant impact.</p> <p>(Draft EIR pp. 4.8-11 to 4.8-13; Final EIR pp. 4.8-11 to 4.8-13; Final EIR Response 19.)</p>	<p>4.8-1: The following measures shall be enacted during construction of the Proposed Project to minimize noise impacts to all nearby sensitive receptors:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Stationary equipment and staging areas shall be located as far as practical from noise-sensitive receptors. All construction vehicles or equipment, fixed or mobile, shall be equipped with properly operating and maintained mufflers and acoustical shields or shrouds, in accordance with manufacturers' recommendations. Construction shall occur only between the hours of 7 a.m. to 7 p.m. For construction occurring less than 150 feet from sensitive receptors, temporary sound walls shall be constructed to shield residents from 	<p>Less-than-significant</p>	<p>Finding: Compliance with MM 4.8-1, which has been required or incorporated into the Project, will reduce construction noise impacts by limiting construction activities to daytime hours and requires the use of other practices and procedures such as the use of mufflers and acoustical shields for all equipment. The Board hereby directs that this mitigation measure be adopted. Pursuant to Public Resources Code Section 21081 (a) and CEQA Guidelines Section 15091 (a), the Board hereby finds that changes or alterations have been required in, or incorporated into, the Project which avoid or substantially lessen this impact to a less</p> <p>Explanation/Facts in Support of Finding: Construction activities will be limited to daytime hours during which ambient additional ambient noise is less disruptive. Mufflers and acoustical shields as well as other procedures to minimize noise will also be required during construction of the Project. Therefore, implementation of MM 4.8-1 would reduce construction noise impacts to a less-than-significant level.</p>

ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACT (SIGNIFICANCE FINDING BEFORE MITIGATION)	MITIGATION MEASURES	SIGNIFICANCE AFTER MITIGATION	FINDINGS OF FACT
	<p>construction noise. No temporary sound walls are necessary for construction occurring greater than 150 feet from sensitive receptors.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Applicant shall install mufflers on any wind machines located less than 150 feet from existing residences. A map showing the location of affected wind machines shall be provided to the Director prior to installation and issuance of building permits. Mufflers shall be installed and inspected by County staff prior to use. 		<p>(See Final EIR pp. 4.8-11 to 4.8-13; Final EIR Response 19; Final EIR Responses to Comments I047-3, I062-4, I104-2, I104-3, I104-4, I104-5, I146-171.)</p>
<p>Impact 4.8-2: The Project could expose persons to or generate excessive groundborne vibration or groundborne noise levels. This is a significant impact.</p> <p>Generally, excessive vibration is only an issue when construction requiring the use of equipment with high vibration levels occurs within 25 to 100 feet of an existing structure. The nearest noise receptor is a housing development approximately 30 feet from the southern property boundary. Actual distance to where equipment will be used may be greater. At 30 feet distance, blasting would exceed the significances threshold for sensitive receptors.</p> <p>(Draft EIR pp. 4.8-13 to 4.8-14; Final EIR pp. 4.8-13 to 4.8-14; Final EIR Response 19.)</p>	<p>4.8-2: Blasting within 775 feet of a residence exceeds Caltrans significance thresholds for vibration. Therefore, no blasting shall occur within vineyard blocks 15, 16, and 68. The approved project map shall be revised to include a note stating that no blasting shall occur within these blocks.</p>	<p>Less-than-significant</p>	<p>Finding: Compliance with MM 4.8-2, which has been required or incorporated into the Project, will reduce impacts from groundborne noise and vibration by prohibiting blasting within vineyard blocks 15, 16, and 68. The Board hereby directs that this mitigation measure be adopted. Pursuant to Public Resources Code Section 21081 (a) and CEQA Guidelines Section 15091 (a), the Board hereby finds that changes or alterations have been required in, or incorporated into, the Project which avoid or substantially lessen this impact to a less-than-significant level.</p> <p>Explanation/Facts in Support of Finding: At 775 feet from a residential sensitive receptor, blasting would generate 0.1 PPV groundborne vibration, which does not exceed the Caltrans threshold of 0.1 PPV for residences. Compliance with MM 4.8-2 would result in no blasting within vineyard blocks 15, 16, and 68, which are located within 775 feet of a residence. Therefore, implementation of MM 4.8-1 would reduce groundborne vibration and noise impacts to a less-than-significant level.</p> <p>(See Final EIR pp. 4.8-13 to 4.8-14; Final EIR Response 19; Final EIR Response to Comments O9-49, O9-50, O9-51, O9-52, O9-53, I068-5, I068-6, I068-7, I104-2, I104-5.)</p>
6.0: OTHER CEQA-REQUIRED SECTIONS			
<p>Impact 6-1: Construction of the Project would emit GHGs and would have the potential to exacerbate global climate change. Project sources of GHG emissions during construction would include the transport and delivery of construction equipment to the project site; operation of construction equipment, including equipment used for planting and irrigation system installation; worker trips, fuel use, and material transport, loss of sequestration due to removal of oak woodlands, tree</p>	<p>6-1: In order to offset the construction emissions from development of the Proposed Project, the Applicant shall place in permanent protection no less than 248 acres of woodland habitat. All acreage designated for preservation shall be identified as such in a conservation easement with an accredited land trust organization such as the Land Trust of Napa County as the grantee, or other means of permanent protection. The conservation easement shall be prepared in a form acceptable to County Counsel and entered into and recorded with the Napa County Recorder's office prior to any ground</p>	<p>Less-than-significant</p>	<p>Finding: Compliance with MM 6-1, which has been required or incorporated into the Project, will reduce impacts from GHG emissions through preservation of woodland on the property. The Board hereby directs that this mitigation measure be adopted. Pursuant to Public Resources Code Section 21081 (a) and CEQA Guidelines Section 15091 (a), the Board hereby finds that changes or alterations have been required in, or incorporated into, the Project which avoid or substantially lessen this impact to a less-than-significant level.</p> <p>Explanation/Facts in Support of Finding: Preservation of no</p>

ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACT (SIGNIFICANCE FINDING BEFORE MITIGATION)	MITIGATION MEASURES	SIGNIFICANCE AFTER MITIGATION	FINDINGS OF FACT
<p>removal, tillage of soil, etc. This is a potentially significant impact.</p> <p>(Draft EIR pp. 6-16 to 6-18; Final EIR pp. 6-16 to 6-19; Final EIR Responses 6 and 21.)</p>	<p>disturbing activities, grading or vegetation removal, or within 12 months of project approval, or whichever occurs first.</p> <p>Any request by the permittee for an extension of time to record the conservation easement shall be considered by the Planning Director and shall be submitted to Napa County prior to the 12 month deadline, and shall provide sufficient justification for the extension.</p> <p>Land placed in protection shall be restricted from development and other uses that would potentially degrade the quality of the habitat (including, but not limited to, conversion to other land uses such as agriculture, residential, or urban development, and excessive off-road vehicle use that increases erosion), and should otherwise be restricted by the existing goals and policies of Napa County.</p>		<p>less than 248 acres of woodland habitat held in an open space easement as required in MM 6-1 would offset carbon emissions that would result from tree removal and operation of construction equipment. Implementation of MM 6-1 would result in consistency with the adopted CAP; therefore, construction of the Project would have a less than a significant impact on climate change.</p> <p>(See Final EIR pp. 6-16 to 6-19; Final EIR Responses 6 and 21; Final EIR Responses to Comments O10-13, O10-15, O10-17, O11-35, O12-6, O21-113, O21-114, O21-115, O21-116, O21-118, O21-121.) For further detail on implementation of this mitigation measure see BRMP section 5.4.)</p>