

COUNTY OF NAPA
CONSERVATION, DEVELOPMENT & PLANNING DEPARTMENT
1195 THIRD ST., SUITE 210
NAPA, CA 94559
(707) 253-4416

Initial Study Checklist
(reference CEQA, Appendix G)

1. **Project Title:** John Fisher Tentative Map (Tentative Map # P06-01290-TM)
2. **Property Owner(s):** Claire Louise Fisher 1997 Trust / Jill Randal Fisher 1997 Trust (Bruce Cowan, Trustee) and John J. Fisher
3. **Contact person and phone number:** Ronald Gee, Project Planner, 707.253.4417, rgee@co.napa.ca.us
4. **Project location and APN:** Located on an approximately 1,141.99 acre parcel on the northeast and southwest sides of Partrick Road, approximately 0.53 mile south of the north terminus of Partrick Road, within an AW (Agricultural Watershed) zoning district. (Assessor's Parcel # 050-010-024, -030 and -043) 2433 Partrick Road, Napa
5. **Project Sponsor's Name and Address:** John J. Fisher, c/o PISCES, Inc., 1 Maritime Plaza, Suite 1400, San Francisco, CA 9411-3502
6. **General Plan description:** Agriculture, Watershed & Open Space, *Napa County General Plan, 2008*
7. **Zoning:** AW (Agricultural Watershed) District
8. **Project Description:**

The proposal will subdivide three existing parcels (322.0, 428.2 and 391.79 acres) into six new parcels of approximately 207.8, 165.6, 166.5, 188.7, 232.6 and 180.8 acres in size. No structures are proposed as part of this application; however, proposed building envelopes for future single-family residences, are designated on each new parcel that are located on knoll-tops, ridges and saddle areas outside 30% slopes and other potential, environmentally-sensitive areas.

A new, shared access road varying between 10-20 feet in width, with a shoulder turnout every 400 feet, will be constructed for Parcels 1, 2 and 3 on the northeast side of Partrick Road; individual access driveways along existing dirt roads are proposed for Parcels 5 and 6 on the southwest side of Partrick Road and for Parcel 4 on the northeast.

9. **Environmental setting and surrounding land uses:**

The irregular, V-shaped project site extends over moderately-steep to steep terrain between approximately 500 feet and 1,500 feet elevation on the east side of Carneros Valley, above Carneros Creek to the top of the ridge. The property includes knolls, saddles, swales, ravines and ridges that are locally, densely-wooded with interspersed, grass-covered areas. The property is underlain by relatively stable terrain flanked by numerous landslides of varying complexity and activity. Three intermittent, blue-line streams originate on the northeastern portion of the property and flow northerly and easterly, on the east side of the ridge top, away from proposed building sites. The property is presently used as a cattle ranch and is divided into several fenced-in pastures that are accessed by existing dirt roads and trails; some of the pastures contain small stock ponds and corrals. Partrick Road, a 40 feet wide County right-of-way, crosses the site from the northwest to the southeast; the paved roadway is not located within the designated right-of-way. Carneros Creek, a perennial blue-line stream, bounds the property along the southwest. There are no FEMA-designated Flood Zones located in the vicinity. No wetlands or vernal pools have been identified on the property. The closest active fault zone, the West Napa Fault, is located approximately 2.5 miles east of the project site, on the Napa Valley floor.

The USDA Soil Survey of Napa County identifies Forward-Kidd complex (50 to 75 percent slopes), Forward gravelly loam (9 to 30 and 30 to 75 percent slopes) and Felton gravelly loam (30 to 50 percent slopes) soil series as the dominant soil types within the project site on the northeast side of Partrick Road. On the southwest side of Partrick Road is a mix of Forward gravelly loam (30 to 75 per cent slopes), Fagan clay loam (15 to 30 per cent slopes) and Felton gravelly loam (30 to 50 percent slopes). For these soils, steeper slopes, these soils have a rapid run-off rate and the hazard of erosion is high in the less sloping areas. Runoff is very rapid and the hazard of erosion is very high in the more sloping areas and high in less sloping areas. The project site is located within an area that has "very low" liquefaction index.

The RGH Consultants, Inc., *Preliminary Geotechnical Study, Fisher Parcel Split – II, November 12, 2007*, states that, "based upon the results of our review of geologic data review and surficial reconnaissance, we judge that the proposed building envelopes are currently outside of the mapped landslides. Thus, we judge it is geotechnically feasible to subdivide the property. Access roads to the proposed building envelopes are also feasible provided unstable areas are avoided." As detailed below, the study recommended specific mitigation measures for building site development and roadway construction addressing structural setbacks, fill and foundation support, home foundation design, leachfield installation (although they are not proposed as part of this application) and access road construction.

The Theodore Wooster, Consulting Biologist, *Raptor and Other Wildlife Report for the Fisher Parcel Division, Partrick Road, Napa County, June 21, 2003 (and November 23, 2007 follow-up statement)* surveyed the project area flora, fauna and sensitive habitats based upon California Department of Fish & Game (DF&G) Natural Diversity Data Base (CNDDDB) and DF&G–California Department of Forestry and Fire Protection Northern Spotted Owl Data Base data. Sensitive habitat areas include the man-made ponds which have attracted and hold numerous species of wildlife, the Montane hardwood-conifer forest in the north end of Parcel 1 and 2 and the east ends of Parcels 5 and 6, and the riverine habitat of Carneros Creek. There are two known activity centers of NSOs that are located over 1,000 feet from the proposed Parcel 4 building site, on an adjacent 205 acre parcel, APN 050-010-022. Both centers have sufficient habitat within 1.3 miles of their activity centers to meet the 'bulls eye' habitat requirements by the DF&G and U.S. Fish & Wildlife Service (F&WS) for determining whether there is a 'take' or not." The survey concludes that, "... proposed house pads and driveways for Lots (Parcels) 4, 5, and 6 will not have a negative effect on to any listed or unique natural resources. The house pads and driveways for Lots 1, 2 and 3 could have a negative effect on the Montane hardwood-conifer forest habitat on the east side of Partrick Road and, in turn, the habitat (foraging and roosting areas) of existing Northern Spotted Owl activity center in the forest on the nearby Institute de La Salle property. Relocation of these structures to other parts of the lots would avoid these effects." The November 23, 2007 Update included a map of the Montane-hardwood conifer habitat for the parcel map and stated that the remainder of the habitat is either grass lands or small patches of oak woodland.

Kjeldsen Biological Consulting prepared *Special-Status Animal Update, Review of Theodore W. Wooster May 2003 Wildlife Report, April 20, 2009*. The purpose of the update was to review the DF&G CNDDDB, and F&WS databases for any new listed animal species or species distribution that may have occurred since 2003 and to review special-status databases for any new animal species which could have potential presence on the site. Based on site conditions, habitat, historic and ongoing site utilization, hydrology, lack of any records, topography and plant associates present, the update concluded that no special-special status species identified within five miles of the property in the 2009 CNDDDB database or within the 2009 species list for the F&WS quadrangle are located on the project site. The project is not within any mapped or identified critical habitat that would indicate a need for species-specific surveys. They found no habitat within the project footprint that would dictate a need for species-specific surveys. The report states, "... There are no new NSO occurrences listed on the CNDDDB Owl Data Base close to the project sites. Theodore W. Wooster located a single male Owl in 2003 west of Lot 1. The proposed house sites are mainly open grassland and do not contain nesting or foraging habitat for the Northern Spotted Owl. There is no reason to expect any significant impacts on local or regional special-status animal species by the proposed project."

Botanists at Kjeldsen Biological Consulting, *Special-Status Plant Survey, Fisher Property, November 5, 2007*, stated that, "The property is presently managed for cattle grazing (and) consists of agrestal pasturelands, oak woodlands and conifer woodlands. Spring surveys did not identify any potential habitat or presence of special-status plant species on or near the proposed building sites or access roads. The site conditions, lack of any findings during our survey, soils present, site topography, lack of any historical records for the site, and the habitat and plant associates present would reasonably preclude the presence of special-status species." The survey concluded that, "The proposed project will not have a significant negative biological impact on-site or off-site to local flora. The proposed building sites will not impact any sensitive plant communities, special-status species populations or unique plant populations." The survey stated that no specific mitigation measures are required since there is no potential "take" of critical or regulated resources that would result from the project. It recommended that standard construction

practices, including silt and erosion control measures, must be implemented to protect off-site movement of sediment and dust during and post construction.

Kjeldsen Biological Consulting prepared *Special-Status Plant Survey Update, Review of Theodore W. Wooster May 2003 Wildlife Report, April 6, 2009*. The purpose of the update was to review the DF&G, CNDDDB, and F&WS database for any new critical habitat, or new listed species which could have potential or presence on the site; to review special-status databases for any new species distribution that may have occurred since 2007; review the project for any changes in scope and their potential impacts; review Lots 1, 2 and 3 for their potential impact(s) to Montane hardwood-conifer forest habitats, and habitat for existing NSO activity; check the project site for any changes in vegetation since the last survey; and provide a field check for any habitat alteration, fluctuations in species abundance or colonization from seed dispersal or seed bank exposure.

The Update concluded, "that it is unlikely any of the new listed plant species shown in the 2009 CNDDDB or known for Napa County would occur on the site (including California Native Plant Society List of Special-status Plants and Federal Endangered and Threatened Species that occur in the U.S.G.S 7 ½ Minute Quadrangle). No special-status plants were observed; there is no designated critical habitat for any plants associated with the project site. There have not been any changes in native vegetation, significant habitat alteration, fluctuations in species abundance or colonization from seed dispersal or seed bank exposure on the site. The most significant change is the increase in French Broom, a non-native invasive species. No sensitive plant communities are associated with the proposed building envelopes, access roads or surrounding development.

Regarding Lots 1, 2 and 3, Kjeldsen noted Wooster's earlier comments regarding the location of Montane hardwood-conifer forests on the north end of these lots, the 'valuable foraging and roosting areas for the NSO, and his concern about the potential for the house pads and driveway 'could have a potential negative effect on the Montane hardwood-conifer forest habitat on the east side of Patrick Road." The Kjeldsen's report stated, "The project as proposed will not result in any significant removals of Montane hardwood-conifer forests and there is no reason to expect any negative impacts to Montane-conifer forest on the property. The proposed building envelopes are large and are designed to avoid removing large native trees. There is no reason given the size of the property and the extensive woodlands present to account for any impacts to NSO. The access road for the building envelopes is present (note: although not paved) and will not significantly impact NSO habitat by tree removal. The project as proposed will not have a significant impact to Montane hardwood-conifer forest and or the NSO (sic)."

The project area is surrounded by grassland and rural residential uses to the northwest, forest and vineyards to the north, vineyards and rural residential uses to the northeast, patches of oak woodland and grassland to the southeast, grassland and oak woodland to the south, and Montane Hardwood-conifer to the west of Carneros Creek.

10. **Other agencies whose approval is required** (e.g., permits, financing approval, or participation agreement).

Napa County Environmental Management – Septic System
Napa County Public Works – Tentative Tract Map, Roads

JURISDICTIONAL BACKGROUND: Public Plans and Policies

Based on an initial review, the following findings have been made for the purpose of the Initial Study and do not constitute a final finding by the County in regard to the question of consistency.

	YES	NO	N/A
Is the project consistent with:			
a) Regional and Subregional Plans and Policies?	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
b) LAFCOM Plans and Policies?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
c) The County General Plan?	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
d) Appropriate City General Plans?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
e) Adopted Environmental Plans and Goals of the Community?	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
f) Pertinent Zoning?	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>

Responsible (R) and Trustee (T) Agencies**Other Agencies Contacted**

None

ENVIRONMENTAL FACTORS POTENTIALLY AFFECTED

The environmental factors checked below would be potentially affected by this project, involving at least one impact that is a "Potentially Significant Impact" or "Less Than Significant with Mitigation Incorporation" as indicated by the checklist on the following pages.

- | | | |
|--|---|---|
| <input type="checkbox"/> Aesthetics | <input type="checkbox"/> Agriculture Resources | <input type="checkbox"/> Air Quality |
| <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Biological Resources | <input type="checkbox"/> Cultural Resources | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Geology and Soils |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Hazards & Hazardous Materials | <input type="checkbox"/> Hydrology and Water Quality | <input type="checkbox"/> Land Use/Planning |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Mineral Resources | <input type="checkbox"/> Noise | <input type="checkbox"/> Population/Housing |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Public Services | <input type="checkbox"/> Recreation | <input type="checkbox"/> Transportation/Traffic |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Utilities and Service Systems | <input type="checkbox"/> Mandatory Findings of Significance | |

MITIGATION MEASURES:

- ___ None Required
___ Identified By This Study - Unadopted (see attached Draft Project Revision Statement)
X Included By Applicant As Part of Project (see attached Project Revision Statement)
___ Recommended For Inclusion As Part of Public Project (see attached Recommended Mitigation Measure List)

BASIS OF CONCLUSIONS:

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

AGENCY STAFF PARTICIPATING IN THE INITIAL STUDY:

Resource Evaluation:	Ronald Gee	Date: July 3, 2009
Site Review:	Ronald Gee	Date: July 3, 2009
Planning/Zoning Review:	Ronald Gee	Date: July 3, 2009

PRELIMINARY DETERMINATION:

- ___ No reasonable possibility of environmental effect has been identified, and a Negative Declaration should be prepared.
X A Negative Declaration cannot be prepared unless all identified impacts are reduced to a level of insignificance or avoided.

DATE: July 8, 2009

By: Ronald Gee

FINAL DETERMINATION. (by Napa County)

On the basis of this initial evaluation:

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

Signature

Ronald Gee, AICP
Printed Name

July 8, 2009
Date

Napa County Conservation, Development and Planning Department
Lead Agency

PROPOSED MITIGATED NEGATIVE DECLARATION

The Conservation, Development and Planning Director of Napa County has tentatively determined that the following project would not have a significant effect on the environment. Documentation supporting this determination is on file for public inspection at the Napa County Conservation, Development and Planning Department Office, 1195 Third St., Suite 210, Napa, California 94559. For further information call (707) 253-4416.

Project Title: John Fisher Tentative Map (Tentative Map # P06-01290-TM)

1. **Project Sponsor's Name and Address:** John J. Fisher, c/o PISCES, Inc., 1 Maritime Plaza, Suite 1400,
San Francisco, CA 9411-3502
2. **Property Owner:** Claire Louise Fisher 1997 Trust / Jill Randal Fisher 1997 Trust (Bruce Cowan, Trustee) and John J. Fisher

PROJECT DESCRIPTION:

The proposal will subdivide three existing parcels (322.0, 428.2 and 391.79 acres) into six new parcels of approximately 207.8, 165.6, 166.5, 188.7, 232.6 and 180.8 acres in size. No structures are proposed as part of this application; proposed building envelopes are designated on each new parcel that are located on knoll-tops, ridges and saddle areas outside of 30% slopes and other potential environmentally sensitive areas.

A new, shared access road varying between 10-20 feet in width, with a shoulder turnout every 400 feet, will be constructed for Parcels 1, 2 and 3 on the northeast side of Partrick Road; individual access driveways along existing dirt roads are proposed for Parcels 5 and 6 on the southwest side of Partrick Road and for Parcel 4 on the northeast.

The project site is located on an approximately 1,141.99 acre parcel on the northeast and southwest sides of Partrick Road, approximately 0.53 mile south of the north terminus of Partrick Road, within an AW (Agricultural Watershed) zoning district. (Assessor's Parcel # 050-010-024, -030 and -043) 2433 Partrick Road, Napa.

WRITTEN COMMENT PERIOD: July 10, 2009 through August 10, 2009

HEARING DATE and LOCATION: August 15, 2009, 9:00 a.m., Napa County Board of Supervisors Chambers, 1195 Third Street, Third Floor, Napa, CA 94559.

DATE: July 8, 2009

BY THE ORDER OF

Hillary Gitelman
Director
Napa County Conservation, Development and Planning Department

PROJECT REVISION STATEMENT

Fisher Tract Map
Tentative Parcel Map # P06-01290-TM
APN 050-010-024, -030 and -043

I hereby revise my request to include the measures specified below:

Mitigation Measure IV (a and e), Biology,

- 1) Building envelopes for Parcels 1, 2 and 3 shall be located outside the perimeter of identified Montane hardwood-conifer forest to avoid forest habitat on the east side of Partrick Road and the habitat (foraging and roosting areas) of existing Northern Spotted Owl activity center in the forest on the nearby Institute de La Salle property.
- 2) Prior to any access, utility and residential development of the Parcel 4 building envelope, demonstration of California Department of Forestry Exemption from Timber Harvesting Permit requirements shall be submitted to the Conservation, Development and Planning Department Director.

Mitigation Measure VI (a), Geology & Soils,

- 3) Development on the project site shall comply with all mitigation measures recommended by the RGH Consultants, Inc., *Preliminary Geotechnical Study, Fisher Parcel Split – II, November 12, 2007*, addressing residence locations, downslope creep, fill support, foundation support, floor systems, leachfield installation, access roads, erosion and site drainage, and groundwater.

I understand and explicitly agree that with regards to all California Environmental Quality Act, Permit Streamlining Act, and Subdivision Map Act processing deadlines, this revised application will be treated as a new project, filed on the date this project revision statement is received by the Napa County Conservation, Development and Planning Department. For purposes of Section 66474.2 of the Subdivision Map Act, the date of application completeness shall remain the date this project was originally found complete.

<hr/>	<hr/>	<hr/>
Signature of Owner(s)	Print Name	Interest
<hr/>	<hr/>	<hr/>
Signature of Owner(s)	Print Name	Interest
<hr/>	<hr/>	<hr/>
Signature of Owner(s)	Print Name	Interest

ENVIRONMENTAL CHECKLIST FORM

	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporation	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
I. AESTHETICS. Would the project:				
a) Have a substantial adverse effect on a scenic vista?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
b) Substantially damage scenic resources, including, but not limited to, trees, rock outcroppings, and historic buildings within a state scenic highway?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
c) Substantially degrade the existing visual character or quality of the site and its surroundings?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
d) Create a new source of substantial light or glare which would adversely affect day or nighttime views in the area?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>

Discussion:

- a. No new structures are proposed as part of this application, however, three potential home building sites identified on Parcels 1, 2 and 3 are located at the ridge-top facing Napa Valley. These building sites are located in heavily-wooded areas, but are potentially visible from Highway 29 (SR 29); the highway is a designated "Scenic Highway" listed in the *Scenic Highway Element* of the Napa County General Plan. The proposed building sites are approximately 3.0 miles from Highway 29. With screening provided by existing woodlands and perimeter landscaping, there will be a less than significant impact on any scenic vista. The other three building sites on Parcels 4, 5 and 6 are located on the west side of the hilltop, down-slope and facing an interior valley with no "Scenic Highway" roads.
- b. This project would not substantially degrade a scenic resource. The construction of future residences would be subject to Napa County Zoning Ordinance, Chapter 18.106030(A), *Viewshed Protection Ordinance, General Provisions, Applicability*, since the proposed structures are located on a minor or major ridgeline. Perimeter landscape improvement plans and compliance with the Viewshed Protection Ordinance would reduce this impact to a less than significant level.
- c. The proposed subdivision is consistent with existing agricultural (vineyard, cattle grazing) and rural residential uses in the area. New residential development may be visible from Highway 29 (SR 29). Perimeter landscape improvements and compliance with the Viewshed Protection Ordinance would reduce this impact to a less than significant level..
- d. The six new home sites will result in a minor increase in night-time lighting. In accordance with County standards, all exterior lighting will be the minimum necessary for the operational and security needs. Light fixtures will be kept as low to the ground as possible and include shields to deflect the light downward and kept on-site. Avoidance of highly reflective surfaces will be required as part of the following standard County condition for development to prevent light from being cast skyward:

"All exterior lighting, including landscape lighting, shall be shielded and directed downward, shall be located as low to the ground as possible, and shall be the minimum necessary for security, safety, or operations and shall incorporate the use of motion detection sensors to the greatest extent practical. No flood-lighting or sodium lighting of the building is permitted, including architectural highlighting and spotting. Low-level lighting shall be utilized in parking areas as opposed to elevated high-intensity light standards. Prior to issuance of any building permit for construction of the winery, two (2) copies of a detailed lighting plan showing the location and specifications for all lighting fixtures to be installed on the property shall be submitted for CDPD review and approval. All lighting shall comply with the Uniform Building Code (UBC)."

As designed, and as subject to standard conditions of approval, the project will not have a significant impact from light or glare.

Mitigation Measure(s): None.

	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporation	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
II. AGRICULTURE RESOURCES. In determining impacts to agricultural resources are significant environmental effects, lead agencies may refer to the California Agricultural Land Evaluation and Site Assessment Model (1997) prepared by the California Dept. of Conservation as an optional model to use in assessing impacts on agriculture and farmland. Would the project:				
a) Convert Prime Farmland, Unique Farmland, or Farmland of Statewide Important (Farmland) as shown on the maps prepared pursuant to the Farmland Mapping and Monitoring Program of the California Resources Agency, to non-agricultural use?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
b) Conflict with existing zoning for agricultural use, or a Williamson Act contract?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
c) Involve other changes in the existing environment which, due to their location or nature, could result in conversion of Farmland, to non-agricultural use?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>

Discussion:

a. The proposed project will not convert Prime Farmland, Unique Farmland or Farmland of Statewide importance to non-agricultural use. Designated building sites for single-family residences, which are permitted in the AW (Agricultural Watershed) District and existing Agricultural Preserve Contracts, may limit some cattle grazing; given the large parcel sizes and small building envelopes, much of the parcel would be expected to remain in its current state and available for cattle grazing or other agricultural use.. The shared access and utility easement from Partrick Road for Parcels 1, 2 and 3 will be located along the existing dirt access road; the separate access driveways for Lots 5 and 6 will also be located along existing dirt roads; and Lot 4 will have direct access from Partrick Road. Because of the large parcel sizes and limited size of the building envelopes, the overall project is supportive of maintaining agriculture on the site and this impact is considered less than significant.

b. The parcels are designated AW (Agricultural Watershed) District; all new parcels are greater than the minimum 160 acre lot size requirement and are allowed single-family development as a specific "Permitted Use". No non-agricultural uses are proposed as part of this project.

The three existing parcels each have individual Type H, Agricultural Preserve Contracts (APN 050-010-24, Contract # 02195AGK-H; APN 050-010-030, Contract # 02208AGK-H; and, APN 050-010-043, Contract # 02209AGK-H). These contracts allow subdivision of the properties under the conditions permitted by Government Code, Section 51230.1 for intra-family transfers under joint family management agreement. The owner must submit to the County a fully executed, written *Joint Family Management Agreement* between the owner and family members of the owner who are parties to the proposed transfer of parcels to be created by the subdivision map prior to final map recordation. Compliance with the terms of these existing Agricultural Preserve Contracts will not conflict with existing zoning for agricultural use or existing Williamson Act contracts.

c. The project does not involve changes to the environment that would result in the conversion of Farmland to non-agricultural use. The parcel is currently used for cattle grazing and may continue to be used as such after the new lots are created.

Mitigation Measure(s): None.

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

Discussion: The proposed facility and associated earthwork would not result in significant adverse impacts to air quality.

a-c. The project site is located in Napa County, which forms one of the climatological sub-regions (Napa County Subregion) within the San Francisco Bay Area Air Basin, and is consequently subject to the requirements of the Bay Area Air Quality Management District (BAAQMD). The project would not be in conflict with or obstruct implementation of the Ozone Maintenance Plan, Carbon Monoxide Maintenance Plan or the Bay Area 1991 Clean Air Plan, under the Federal Clean Air Act. BAAQMD regard emissions of PM-10 and other pollutants from construction activity to be less than significant if dust and particulate control measures are implemented, which are included in this project.

The BAAQMD has determined that land uses that generate fewer than 2,000 trips per day do not generally require detailed air quality analysis, since these land uses would not generally be expected to have potentially significant air quality impacts (specifically, they would not be expected to generate over 80 pounds per day of Reactive Organic Gases (ROG)). The project will only result in six new single-family homes generating a total of 60 new vehicle trips per day, therefore, the project's potential to impact air quality is considered less-than-significant.

d-e. The BAAQMD defines public exposure to offensive odors as a potentially significant impact. The project site is not located in close proximity to any sensitive receptors. The project has the potential to generate dust or other construction-related air quality disturbances once dwelling construction begins after recordation of a final parcel map and issuance of required permits. As a standard practice for County development projects, application of water and/or dust palliatives are required in sufficient quantities during grading and other ground disturbing activities on-site to minimize the amount of dust produced as stated in the following standard permit condition:

"Water and/or dust palliatives shall be applied in sufficient quantities during grading and other ground disturbing activities on-site to minimize the amount of dust produced. Outdoor construction activities shall not occur during windy periods."

These Best Management Practices will reduce potential temporary changes in air quality to a less than significant level.

Mitigation Measure(s): None.

	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporation	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
IV. BIOLOGICAL RESOURCES. Would the project:				
a) Have a substantial adverse effect, either directly or through habitat modifications, on any species identified as a candidate, sensitive, or special status species in local or regional plans, policies, or regulations, or by the California Department of Fish and Game or U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
b) Have a substantial adverse effect on any riparian habitat or other sensitive natural community identified in local or regional plans, policies, regulations or by the California Department of Fish and Game or US Fish and Wildlife Service?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
c) Have a substantial adverse effect on federally protected wetlands as defined by Section 404 of the Clean Water Act (including, but not limited to, marsh, vernal pool, Coastal, etc.) through direct removal, filling, hydrological interruption, or other means?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
d) Interfere substantially with the movement of any native resident or migratory fish or wildlife species or with established native resident or migratory wildlife corridors, or impede the use of native wildlife nursery sites?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
e) Conflict with any local policies or ordinances protecting biological resources, such as a tree preservation policy or ordinance?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
f) Conflict with the provisions of an adopted Habitat Conservation Plan, Natural Community Conservation Plan, or other approved local, regional, or state habitat conservation plan?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>

Discussion:

- a. The Theodore Wooster, Consulting Biologist, *Raptor and Other Wildlife Report for the Fisher Parcel Division, Partrick Road, Napa County, June 21, 2003 (and November 23, 2007 follow-up statement)* surveyed the project area flora, fauna and sensitive habitats based upon California Department of Fish & Game (DF&G) Natural Diversity Data Base and DF&G–California Department of Forestry and Fire Protection Northern Spotted Owl (NSO) Data Base data. Sensitive habitat areas include the man-made ponds which have attracted and hold numerous species of wildlife, the Montane hardwood-conifer forest in the north end of Parcel 1 and 2 and the east ends of Parcels 5 and 6, and the riverine habitat of Carneros Creek. There are two known activity centers of NSOs that are located over 1,000 feet from the proposed Parcel 4 building site, on an adjacent 205 acre parcel, APN 050-010-022. Both centers have sufficient habitat within 1.3 miles of their activity centers to meet the ‘bulls eye’ habitat requirements by the DF&G and U.S. Fish & Wildlife Service for determining whether there is a ‘take’ or not.”

The survey concludes that, “. . . proposed house pads and driveways for Lots (Parcels) 4, 5, and 6 will not have a negative effect on to any listed or unique natural resources. The house pads and driveways for Lots 1, 2 and 3 could have a negative effect on the

Montane hardwood-conifer forest habitat on the east side of Partrick Road and, in turn, the habitat (foraging and roosting areas) of existing Northern Spotted Owl activity center in the forest on the nearby Institute De La Salle property. Relocation of these structures to other parts of the lots would avoid these effects."

Kjeldsen Biological Consulting prepared *Special-Status Animal Update, Review of Theodore W. Wooster May 2003 Wildlife Report, April 20, 2009*. The purpose of the update was to review the DF&G CNDDDB, and F&WS databases for any new listed animal species or species distribution that may have occurred since 2003 and to review special-status databases for any new animal species which could have potential presence on the site. Based on site conditions, habitat, historic and ongoing site utilization, hydrology, lack of any records, topography and plant associates present, the update concluded that no special-special status species identified within five miles of the property in the 2009 CNDDDB database or within the 2009 species list for the F&WS quadrangle are located on the project site. The project is not within any mapped or identified critical habitat that would indicate a need for species-specific surveys. They found no habitat within the project footprint that would dictate a need for species-specific surveys. The report states, "... There are no new NSO occurrences listed on the CNDDDB Owl Data Base close to the project sites. Theodore W. Wooster located a single male Owl in 2003 west of Lot 1. The proposed house sites are mainly open grassland and do not contain nesting or foraging habitat for the Northern Spotted Owl. There is no reason to expect any significant impacts on local or regional special-status animal species by the proposed project."

The revised tentative map has relocated proposed building envelopes for Parcels 1, 2 and 3 *outside* of the identified Montane hardwood-conifer forest perimeter; Parcels 5 and 6 building envelopes are both located in open grass land areas. The proposed building envelope for Parcel 4 is located within identified Montane hardwood-conifer forest; however, the site is adjacent to Partrick Road and is on the northwest side of a 1,500 feet hilltop, between 1,200-1,350 feet MSL, about 0.25 northwest of the identified potential NSO habitat area in the 550-1,000 feet MSL range. Removal of trees are required for any road access, utility or residential development within the Parcel 4 building envelope.

Kjeldsen Biological Consulting prepared *Special-Status Plant Survey Update, Review of Theodore W. Wooster May 2003 Wildlife Report, April 6, 2009*. The purpose of the update was to review the DF&G, CNDDDB, and F&WS database for any new critical habitat, or new listed species which could have potential or presence on the site; to review special-status databases for any new species distribution that may have occurred since 2007; review the project for any changes in scope and their potential impacts; review Lots 1, 2 and 3 for their potential impact(s) to Montane hardwood-conifer forest habitats, and habitat for existing NSO activity; check the project site for any changes in vegetation since the last survey; and provide a field check for any habitat alteration, fluctuations in species abundance or colonization from seed dispersal or seed bank exposure.

The Update concluded, "that it is unlikely any of the new listed plant species shown in the 2009 CNDDDB or known for Napa County would occur on the site (including California Native Plant Society List of Special-status Plants and Federal Endangered and Threatened Species that occur in the U.S.G.S 7 1/2 Minute Quadrangle). No special-status plants were observed; there is no designated critical habitat for any plants associated with the project site. There have not been any changes in native vegetation, significant habitat alteration, fluctuations in species abundance or colonization from seed dispersal or seed bank exposure on the site. The most significant change is the increase in French Broom, a non-native invasive species. No sensitive plant communities are associated with the proposed building envelopes, access roads or surrounding development.

Regarding Lots 1, 2 and 3, Kjeldsen noted Wooster's earlier comments regarding the location of Montane hardwood-conifer forests on the north end of these lots, the 'valuable foraging and roosting areas for the NSO, and his concern about the potential for the house pads and driveway 'could have a potential negative effect on the Montane hardwood-conifer forest habitat on the east side of Partrick Road.' The Kjeldsen's report stated, "The project as proposed will not result in any significant removals of Montane hardwood-conifer forests and there is no reason to expect any negative impacts to Montane-conifer forest on the property. The proposed building envelopes are large and are designed to avoid removing large native trees. There is no reason given the size of the property and the extensive woodlands present to account for any impacts to NSO. The access road for the building envelopes is present and will not significantly impact NSO habitat by tree removal. The project as proposed will not have a significant impact to Montane hardwood-conifer forest and or the NSO (sic)."

A mitigation measure to relocate Parcels 1, 2 and 3 building envelopes outside potential NSO habitat Montane hardwood-conifer forest areas will reduce any potential substantial adverse effect, either directly or through habitat modifications, on any species identified as a candidate, sensitive, or special status species in local or regional plans, policies, or regulations, or by the California Department of Fish and Game or U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service to a less than significant level.

- b. Botanists at Kjeldsen Biological Consulting, *Special-Status Plant Survey, Fisher Property, November 5, 2007*, stated that, "The property is presently managed for cattle grazing (and) consists of agrestal pasturelands, oak woodlands and conifer woodlands. Spring surveys did not identify any potential habitat or presence of special-status plant species on or near the proposed building sites or access roads. The site conditions, lack of any findings during our survey, soils present, site topography, lack of any historical records for the site, and the habitat and plant associates present would reasonably preclude the presence of special-status species." The survey concluded that, "The proposed project will not have a significant negative biological impact on-site or off-site to local flora. The proposed building sites will not impact any sensitive plant communities, special-status species populations or unique plant populations." The survey stated that no specific mitigation measures are required since there is no potential "take" of critical or regulated resources that would result from the project. It recommended that standard construction practices, including silt and erosion control measures, must be implemented to protect off-site movement of sediment and dust during and post construction. Carneros Creek is the nearest stream to the project site comprising the western border to APN 050-010-043. No new improvements will be constructed in the creek or within the vicinity of a riparian area; the existing dirt access road will be improved. The project would have no substantial adverse impacts on riparian habitats or other sensitive natural communities and will not result in any changes from what presently exists.

The project would not result in any substantial adverse effect on any riparian habitat or other sensitive natural community identified in local or regional plans, policies, regulations or by the California Department of Fish and Game or US Fish and Wildlife Service.

- c. Napa County Environmental Sensitivity Maps (Watershed Overlay) and the Baseline Data Report do not indicate the presence of any wetlands or potential wetlands within the project boundary. The project would result in no substantial impacts to federally protected or potentially sensitive wetlands.
- d. The project will take place on an already-disturbed, cattle grazing rangeland and would not interfere with the movement of any native resident or migratory fish or wildlife species or with established native resident or migratory wildlife corridors, or impede the use of native wildlife nursery sites. No new fencing is proposed.
- e. The project, as proposed, will result in the removal of trees in the identified Montane hardwood-conifer forest area on Parcel 4. Located directly off Partrick Road frontage, the proposed one-acre building envelope will require tree removal to create access, utility and single-family development. The one-acre building envelope represents less than a 1% portion of the over 100 acres of Montane hardwood-conifer forest identified on the 188.7 acre parcel and even less of the almost 400 acres of forest on the entire project site. A mitigation measure to require California Department of Forestry Exemption from Timber Harvesting Permit prior to any road access, utility and single-family residential development will ensure the project does not conflict with any County ordinance or requirement to preserve existing trees, and therefore would reduce potential for significant impacts.
- f. The proposed project would not conflict with the provisions of an adopted Habitat Conservation Plans, Natural Community Conservation Plans or other approved local, regional or state habitat conservation plans. There are no plans applicable to the subject parcel.

Mitigation Measure(s): 1) Building envelopes for Parcels 1, 2 and 3 shall be located outside the perimeter of identified Montane hardwood-conifer forest to avoid forest habitat on the east side of Partrick Road and the habitat (foraging and roosting areas) of existing Northern Spotted Owl activity center in the forest on the nearby Institute de La Salle property. 2) Prior to any access, utility and residential development of the Parcel 4 building envelope, demonstration of California Department of Forestry Exemption from Timber Harvesting Permit requirements shall be submitted to the Conservation, Development and Planning Department.

Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporation	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
--------------------------------------	---	------------------------------------	--------------

V. CULTURAL RESOURCES. Would the project:

	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporation	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
a) Cause a substantial adverse change in the significance of a historical resource as defined in CEQA Guidelines §15064.5?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
b) Cause a substantial adverse change in the significance of an archaeological resource pursuant to CEQA Guidelines §15064.5?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
c) Directly or indirectly destroy a unique paleontological resource or site or unique geological feature?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
d) Disturb any human remains, including those interred outside of formal cemeteries?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>

Discussion:

- a. All proposed improvements would take place in already-disturbed areas of an existing cattle ranch. Except for a change in property boundaries, no substantial adverse changes to any historical resource would take place. Potential project impacts are therefore considered less than significant.
- b. County Environmental Sensitivity Maps (Archaeological Resources Overlay) indicate there are no known historically sensitive sites or structures located within the project site and on contiguous parcels. In the event archaeological artifacts are encountered during construction of the project, all work would cease to allow a qualified archaeologist to record and evaluate the resources, as required with the standard condition of approval which states:

"In the event that archeological artifacts or human remains are discovered during construction, work shall cease in a 50-foot radius surrounding the area of discovery. The permittee shall contact the CDPD for further guidance, which will likely include the requirement for the permittee to hire a qualified professional to analyze the artifacts encountered and to determine if additional measures are required. If human remains are encountered during the development, all work in the vicinity must be, by law, halted, and the Napa County Coroner informed so that the Coroner can determine if an investigation of the cause of death is required, and if the remains are of Native American origin. If the remains are of Native American origin, the nearest tribal relatives as determined by the State Native American Heritage Commission would be contacted to obtain recommendations for treating or removal of such remains, including grave goods, with appropriate dignity, as required under Public Resources Code Section 5097.98."

With this standard development condition, the potential project impacts are considered less-than-significant.
- c. The subject site does not contain any known paleontological resources or unique geologic features and therefore is not anticipated to result in any significant adverse impacts to such resources.
- d. The presence of any formal cemeteries is not known to occur within the project area and therefore the proposed project is not anticipated to result in any significant adverse impacts on any such resources.

Mitigation Measure(s): None.

	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporation	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
--	--------------------------------------	---	------------------------------------	--------------

Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporation	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
--------------------------------------	---	------------------------------------	--------------

VI. GEOLOGY AND SOILS. Would the project:

- | | | | | |
|--|--------------------------|-------------------------------------|-------------------------------------|-------------------------------------|
| a) Expose people or structures to potential substantial adverse effects, including the risk of loss, injury, or death involving: | | | | |
| i) Rupture of a known earthquake fault, as delineated on the most recent Alquist-Priolo Earthquake Fault Zoning Map issued by the State Geologist for the area or based on other substantial evidence of a known fault? Refer to Division of Mines and Geology Special Publication 42. | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> |
| ii) Strong seismic ground shaking? | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> |
| iii) Seismic-related ground failure, including liquefaction? | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> |
| iv) Landslides? | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> |
| b) Result in substantial soil erosion or the loss of topsoil? | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> |
| c) Be located on a geologic unit or soil that is unstable, or that would become unstable as a result of the project, and potentially result in on- or off-site landslide, lateral spreading, subsidence, liquefaction or collapse? | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> |
| d) Be located on expansive soil, as defined in Table 18-1-B of the Uniform Building Code (1997), creating substantial risks to life or property? | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> |
| e) Have soils incapable of adequately supporting the use of septic tanks or alternative waste water disposal systems where sewers are not available for the disposal of waste water? | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> |

Discussion:

- a. The proposed project is not located within any designated Alquist-Priolo earthquake fault zone. According to Napa County Environmental Sensitivity Map (Alquist-Priolo fault, Liquefaction), soil types located on the project site have very low liquefaction potential. While seismic activity is endemic to the Bay Area, these structures will be constructed to UBC requirements and result in a less than significant risk.

The RGH Consultants, Inc., *Preliminary Geotechnical Study, Fisher Parcel Split – II, November 12, 2007*, states that, "based upon the results of our review of geologic data review and surficial reconnaissance, we judge that the proposed building envelopes are currently outside of the mapped landslides. Thus, we judge it is geo-technically feasible to subdivide the property. Access roads to the proposed building envelopes are also feasible provided unstable areas are avoided." The study recommended specific mitigation measures for building site development and roadway construction addressing structural setbacks, fill and foundation support, home foundation design, leachfield installation, access road construction, erosion and site drainage, and groundwater. With these mitigations, potential project impacts are therefore considered less than significant.

- b. The future single-family residential development will generally occur on slopes with less than 15% grade. The soils on site are characterized by rapid runoff with high to very high erosion potential. The project is required to submit a site development plan, including

implementation of storm water and erosion control Best Management Practices under the standards developed in the County's National Pollutant Discharge Elimination System, Phase II Stormwater Permit, which is required by County Code and is a standard practice on all County development projects. These practices include mandatory design and implementation of pre- and post-construction erosion control and drainage measures with an ongoing monitoring component. Therefore, the potential for impacts is considered less than significant.

- c. While portions of the project site contain mapped unstable areas, as stated in the RGH Consultants, Inc. geotechnical study above, proposed building envelopes identified on the tentative parcel map are currently located outside of the mapped landslide areas. Proposed development would not be located on a geologic unit or soil that is unstable, or that would become unstable as a result of the project, and potentially result in on- or off-site landslide, lateral spreading, subsidence, liquefaction or collapse.
- d. Proposed development will be located on a soil type that is not considered to be expansive, as defined in table 19.1B of the UBC, creating substantial risks to life or property.
- e. The Department of Environmental Management has reviewed the proposed tentative map and required that, as required by Section 17.14.230 of the Napa County Code, notes be added to the final map stating that no water supply/sewage is system is provided for any parcel located within this subdivision as of the date of recordation of this document. Prior to the issuance of a building permit or any other permit permitting development of any lot, a water supply/sewage system complying with County requirements must first be satisfied. There are existing systems on surrounding rural residential properties. There will be no impact to soils relative to septic tanks or waste water disposal systems.

Mitigation Measure(s): 3) Development on the project site shall comply with all mitigation measures recommended by the RGH Consultants, Inc., *Preliminary Geotechnical Study, Fisher Parcel Split – II, November 12, 2007*, addressing residence locations, downslope creep, fill support, foundation support, floor systems, leachfield installation, access roads, erosion and site drainage, and groundwater.

	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporation	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
VII. HAZARDS AND HAZARDOUS MATERIALS. Would the project:				
a) Create a significant hazard to the public or the environment through the routine transport, use, or disposal of hazardous materials?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
b) Create a significant hazard to the public or the environment through reasonable foreseeable upset and accident conditions involving the release of hazardous materials into the environment?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
c) Emit hazardous emissions or handle hazardous or acutely hazardous materials, substances, or waste within one-quarter mile of an existing or proposed school?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
d) Be located on a site which is included on a list of hazardous materials sites compiled pursuant to Government Code Section 65962.5 and, as a result, would it create a significant hazard to the public or the environment?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>

	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporation	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
e) For a project located within an airport land use plan or, where such a plan has not been adopted, within two miles of a public airport or public use airport, would the project result in a safety hazard for people residing or working in the project area?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
f) For a project within the vicinity of a private airstrip, or, where such a plan has not been adopted, within two miles of a public airport or public use airport, would the project result in a safety hazard for people residing or working in the project area?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
g) Impair implementation of or physically interfere with an adopted emergency response plan or emergency evacuation plan?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
h) Expose people or structures to a significant risk of loss, injury or death involving wild-land fires, including where wild-lands are adjacent to urbanized areas or where residences are intermixed with wild-lands?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>

Discussion:

- a. The proposed project will not involve the transport of hazardous materials.
- b. The project would not result in the release of hazardous materials into the environment.
- c. There are no schools located within one-quarter mile from the proposed project site.
- d. The proposed site is not on any known list of hazardous materials sites.
- e. The project site is not located within an airport land use plan area or within two miles of any public airport or public use airport.
- f. The project site is not located within the vicinity of any private airports.
- g. The access driveways that will serve the project will be improved to comply with County road standards. Therefore, the design of the project will not negatively impact or hinder emergency vehicle access. The project has been reviewed by the County Fire Department and Public Works Department and found acceptable as conditioned.
- h. The project, a tentative parcel map, would not increase exposure of people and/or structures to a significant loss, injury or death involving wild land fires. Development on the new building envelopes would require compliance with designated *Wildland-Urban Interface Fire Area* requirements in Chapter 7A of the California Building Code. The project will comply with current California Department of Forestry and Uniform Building Code requirements for fire safety.

Mitigation Measure(s): None.

	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporation	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
VIII. HYDROLOGY AND WATER QUALITY. Would the project:				
a) Violate any water quality standards or waste discharge requirements?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
b) Substantially deplete groundwater supplies or interfere substantially with groundwater recharge such that there would be a net deficit in aquifer volume or a lowering of the local groundwater table level (e.g., the production rate of pre-existing nearby wells would drop to a level which would not support existing land uses or planned uses for which permits have been granted)?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
c) Substantially alter the existing drainage pattern of the site or area, including through the alteration of the course of a stream or river, in a manner which would result in substantial erosion or siltation on- or off-site?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
d) Substantially alter the existing drainage pattern of the site or area, including through the alteration of the course of a stream or river, or substantially increase the rate or amount of surface runoff in a manner which would result in flooding on- or off-site?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
e) Create or contribute runoff water which would exceed the capacity of existing or planned stormwater drainage systems or provide substantial additional sources of polluted runoff?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
f) Otherwise substantially degrade water quality?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
g) Place housing within a 100-year flood hazard area as mapped on a federal Flood Hazard Boundary or Flood Insurance Rate Map or other flood hazard delineation map?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
h) Place within a 100-year flood hazard area structures which would impede or redirect flood flows?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
i) Expose people or structures to a significant risk of loss, injury or death involving flooding, including flooding as a result of the failure of a levee or dam?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
j) Inundation by seiche, tsunami, or mudflow?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>

Discussion:

- a. The proposed project will not violate any known water quality standards or waste discharge requirements. The applicant is not required to obtain a Stormwater Permit from the California State Regional Water Quality Control Board because the project disturbance will not exceed one acre on each proposed parcel. Incorporation of standard stormwater best management practices ensure that the project will have a less than significant impact to water quality and discharge standards.
- b. As required by the County Department of Environmental Management, notes shall be recorded with the final map stating that no water supply or sewer system is provided for any parcel located in the subdivision as of the date of recordation. Prior to issuance of a building

permit or any other permit for development of any lot requiring a domestic water supply or sewage system appropriate Napa County Codes must first be satisfied.

- c-d. The proposed project will not substantially alter the drainage pattern on site or cause a significant increase in erosion or siltation on or off the existing open grazing lands. The project will incorporate erosion control measures appropriate to its maximum slope to manage on-site surface drainage and erosion of onsite soils during construction and winter months (October to April). By incorporating erosion control measures, this project would have a less than a significant impact. No substantial alteration of existing drainage is anticipated to occur. There will be an increase in the overall impervious surface resulting from the new buildings and roadway. However, given the size of the drainage basin and the specific parcels, the increase in impervious surfaces will not discernibly change the amount of groundwater filtration or discernibly increase surface runoff from that which currently existing on site. This project would therefore result in a less than significant impact.
- e. The project will use sheet flow drain facilities that will discharges towards Hopper Creek and Dry Creek. These facilities will be sized appropriately to ensure that there is a less than significant impact.
- f. There are no other factors in this project that would otherwise degrade water quality.
- g. - h. None of the project site is located within either a FEMA-designated 100-year or 500-year flood zone.
- i. - j. The project site is located between approximated 500 feet to 1,500 feet elevation, near the top of a ridge above Carneros Valley. Potential for tsunami is considered less-than-significant. The project is located many miles from San Francisco bay, and in the unlikely event that a tsunami enters the bay, any surge would dissipate well before reaching Napa.

Mitigation Measure(s): None.

	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporation	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
IX. LAND USE AND PLANNING. Would the project:				
a) Physically divide an established community?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
b) Conflict with any applicable land use plan, policy, or regulation of an agency with jurisdiction over the project (including, but not limited to the general plan, specific plan, local coastal program, or zoning ordinance) adopted for the purpose of avoiding or mitigating an environmental effect?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
c) Conflict with any applicable habitat conservation plan or natural community conservation plan?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>

Discussion:

- a. - c. The project would not result in physical division of an established community or conflict with any applicable land use policy. The County has designated the site for agricultural use, and as proposed, the subdivision of an established cattle grazing property is consistent with the AWOS (Agricultural Watershed and Open Space) designation of the Napa County General Plan, Land Use Element and with its AW (Agricultural Watershed) zoning district; single-family residences are allowed as a matter of right in the AW zoning district. No conflict with any applicable conservation plan or natural community conservation would take place.

Mitigation Measure(s): None.

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

Discussion:

The proposed project would not result in impacts to mineral resources as designated by Napa County Environmental Sensitivity maps (Soil Type, Surficial Deposits Overlays).

- a. The project site does not contain any known mineral resources.
- b. The project site is not designated as a locally important mineral resources recovery site.

Mitigation Measure(s): None.

	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporation	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
XI. NOISE. Would the project result in:				
a) Exposure of persons to or generation of noise levels in excess of standards established in the local general plan or noise ordinance, or applicable standards of other agencies?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
b) Exposure of persons to or generation of excessive groundborne vibration or groundborne noise levels?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
c) A substantial permanent increase in ambient noise levels in the project vicinity above levels existing without the project?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
d) A substantial temporary or periodic increase in ambient noise levels in the project vicinity above levels existing without the project?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
e) For a project located within an airport land use plan or, where such a plan has not been adopted, within two miles of a public airport or public use airport, would the project expose people residing or working in the project area to excessive noise levels?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>

	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporation	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
f) For a project within the vicinity of a private airstrip, would the project expose people residing or working in the project area to excessive noise levels?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>

Discussion:

The project will result in a temporary increase in noise levels during any future construction resulting from the subdivision. Construction activities will be limited to daylight hours using properly muffled vehicles. Noise generated during this time is not anticipated to be significant with the implementation of County standard practices.

- a. There are residential uses within 0.25 mile of the boundary of the nearly 1,142 acre project site; proposed building envelopes would be located a minimum 0.6 mile from any existing, nearby residence. Temporary construction noise will be required to comply with County noise standards, reducing the potential for impact to a less than significant level
- b. Construction activities may result in ground-borne vibrations and noise levels. However, given the lack of proximity of the construction site to existing residences, the potential for impact is less-than-significant.
- c. - d. The anticipated noise levels following the completion of construction would be minimal, typical of rural residential uses, and are considered less-than-significant.
- e. The project site is not located within an airport land use plan or within two miles of a public use airport.
- f. The project site is not located within the vicinity of a private airstrip.

Mitigation Measure(s): None.

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

Discussion:

- a. – c. The project will involve subdivision of three existing parcels into six parcels. The project will not displace any housing or divide any established communities. The project will not contribute significantly to a cumulatively considerable increase in the demand for housing units within the communities of Napa County and the general vicinity since the subdivision will create two new home sites.

Mitigation Measure(s): None.

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

Discussion:

The proposed project would not result in potentially significant adverse impacts on public services.

- a. The project site is located within the unincorporated area of Napa County. The site is currently served by the Napa County Fire Department and Napa County Sheriff's Department. The project would not significantly increase demand for schools, parks or other public facilities with the creation of three additional parcels, as proposed. The increased number of developable lots will not pose a major additional demand on emergency services. Therefore, impacts would be less than significant on public services.

Mitigation Measure(s): None.

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

Discussion:

The proposed project would not result in significant adverse impacts on recreation facilities.

a-b. The project would not significantly increase the use of existing recreational facilities.

Mitigation Measure(s): None.

	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporation	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
XV. TRANSPORTATION/TRAFFIC. Would the project:				
a) Cause an increase in traffic which is substantial in relation to the existing traffic load and capacity of the street system (i.e., result in a substantial increase in either the number of vehicle trips, the volume to capacity ratio on roads, or congestion at intersections)?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
b) Exceed, either individually or cumulatively, a level of service standard established by the county congestion management agency for designated roads or highways?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
c) Result in a change in air traffic patterns, including either an increase in traffic levels or a change in location that results in substantial safety risks?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
d) Substantially increase hazards due to a design feature, (e.g., sharp curves or dangerous intersections) or incompatible uses (e.g., farm equipment)?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
e) Result in inadequate emergency access?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
f) Result in inadequate parking capacity?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>

	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporation	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
g) Conflict with adopted policies, plans, or programs supporting alternative transportation (e.g., bus turnouts, bicycle racks)?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>

Discussion:

- a-b. The increase in average daily traffic resulting from six additional single-family homes along a shared, private road access for three parcels and three new private driveways extending from Partrick Road would only add approximately 60 vehicle-trips per day; Partrick Road has an existing Level-of-Service (LOS) A and would be a less-than-significant impact on the low density, agricultural area.
- c. The project does not have any impact on air traffic patterns.
- d – f. The six, new 160-acre minimum lots will have adequate on-site parking area available. The project will result in minor changes to levels of service and no substantial increase in hazards due to a design feature, incompatible uses or inadequate emergency access will result from the project.
- g. The proposed project does not conflict with any known policies or plans supporting alternative transportation.

Mitigation Measure(s): None.

	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporation	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
XVI. UTILITIES AND SERVICE SYSTEMS. Would the project:				
a) Exceed wastewater treatment requirements of the applicable Regional Water Quality Control Board?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
b) Require or result in the construction of a new water or wastewater treatment facilities or expansion of existing facilities, the construction of which could cause significant environmental effects?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
c) Require or result in the construction of a new storm water drainage facilities or expansion of existing facilities, the construction of which could cause significant environmental effects?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
d) Have sufficient water supplies available to serve the project from existing entitlements and resources, or are new or expanded entitlements needed?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
e) Result in a determination by the wastewater treatment provider which serves or may serve the project that it has adequate capacity to serve the project's projected demand in addition to the provider's existing commitments?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>

	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporation	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
f) Be served by a landfill with sufficient permitted capacity to accommodate the project's solid waste disposal needs?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
g) Comply with federal, state, and local statutes and regulations related to solid waste?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>

Discussion:

- a. The project will comply with Napa County Environmental Management requirements for provision of new domestic water supply and sewage systems prior to issuance of building permits for residential or any other type of development.
- b. The project will not require construction of any new water or wastewater treatment facilities that will result in a significant impact to the environment.
- c. New, private storm drain lines will not be required for residential development on the project site after recordation of a final parcel map. Given the sloping topography and minimum 160 acre lot sizes of the proposed subdivision, drainage will sheet-flow towards Carneros Creek that borders the site to the southwest. The project will not cause a significant impact to the environment.
- d. All new parcels will require separate water and septic sewer service approval from the Napa County Environmental Management Department prior to issuance of any permits after recordation of a final tract map.
- e. See response "a." above.
- f.-g. The project will be served by Napa Recycling and Waste Services which provides waste-transfer and landfill disposal with sufficient capacity to meet the projects demands. No significant impact will occur from the disposal of solid waste generated by the project. The project will comply with federal, state, and local statutes and regulations related to solid waste.

Mitigation Measure(s): None.

	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporation	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
XVII. MANDATORY FINDINGS OF SIGNIFICANCE				
a) Does the project have the potential to degrade the quality of the environment, substantially reduce the habitat of a fish or wildlife species, cause a fish or wildlife population to drop below self-sustaining levels, threaten to eliminate a plant or animal community, reduce the number or restrict the range of a rare or endangered plant or animal or eliminate important examples of the major periods of California history or prehistory?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>

	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporation	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
b) Does the project have impacts that are individually limited, but cumulatively considerable? ("Cumulatively considerable" means that the incremental effects of a project are considerable when viewed in connection with the effects of past projects, the effects of other current projects, and the effects of probable future projects)?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
c) Does the project have environmental effects that will cause substantial adverse effects on human beings, either directly or indirectly?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>

Discussion:

- a. The project site has previously been disturbed and does not contain any known listed planted or animal species.
- b. The project does not have impacts that are individually limited, but cumulatively considerable. Potential air quality, traffic and housing impacts are discussed in their respective sections above.
- c. The project does not pose any substantial adverse effects on human beings, either directly or indirectly.