

“C”

## Initial Study/Negative Declaration

Rodde Residence Private Access Road, Use Permit Conservation  
Regulations Exception Request, P16-00383  
Planning Commission Hearing Date September 20, 2017

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

**Initial Study Checklist**  
(form updated October 2016)

1. **Project Title:** Rodde Residence Private Access Road (Conservation Regulations Exception, Use Permit Application #P16-00383 – UP)
2. **Property Owner:** Yahome Vineyards, LLC
3. **County Contact Person, Phone Number and Email Address:** Dana Ayers, (707) 253-4388, dana.ayers@countyofnapa.org
4. **Project Location and Assessor’s Parcel No. (APN):** 4028 Hagen Road (nearest cross street Third Avenue), east of the city of Napa municipal boundary in unincorporated Napa County, APN 049-270-014
5. **Project Proponent’s Name and Address:** Scott Rodde, 1500 Third Street, Suite C, Napa, California 94558
6. **General Plan Land Use Designation:** Agriculture, Watershed and Open Space (AWOS)
7. **Zoning:** AW (Agricultural Watershed) District
8. **Background:** The project proponent resides on the 17.7-acre parcel located at 4100 Hagen Road. The property is developed with a single-family residence that was constructed in 1990, with issuance of County building permit #43515. Subsequent to construction of the residence, the property owner obtained permits to construct a swimming pool and a subterranean cave for display of art and sculptures (County building permits 51537 obtained in 1992, and B00-01108 obtained in 2000); the pool and cave are accessory amenities to the residence on-site. The property is planted with approximately 0.6 acres of vineyards, plus ornamental landscaping. Over half of the property is undeveloped oak woodland.  
  
The property at 4100 Hagen Road lacks any frontage on a public street. Instead, access to the parcel is from Hagen Road via a 0.22-mile long, asphalt-paved, private roadway within an easement across an adjacent parcel (APN 049-270-019) owned by Cedar Knolls Vineyards. The existing, approximately quarter-mile long private roadway is a shared facility providing access to the project proponent’s residence, a separately-owned residence located at 4031 Hagen Road, and the Palmaz Winery located at 4029 Hagen Road. The existing roadway has an average width of 10 feet, narrowing to as little as 8.5 feet in some areas, and does not meet Napa County Road and Street Standards, Design Criteria for Common Drives, in that it lacks shoulders, intermittent vehicle turnouts, and has a paved width narrower than 20 feet.
9. **Description of Project:** The proposed project is a request for an exception to the Napa County Conservation Regulations (County Code Chapter 18.108), in the form of a Use Permit, in order to allow portions of a new, 20-foot wide, asphalt-paved driveway to encroach into the minimum required creek setback from the top of bank of Hagen Creek. The proposed new driveway would provide access from Hagen Road to the Rodde Residence located at 4100 Hagen Road, within a 25-foot wide access easement across the southern boundary of APN 049-270-014, an approximately 167-acre adjacent parcel that is planted with approximately 130 acres of grapevines in the vicinity of the project location. The proposed roadway alignment would generally follow the alignment, and periodically would overlap, an existing dirt and gravel vineyard road next to the on-site vineyards. No vineyards would be removed for the project.

Napa County Code section 18.108.025 establishes minimum setbacks from the top of bank of intermittent and perennial streams, prohibiting structures, earthmoving activity, grading, removal of vegetation and certain agricultural uses of land within the specified setbacks. The required minimum setback is as little as 35 feet from top of bank, with the setback distance increasing as the slope at top of bank becomes steeper, up to as much as 150 feet where the slope is or exceeds 60

percent. In the proposed project area, slope at the top of bank ranges between four and 14 percent, so that the minimum stream setback from top of bank is either 45 or 55 feet depending on precise location along the roadway. While over half the length of the proposed new private road would be outside of required setbacks, approximately 492 feet of the 1,170-foot long roadway would be within the required stream setbacks, necessitating a request for an exception to the Conservation Regulations (County Code section 18.108.040).

In addition to grading and paving, construction of the roadway project would include, on either side of the roadway, two- to four-foot tall retaining walls and bioswales for treatment of stormwater runoff from the roadway prior to discharge of the runoff into Hagen Creek. Site preparation would require grading and off-hauling of approximately 1,100 cubic yards of soil from the site.

10. **Environmental setting and surrounding land uses:** The property on which the road is proposed to be built is not located within any Alquist-Priolo Earthquake Fault Zone designated by the California Department of Conservation, Division of Mines and Geology. The portion of the property on which the proposed project road is located is gently sloping, with grades along the length of the proposed roadway not exceeding 15 percent. The property is underlain with Coombs gravelly loam, a mixture of coarse sand, silt and fine clay soils. The 167-acre property on which the roadway is proposed to be built is predominantly planted with grapevines.

Surrounding properties' land uses and land use designations are summarized below:

North: An approximately 14-acre, single-family residential parcel adjoins the northern property line of the parcel on which the roadway is proposed to be constructed. North of the Rodde residence is a 34-acre parcel owned by the Napa County Land Trust. All parcels to the north of the project parcel and residence have a General Plan land use designation of AWOS and are zoned AW District.

West: Beyond the 167-acre parcel on which the roadway is proposed is a neighborhood of large-lot (one acre or larger), single-family residences with and without vineyards, and the 97-acre Napa Valley Country Club and golf course. The Napa Valley Country Club has a General Plan land use designation of AWOS and is zoned AW District. The neighborhood of single-family residences has a General Plan land use designation of Rural Residential and is zoned RC (Residential Country) District.

South: The 122-acre, Palmaz Vineyards and winery parcel adjoins the southern property line of the parcel on which the roadway is proposed to be built. Further south of that parcel are single-family residential parcels ranging in size from seven to 160 acres. All parcels to the south of the proposed roadway have a General Plan land use designation of AWOS and are zoned AW District.

East: A three-acre parcel and a 220-acre parcel are east of the proposed roadway. Both parcels are developed with single-family residences. The larger of the two parcels also has approximately three acres of vineyard plantings and vineyard access roads but is predominantly undeveloped woodland. All parcels to the east of the Project site have a General Plan land use designation of AWOS and are zoned AW District.

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

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

None required.

12. **Tribal Cultural Resources.** Have California Native American tribes traditionally and culturally affiliated with the project area requested consultation pursuant to Public Resources Code section 21080.3.1? If so, has consultation begun?

Note: Conducting consultation early in the CEQA process allows tribal governments, lead agencies, and project proponents to discuss the level of environmental review, identify and address potential adverse impacts to tribal cultural resources, and reduce the potential for delay and conflict in the environmental review process. (See Public Resources Code section 21083.3.2.) Information may also be available from the California Native American Heritage Commission's Sacred Lands File per Public Resources Code section 5097.96 and the California Historical Resources Information System administered by the California Office of Historic Preservation. Please also note that Public Resources Code section 21082.3(c) contains provisions specific to confidentiality.

On November 8, 2016, county staff sent invitations to consult on the proposed project to Native American tribes who had a cultural interest in the area and who as of that date had requested to be invited to consult on projects, in accordance with the requirements of Public Resources Code section 21080.3.1. On January 11, 2017, county staff received from a representative of the Yocha Dehe Wintun Nation a written request for additional information about the project and potential impacts to cultural resources. On April 19, 2017, county staff conveyed to the Yocha Dehe Wintun Nation representatives a cultural resources report citing negative findings for the project site. No further information was requested by the tribal representatives, and 30 days after sending the report, county staff concluded consultation proceedings by letter of June 23, 2017.

**ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACTS AND BASIS OF CONCLUSIONS:**

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

On the basis of this initial evaluation:

- I find that the proposed project COULD NOT have a significant effect on the environment, and a 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.



---

Dana Ayers, Planner III  
Napa County Planning, Building & Environmental Services Department

August 28, 2017

---

Date

	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporation	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
I. <b>AESTHETICS.</b> 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 that would adversely affect day or nighttime views in the area?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>

Discussion:

a-d. The proposed project, if approved, would not have a substantial adverse effect on a scenic vista nor substantially damage scenic resources or the existing visual character of the site and its surroundings.

The proposed alignment of the roadway is on land that is gently sloping. During a visit to the property, Planning staff observed no significant scenic resources such as rock outcroppings along the length of the roadway. The vegetation that would be removed to accommodate the proposed roadway would be minimal, consisting of grasses that have grown alongside the existing dirt and gravel vineyard road. No trees or structures would be removed from the property for roadway construction.

There is no state highway within 1.5 miles of the site. The property is not located on a hillside or knoll so as to be visually prominent from several perspectives; rather, the property is only visible from a public roadway at the terminus of Hagen Road at the entrance to the property. No existing trees or grapevines would be removed with the project, and as the proposed roadway is an at-grade improvement of an existing dirt and gravel vineyard road, with new retaining walls that would not exceed four-feet above adjacent grade, there would be no significant change in the appearance of the property as viewed from the limited perspective of the terminus of the Hagen Road public right-of-way. Plans submitted with the application for the use permit do not identify any illumination of the private roadway.

With slope that does not equal or exceed 15 percent along any segment of the roadway, the proposed new construction is not subject to the requirements of Napa County Code Chapter 18.106 (Viewshed Protection Program).

Mitigation Measures: None required.

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

Discussion:

- a/e The California Department of Conservation maps the 167-acre parcel on which the roadway is proposed to be built as Prime Farmland, a designation that identifies those lands with an optimal combination of physical and chemical features, micro-climate and water supply to produce high crop yields. The proposed roadway alignment generally follows that of an existing vineyard road currently used to provide access around the property for management of the grapevines. The proposed project would improve the roadway by adding an all-weather surface and introducing stormwater quality preservation measures along the length of the road. No grapevines would be removed to accommodate construction of the roadway.
- b. The County's zoning of the property is AW (Agricultural Watershed) District, and the General Plan land use designation is AWOS (Agriculture, Watershed and Open Space). This zoning district allows agriculture and single-family residences as permitted uses of property, and these land uses are also consistent with the intent of the AWOS General Plan land use designation (County Code section 18.20.020 and General Plan Policy AG/LU-20). The proposed roadway would be accessory to the existing, permitted agricultural use of the parcel on which it would be located, and it would provide access to the Rodde residence, also a permitted use in the AW zone and AWOS designation. There is no Williamson Act contract applicable to this property.
- c/d. As previously noted, the parcel on which the roadway is proposed is currently planted with vineyards. There are no forest resources on the site.

Mitigation Measures: None required.

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

	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 odors affecting a substantial number of people?   | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> |

Discussion:

On June 2, 2010, the Bay Area Air Quality Management District (BAAQMD) Board of Directors unanimously adopted Thresholds of Significance (Thresholds) to assist local agencies in the nine-county Bay Area in the review of projects' potential environmental impacts pursuant to the California Environmental Quality Act (CEQA). The Thresholds were designed to establish the level at which the BAAQMD believed air pollution emissions would cause significant air quality and climate impacts in the region; were posted on the BAAQMD website; and were incorporated into the BAAQMD's updated CEQA Guidelines (updated May 2012). The Thresholds are advisory, and local agencies may follow them at the agencies' discretion.

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

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

BAAQMD published a new version of the Guidelines dated May 2017, which includes revisions made to address the Supreme Court's opinion. The May 2017 Guidelines update does not address outdated references, links, analytical methodologies or other technical information that may be in the Guidelines or Threshold Options and Justification Report. The Air District is currently working to revise any outdated information in the Guidelines as part of its update to the CEQA Guidelines and thresholds of significance.

a-d. The proposed project consists of construction of a new, 20-foot wide, 1,170-foot long roadway parallel to the existing private access roadway between Hagen Road and the driveway to the residential property at 4100 Hagen Road. Over the long term, emission sources associated with the proposed project consist primarily of automobiles using the roadway. However, because the roadway is parallel to an existing facility that currently provides access to on-site vineyards and the property at 4100 Hagen Road, and because no new residences or trip-generating land uses are included with the proposed project, there are no new emissions sources that would result from the proposed project as compared to current conditions without the project.

In 2010, the Bay Area Air Quality Management District (BAAQMD) adopted an updated Clean Air Plan (2010), which outlines a regional program and a set of measures to reduce ozone, ozone precursors, particulate matter, greenhouse gas emissions, and other sources of air pollution. At the time of adoption of the Clean Air Plan, the nine-county San Francisco Bay Area as a region was in non-attainment for ozone and particulate matter (PM), and the region as a whole remains in non-attainment for those two air pollutants. Sources of ozone and PM include combustion (e.g., burning of fossil fuels or vegetation) and fugitive dust from earth-moving activities. The combustion process of passenger and heavy duty vehicles engines is a source of air pollutants, including particulate matter as well as carbon dioxide and nitrogen dioxide, two precursors to formulation of ozone.

The proposed project would not conflict with or obstruct the implementation of the applicable air quality plan. Over the long term, emissions resulting from the proposed use permit would consist primarily of mobile sources (automobiles), which, as noted above, are not anticipated to increase with the project because no new trip-generating land uses are proposed with the project.

In the short term, potential air quality impacts are most likely to result from earthmoving and construction activities required for roadway construction. Although there are no schools or healthcare facilities within one mile of the proposed project, there are existing residences along Hagen Road and Olive Hill Lane that are as close as 300 feet to the closest point of construction of the new roadway. Earthmoving and construction emissions would be short-term, consisting mainly of dust generated during grading and other construction activities and exhaust emissions from construction-related equipment and vehicles during the estimated eight to 12 weeks (40 to 60 work days) of site grading and roadway construction.

The applicant's engineer estimates site grading would occur over four weeks of the eight- to 12-week total project construction timeframe. Within that timeframe, trucks would be driving onto and off of the property to off-haul soil for approximately 10 days. With an estimated 1,200 cubic yards of earthwork estimated to occur for construction of the roadway; applying the heavy- and light-duty construction equipment exhaust emission factors of the BAAQMD (see 1999 CEQA Guidelines, table 7); and an estimated 40- to 60-day timeframe for grading and construction, the emissions from vehicles used in the construction of the project are estimated as follows. For information and comparison, the table includes the thresholds of significance for construction and operations emissions from a project (see 2017 BAAQMD CEQA Guidelines, table 2-1) in the summary below. Average daily emissions in pounds are converted to kilograms (where one pound equals 0.45 kilograms), for consistency in the units across the table:

Contaminant	Emission Factor (grams/yard <sup>3</sup> )	Total Estimated Project Emissions (kilograms, kg)	Estimated Project Emissions per Day of Construction (kg)	Daily Emissions, Threshold of Significance
Reactive Organic Gases (ROG)	9.2	11.0	0.3	24.5 kg (54 pounds)
Oxides of Nitrogen (NO <sub>x</sub> )	42.4	50.9	1.3	24.5 kg (54 pounds)
Coarse Particulate Matter (PM <sub>10</sub> )	2.2	2.64	0.1	37.2 kg (82 pounds)

In addition to the PM<sub>10</sub> estimated to be generated from construction vehicle emissions, dust generated from grading activities within the approximately one acre area of road construction is estimated to generate another 23 kg (51 pounds) of PM<sub>10</sub> per day during the estimated four weeks of site preparation/grading. With an estimated 1,200 cubic yards of earthwork, the project falls below the screening criteria (10,000 cubic yards) for construction impacts, as explained in section 3.5.1 of the 2017 BAAQMD CEQA Guidelines. As noted above, no demolition of structures or new land uses are associated with the project.

The BAAQMD recommends incorporating feasible control measures as a means of addressing construction-related air quality impacts, and with application of these measures, indicates that air pollutant emissions from construction activities would be considered a less than significant impact. These measures are incorporated into the County's standard conditions of project approval and include the following. It is noted that the estimated project emissions per day summarized in the above table are considered to be conservative estimates, as they represent uncontrolled emissions (i.e., activities occurring without inclusion of any of the control measures listed below):

**7.1.c AIR QUALITY**

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

- 1. Post a publicly visible sign with the telephone number and person to contact at the lead agency regarding dust complaints. The BAAQMD's phone number shall also be visible.*



2. Water all exposed surfaces (e.g., parking areas, staging areas, soil piles, grading areas, and unpaved access roads) two times per day.
3. Cover all haul trucks transporting soil, sand, or other loose material off-site.
4. Remove all visible mud or dirt tracked onto adjacent public roads by using wet power vacuum street sweepers at least once per day. The use of dry power sweeping is prohibited.
5. All vehicle speeds on unpaved roads shall be limited to 15 mph.
6. All roadways, driveways, and sidewalks to be paved shall be completed as soon as possible. Building pads shall be laid as soon as possible after grading unless seeding or soil binders are used.
7. Idling times shall be minimized either by shutting equipment off when not in use or reducing the maximum idling time to five minutes (as required State Regulations). Clear signage shall be provided for construction workers at all access points.
8. All construction equipment shall be maintained and properly tuned in accordance with manufacturer's specifications. All equipment shall be checked by a certified visible emissions evaluator. Any portable engines greater than 50 horsepower or associated equipment operated within the BAAQMD's jurisdiction shall have either a California Air Resources Board (ARB) registration Portable Equipment Registration Program (PERP) or a BAAQMD permit. For general information regarding the certified visible emissions evaluator or the registration program, visit the ARB FAQ [http://www.arb.ca.gov/portable/perp/perpfaq\\_04-16-15.pdf](http://www.arb.ca.gov/portable/perp/perpfaq_04-16-15.pdf) or the PERP website <http://www.arb.ca.gov/portable/portable.htm>.

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

**7.1.b DUST CONTROL**

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

With the project proponent's compliance with these relevant best management practices identified by the BAAQMD and the County's standard conditions of project approval, construction-related impacts are considered to be less than significant. The temporary duration of the work would not cause a substantial increase in particulate matter (PM), and compliance with standard conditions would reduce to less than significant the proposed project's significant construction impact related to the region's current non-attainment status for this criteria pollutant.

- e. The closest off-site sensitive receptors to the proposed new private access road are the residences to the northwest and southwest of the western terminus of the new road. The BAAQMD defines public exposure to offensive odors as a potentially significant impact and includes in its 1999 and 2017 CEQA Guidelines several industrial (wastewater treatment plants, landfills and transfer stations, chemical or petroleum processing manufacturing plants) uses that commonly generate odors considered to be offensive. The proposed new roadway is not a use that, in the long term, would generate offensive odors typical of such manufacturing or processing uses. The use of the roadway would be limited to vehicles accessing residential and agricultural developments, both of which are permitted land uses and considered to be acceptable in accordance with the County's Community Character Element (General Plan, Policy CC-51).

Mitigation Measures: None required.

	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporation	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
<b>IV. BIOLOGICAL RESOURCES.</b> Would the project:				
a) Have a substantial adverse effect, either directly or through habitat modifications, on any species identified as a candidate, sensitive, or special status species in local or regional plans, policies, or regulations, or by the California Department of Fish and Wildlife or U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service?	<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
b) Have a substantial adverse effect on any riparian habitat or other sensitive natural community identified in local or regional plans, policies, regulations or by the California Department of Fish and Wildlife or U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input 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 checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
d) Interfere substantially with the movement of any native resident or migratory fish or wildlife species or with established native resident or migratory wildlife corridors, or impede the use of native wildlife nursery sites?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
e) Conflict with any local policies or ordinances protecting biological resources, such as a tree preservation policy or ordinance?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input 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:**

b/c/e. The proposed roadway alignment generally flat, having a slope of less than five percent; slope on the southern side of the roadway is slightly steeper, ranging from four to 14 percent. Although portions of the proposed roadway would be within the county's established stream setback, no portion of the roadway would require grading directly on the banks of Hagen Creek, and county geographic information system (GIS) data indicate no wetlands on the parcel in the vicinity of the roadway alignment. The proposed project includes stormwater quality preservation measures that include landscaping and bioretention areas that are incorporated into the project improvements in order to treat runoff from the property and reduce pollution of storm drainage facilities, consistent with the requirements of chapter 16.28 (Stormwater Management and Discharge Control) of Napa County Code.

a/d. County GIS data do not indicate presence of any sensitive species or sensitive species' habitat along the proposed roadway alignment. The property has been in agricultural use for several decades, and the proposed roadway would be constructed within a previously disturbed and graded area that has served as a vineyard access route. Along the proposed roadway alignment, native vegetation – and the native species habitat that would have been fostered by that vegetation – has long been removed from the property in order to introduce wine grape vines and vineyard roads. Additionally, the proposed project requires no removal of trees or demolition of vacant structures within which colonies of sensitive species (such as birds or bats) might have established, and the demolition of which would consequently have an impact on those species. As described further in Environmental Setting, above, the roadway alignment is bound on one side by grapevines. The other side of the proposed roadway is a ruderal grassland, but it, too, is isolated from the proximate Hagen Creek due to the intervening paved roadway that provides access to the Palmaz Winery on the adjoining parcel. As the proposed project would not construct a barrier nor remove existing native habitat in an undisturbed area, the proposed development would not impede movement within an existing terrestrial habitat corridor.

f. There is no habitat conservation plan (HCP) or natural community conservation plan (NCCP) that has been adopted or is being implemented in unincorporated Napa County.

Mitigation Measures: None required.

	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporation	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
V. <b>CULTURAL RESOURCES.</b> Would the project:				
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 type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" 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 checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
d) Disturb any human remains, including those interred outside of formal cemeteries?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>

Discussion:

a-d. With the use permit application submittal, the applicant submitted a historical resources study prepared by Tom Origer and Associates. The study included archival research and documented results of a field survey of the proposed project location. The study identified no historic structures or other architectural resources on the property on which the roadway would be built, and it concluded that, based on the underlying geology and other analysis of the proposed project site, the likelihood of presence of prehistoric archaeological resources is very low. The property is predominantly flat and developed with a vineyard, lacking any unique geological features such as rock outcroppings, mounds or other landforms, as observed by Planning staff.

There are no known archaeological or paleontological resources on the property; the historical resources likelihood of such resources being present on the site is low; and the property has already experienced significant ground disturbance as would occur to remove native vegetation and grade the site for installation of the existing vineyard. Construction of the proposed roadway would not require demolition of any existing buildings but would involve earthwork and ground disturbance as necessary to remove existing grasses, soil and gravel surfaces along the proposed roadway alignment. Although presence of resources is not likely, ground disturbance to construct the road could uncover previously undocumented archaeological resources. If any resources not previously uncovered during prior site disturbance are found during any earth disturbing activities associated with the proposed project, construction of the project is required to cease, and a qualified archaeologist must be retained to investigate the site in accordance with the County's standard condition of approval, which reads as follows:

**7.2 ARCHEOLOGICAL FINDING**

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

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

Mitigation Measures: None required.

	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporation	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
<b>VI. GEOLOGY AND SOILS.</b> 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 type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
iv) Landslides?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
b) Result in substantial soil erosion or the loss of topsoil?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
c) Be located on a geologic unit or soil that is unstable, or that would become unstable as a result of the project, and potentially result in on- or off-site landslide, lateral spreading, subsidence, liquefaction or collapse?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
d) Be located on expansive soil creating substantial risks to life or property? Expansive soil is defined as soil having an expansive index greater than 20, as determined in accordance with ASTM (American Society of Testing and Materials) D 4829.	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
e) Have soils incapable of adequately supporting the use of septic tanks or alternative waste water disposal systems where sewers are not available for the disposal of waste water?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>

Discussion:

a-c. The banks of Hagen Creek south of the proposed roadway have slopes of up to 14 percent. Within the area of the property to be disturbed for the construction of the roadway, slopes are generally flat and under five percent. Given that the area of disturbance is predominantly flat, underlain with a mixture of course sand, silt and fine clay soils (Coombs gravelly loam) and located on the valley floor, soil movement and erosion potential is anticipated to be low (by contrast, higher erosion potential is anticipated in areas of steep slopes or more moderate slopes with loose, sandy soils). The property also has a low landslide potential, as identified on landslide risk maps produced by the California Department of Conservation and Association of Bay Area Governments. Regional maps of liquefaction risk indicate that the property is within an area of low liquefaction potential.

The property is not located within any Alquist-Priolo Earthquake Fault Zone designated by the State Department of Conservation, Division of Mines and Geology. Although no fault zone underlies the property, the site is generally located within a region of active fault zones, including those of the Berryessa, Concord, Great Valley, North Hayward, Mayacama, Rodgers Creek, San Andreas and West Napa faults. Movement along any of these faults is anticipated to result in intensities of VII and VIII on the Modified Mercalli Scale at the project site; these "very strong" to "severe" intensities would be felt by most people and are likely to result in some damage to well-built structures. However, no structures proposed for human occupancy are proposed with the project.

d/e. The Coombs gravelly loam that underlays the proposed development portion of the site generally has a low erosion potential, moderate shrink-swell potential and severe limitations in use for septic system absorption fields. The expansive soils on-site could pose the potential for cracks in or damage to the proposed road surface, as a result of shrinking and swelling of the soil from moisture absorption and evaporation. However, no structures proposed for human occupancy are proposed with the project, and the project requires no construction of a septic system for wastewater treatment.

Mitigation Measures: None required.

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

Discussion:

GHGs are the atmospheric gases, including carbon dioxide, methane, nitrogen dioxide, and synthetic fluorinated gases, whose absorption of solar radiation is responsible for global warming and that contribute to climate change, a widely accepted theory/science explaining human effects on the atmosphere. Carbon dioxide (CO<sub>2</sub>) is the principal GHG being emitted by human activities, and whose concentration in the atmosphere is most affected by human activity. Commercial and industrial sources of GHG include space conditioning and other metal and chemical production processes. Agricultural sources of carbon emissions include forest clearing, land use changes, and burning of fossil fuels related to goods movement and gas and diesel-powered vehicles and farm equipment (<https://www3.epa.gov/climatechange/science/causes.html>). CO<sub>2</sub> also serves as the reference gas to which to compare other greenhouse gases are measured. The effect that each unit of the other GHGs (methane, nitrogen dioxide and synthetic fluorinated gases) has on causing the global warming effect is exponentially greater than the impact of a unit of CO<sub>2</sub>, to the degrees of tens to tens of thousands of times. Thus, GHG emissions are measured in "carbon dioxide equivalents." Carbon dioxide equivalents (CO<sub>2</sub>e) is a unit of measurement of GHG emissions that uses carbon dioxide as a common denominator, and it is a way to get one number that approximates total emissions from all the different gases that contribute to GHG emissions (BAAQMD CEQA Air Quality Guidelines, May 2017). CO<sub>2</sub>e are measured in units of metric tons, or 1,000 kilograms, equal to approximately 2,204 pounds.

Napa County has been working to develop a Climate Action Plan (CAP) for several years. In 2012, a Draft CAP<sup>2</sup> (March 2012) was recommended using the emissions checklist in the Draft CAP, on a trial basis, to determine potential GHG emissions associated with project development and operation. At the December 11, 2012, Napa County Board of Supervisors (BOS) hearing, the BOS considered adoption of the proposed CAP. In addition to reducing Napa County's GHG emissions, the proposed plan was intended to address compliance with CEQA for projects reviewed by the County and to lay the foundation for development of a local offset program. While the BOS acknowledged the plan's objectives, the BOS requested that the CAP be revised to better address transportation-related GHG, to acknowledge and credit past accomplishments and voluntary efforts, and to allow more time for establishment of a cost-effective local offset program. The Board also requested that best management practices be applied and considered when reviewing projects until a revised CAP is adopted, in order to ensure that projects address the County's goal related to reducing GHG emissions.

In July 2015, the County re-commenced preparation of the CAP to: 1) account for present day conditions and modeling assumptions (such as but not limited to methods, emission factors, and data sources); 2) address the concerns with the previous CAP effort as outlined above; 3) meet applicable State requirements; and 4) result in a functional and legally defensible CAP. On April 13, 2016, the County, as the part of the first phase of development and preparation of the CAP, released Final Technical Memorandum No. 1: *2014 Greenhouse Gas Emissions Inventory and Forecast, April 13, 2016*<sup>3</sup>. This initial phase included updating the unincorporated County's community-wide GHG emissions inventory to 2014 and preparing new GHG emissions forecasts for the 2020, 2030, and 2050 horizon years. Table 1 of the Technical Memorandum indicates that two percent of the County's GHG emissions in 2014 were a result of land use change.

<sup>2</sup> County of Napa, March 2012, Napa County Draft Climate Action Plan, Prepared by ICF International. Sacramento, CA

<sup>3</sup> Supersedes February 2, 2016, version.

Additional information on the County CAP can be obtained at the Napa County Department of Planning, Building and Environmental Services or online at <http://www.countyofnapa.org/CAP/>.

- a. Overall increases in GHG emissions in Napa County were assessed in the Environmental Impact Report (EIR) prepared for the Napa County General Plan Update and certified by the Napa County Board of Supervisors in June 2008. GHG emissions were found to be significant and unavoidable in that document, despite the adoption of mitigation measures incorporating specific policies and action items into the General Plan.

Consistent with these General Plan action items, Napa County participated in the development of a community-wide GHG emissions inventory and "emission reduction framework" for all local jurisdictions in the County in 2008-2009. This planning effort was completed by the Napa County Transportation and Planning Agency in December 2009, and served as the basis for development of a refined inventory and emission reduction plan for unincorporated Napa County.

As discussed in the Air Quality section of this Initial Study, in 2010, the BAAQMD adopted and later incorporated into its 2011 CEQA Guidelines project screening criteria (Table 3-1 – Criteria Air Pollutants and Precursors & GHG Screening Level Sizes) and thresholds of significance for air pollutants, including GHG emissions. The BAAQMD's threshold of significance for proposed projects' potential GHG emissions was set at 1,100 metric tons of CO<sub>2</sub>e (MTCO<sub>2</sub>e) per year and remains the threshold in the more-recently published May 2017 Guidelines. Agencies may choose to use the threshold or other available data source as best available information. For this analysis, the GHG threshold of 1,100 MTCO<sub>2</sub>e, based on the analysis in the BAAQMD's most recent Guidelines and its "Threshold Options and Justifications Report," is considered the best available information and is considered an appropriate threshold against which to measure the potential GHG impacts of the proposed project.

During our ongoing planning effort, the County requires project applicants to consider methods to reduce GHG emissions consistent with Napa County General Plan Policy CON-65(e). (Note: Pursuant to State CEQA Guidelines Section 15183, because this initial study assesses a project that is consistent with an adopted General Plan for which an environmental impact report (EIR) was prepared, it appropriately focuses on impacts which are "peculiar to the project," rather than the cumulative impacts previously assessed.)

For the purposes of this analysis, potential GHG emissions associated with project construction and with ongoing operations are discussed. One-time construction emissions associated with the proposed roadway project include emissions associated with the energy used to grade the project area and construct the road, including construction equipment and worker vehicle trips (hereinafter referred to as "equipment emissions"). These emissions also include underground carbon stocks (or soil carbon) associated with existing vegetation that is proposed to be removed. In addition to the one-time construction emissions, operational emissions of the project are also considered and include: i) any reduction in the amount of carbon sequestered by existing vegetation that is removed as part of the project compared to a "no project" scenario (hereinafter referred to as operational sequestration emissions); and ii) ongoing emissions from including vehicle trips associated with roadway use (hereinafter referred to as operational emissions). Operational emissions of the project would be the primary source of emissions over the long-term when compared to one-time construction emissions.

The proposed project consists of construction and use of a new, approximately 1,170-foot long, private access road to an existing residence and alongside an existing vineyard. The impact screening criteria of the BAAQMD CEQA Guidelines derives from various land uses that are anticipated to generate air and GHG emissions from vehicle trips and utilities, including energy needed for heating, cooling and lighting spaces. Because the roadway is parallel to an existing facility that currently provides access to on-site vineyards and the property at 4100 Hagen Road, and because no new residences or trip-generating land uses are included with the proposed project, there are no new GHG emissions that are anticipated to result from the proposed project as compared to current conditions without the project. Additionally, while low-growing grasses would be disturbed during site preparation, no trees, shrubs or vines would be removed to accommodate roadway construction. Standard conditions of development (see Air Quality discussion, above) would require limitations on idling times of construction equipment and vehicles in order to reduce GHG emissions from engine combustion.

During construction, the combustion process of engines in heavy duty vehicles would be a source of air pollutants, including particulate matter as well as carbon dioxide and nitrogen dioxide. Emissions from heavy duty off-road vehicles (e.g., construction equipment) would increase as a result of those vehicles' use in earthwork and soil off-hauling associated with the project. Although the use of these vehicles would increase emissions in the vicinity of the site, the 2010 Bay Area Clean Air Plan notes that emissions from heavy duty and industrial vehicles are regulated by standards of the U.S. Environmental Protection Agency and California Air Resources Board, and that as those standards have intensified, emissions (particularly nitrogen oxides and particulate matter) from these types of vehicles have and will continue to decrease (3-29, 3-30). U.S. Department of

Transportation, Bureau of Transportation Statistics data demonstrates this downward trend in heavy duty vehicle emissions since 1990. It is again noted that use of these vehicles would be temporary, generating GHG in the property vicinity only for the two- to three-month duration of construction but not thereafter.

- b. The County of Napa does not have an adopted climate action plan. However, as noted above, the proposed project is not anticipated to generate any new, long-term GHG emissions for which mitigation or reduction measures would be necessary.

Mitigation Measures: None required.

	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporation	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
<b>VIII. HAZARDS AND HAZARDOUS MATERIALS.</b> 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 checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
b) Create a significant hazard to the public or the environment through reasonable foreseeable upset and accident conditions involving the release of hazardous materials into the environment?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
c) Emit hazardous emissions or handle hazardous or acutely hazardous materials, substances, or waste within one-quarter mile of an existing or proposed school?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input 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"/>
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 checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>

Discussion:

- a/b. As an improved roadway facility in place of an existing, unpaved vineyard road, the proposed project would continue to facilitate the transport of hazardous materials typically used in agricultural maintenance within vineyards of the subject property and on the project proponent's nearby vineyard, consistent with existing conditions. The vineyard manager would be required to file a Hazardous Materials Business Plan with the Environmental Health Division should the amount of hazardous materials stored on the property or transported on-site reach reportable levels.
- c. The proposed project would not affect schools within one-quarter mile. The school closest to the site is Vichy Elementary, which is over a mile northwest of the subject property.
- d. The property is not on the California Environmental Protection Agency's list of hazardous sites (Government Code Section 65962.5).
- e/f. The proposed roadway site is not within two miles of any public airport or airstrip. Napa County Airport, the closest airport to the site, is over seven miles southwest of the site, and the proposed project site is outside of the boundaries of the land use compatibility plan for that airport. At the time of writing of this initial study, there is a pending application for a use permit for a personal use heliport on the property at 4031 Hagen Road; if approved, that use permit request would allow construction of a helicopter landing pad and hangar building approximately one quarter of a mile northeast of the eastern terminus of the proposed

roadway. No new development is proposed with this roadway project that would increase vehicle trips in the vicinity of the project site, and no buildings would be built nor illumination installed that would interfere with air traffic, should that private use heliport request be approved by the County.

- g. The Napa County Emergency Operations Plan (EOP) outlines procedures, including establishing leadership roles and responsibilities of various agency staff, that guide local preparedness, response, recovery and resource management efforts associated with occurrence of a natural disaster, significant emergency, or other threat to public safety. No component of the implementation of the EOP would otherwise be impaired by the proposed roadway project. The proposed project would not result in permanent closure or obstruction of adjacent public rights-of-way. Construction of the roadway would occur entirely on private property within an existing access easement; there is also adequate space on the property for staging of equipment, such that the public right-of-way of Hagen Road would not be impaired during construction of the private road.
- h. The vineyard property on which the road would be located is considered to be within an area of wildland-urban interface fire threat, according to regional maps (<http://gis.abag.ca.gov/website/Hazards/>). The proposed project, however, does not include construction of any new building constructed for human occupancy and that would incur damage during a wildland fire. The asphalt-paved road surface would be absent of vegetation that would serve as fuel during a fire on the property.

Mitigation Measures: None required.

	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporation	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
<b>IX. HYDROLOGY AND WATER QUALITY.</b> 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 checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input 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 type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" 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) Expose people or structures to significant risk of loss or injury as a result of inundation by seiche, tsunami, or mudflow?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>



Discussion:

a/e/f. The proposed project improvements have been designed in accordance with the County-applicable, Bay Area Stormwater Management Agencies Association (BASMAA) Post-Construction Manual. The guidance in this manual is intended to ensure that stormwater runoff generated from a development is treated prior to entering a storm drain system, and that the quantity of post-construction stormwater runoff does not exceed the quantity of runoff generated by the pre-construction condition of a site.

The impervious surface of the new roadway would be graded to drain into landscaped bioswales. Within these bioswales, stormwater flow would be slowed in order to allow the stormwater runoff from the roadway to percolate back into the soil, where pollutants would be naturally filtered out through landscaping and layers of engineered soil that is specially designed for stormwater treatment. Thus, the proposed system is designed to manage both the quantity and quality of stormwater runoff before discharge of the runoff into nearby Hagen Creek. As these design elements are currently absent on the road alignment, the proposed project is considered to provide an improvement to the on-site treatment of stormwater runoff.

- b. The proposed project consists of construction of a new roadway that would have no ongoing demand for water for consumption or irrigation. With the addition of approximately 0.55 square feet of new impervious surface within the roadway, the majority of the approximately 167-acre vineyard parcel would remain pervious. The proposed project includes landscaped bioswales allowing for infiltration of roadway stormwater runoff back into the adjacent soils.
- c/d. The proposed roadway alignment generally flat, having a slope of less than five percent; slope on the southern side of the roadway is slightly steeper, ranging from four to 14 percent. Although portions of the proposed roadway would be within the County's established stream setback, no portion of the roadway would require grading directly on the banks of Hagen Creek. The proposed project would add a new paved surface for vehicular movement on the property, resulting in just under 24,000 square feet of new impervious surfaces on the site. The addition of the impervious road surface to the site would increase the volume of stormwater runoff as compared to the existing condition of the site (unpaved vineyard road). However, as described in the paragraphs above, the proposed project has been designed in accordance BASMAA standards that require no net increase in the quantity of runoff generated between the pre-construction and post-construction conditions of a development.
- g-i. There would be a less than significant risk to life in the event of a flood on the project site. No structures are proposed to be built with the proposed project, and the proposed roadway, though proximate to Hagen Creek, is not within a 100-year or 500-year flood zone. County GIS maps also show the property to be located outside of any dam failure inundation zone.
- j. The property is located well inland of the Pacific Ocean coast and the shores of the San Pablo Bay where risk of inundation by seiche or tsunami tends to occur; thus, the site is subject to minimal risk of damage or injury related to seiches or tsunamis. The site is also predominantly flat, with the slope across the adjacent vineyard generally not exceeding five percent, and small areas along the sides of the roadway not exceeding 15 percent. However, no buildings are proposed with the project, and therefore, the proposed project is not likely to subject persons or structures to risk of damage as a result of landslide or mudflow.

Mitigation Measures: None required.

	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporation	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
<b>X. LAND USE AND PLANNING.</b> Would the project:				
a) Physically divide an established community?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input 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 checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
c) Conflict with any applicable habitat conservation plan (HCP) or natural community conservation plan (NCCP)?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>

Discussion:

- a. The proposed project would not divide an existing, established community. The proposed roadway would provide vehicular access to existing development on and adjacent to the property. The proposed project site is currently developed with approximately 130 acres of vineyard. There are residential, winery, and other agricultural land uses existing on parcels surrounding the site where the roadway is proposed, as described in more detail in sections 10 and 11 of this initial study. Surrounding land uses would not be physically modified (as by demolition of an existing structure, division of land or construction of a barrier or other structure). The roadway would be constructed entirely on private property and would facilitate improved access to existing residential development on an adjoining parcel.
- b. Despite partial encroachment of the roadway into the Hagen Creek setback required under County Code Section 18.108.025, the road improvement as designed would include a landscaped bioswale adjacent to the length of the road and a two-foot wide rock perimeter at the storm drain inlet proposed to be installed alongside the road. In combination, the bioswale and rock serve to capture sediment and treat stormwater runoff from the new impervious surface of the roadway, consistent with General Plan Circulation Element Policy CIR-8 and Conservation Element Policy CON-48. No part of the roadway improvement would result in direct filling of the creek or other disturbance to the banks of the nearby creek.  
  
The proposed roadway would provide vehicular access from the Hagen Road public right-of-way to existing agricultural and residential developments on the subject and adjacent parcels. No new land use that would generate vehicle trips or air emissions is proposed with the project, and the project includes no new buildings that would significantly change the visual character of the property. Other than low-growing grasses that would be disturbed during site grading, no significant tree, shrub or agricultural planting removal is necessary for construction of the project.
- c. There is no HCP or NCCP that has been adopted or is being implemented in unincorporated Napa County.

Mitigation Measures: None required.

		Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporation	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
<b>XI.</b>	<b>MINERAL RESOURCES.</b> 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:

- a/b. There are no impacts anticipated to occur with respect to mineral resources as a result of the proposed construction of a private roadway on the subject site. As described in Chapter 2 of the Napa County Baseline Data Report (BDR; 2005), mineral resources mostly occur in the southern and northern areas of the County, generally at higher elevations than the valley floor where the subject site is located. BDR Figure 2.2 identifies no mineral mining resources on or in the vicinity of the proposed project site.

Mitigation Measures: None required.

		Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporation	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
<b>XII.</b>	<b>NOISE.</b> Would the project result in:				

	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporation	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
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 type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
e) For a project located within an airport land use plan or, where such a plan has not been adopted, within two miles of a public airport or public use airport, would the project 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"/>
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 type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>

Discussion:

a/b/d. The proposed project would cause a temporary increase in noise levels as a result of operation of equipment for grading and construction of the roadway. However, construction would be at or just below ground surface and would not require driving of piles or similar construction methods that would cause excessive ground vibration. Standard conditions of development in Napa County are intended to reduce to acceptable levels the potential impacts of construction-related noise on neighboring uses by requiring mufflers on construction equipment and prohibiting off-site project equipment staging between the hours of 5:00 p.m. and 8:00 a.m.:

7.3 CONSTRUCTION NOISE

*Construction noise shall be minimized to the greatest extent practical and feasible under State and local safety laws, consistent with construction noise levels permitted by the General Plan Community Character Element and the County Noise Ordinance. Construction equipment muffling and hours of operation shall be in compliance with the County Code. Equipment shall be shut down when not in use. Construction equipment shall be staged, loaded, and unloaded on the project site, if at all practicable. If project terrain or access road conditions require construction equipment to be staged, loaded, or unloaded off the project site (such as on a neighboring road or at the base of a hill), such activities only shall occur daily between the hours of 8:00 AM to 5:00 PM.*

c. Regulations contained within County Code Chapter 8.16 establish exterior noise criteria for various land uses in the County. As described in Project Setting, above, land uses that surround the proposed roadway site are predominantly agricultural (vineyard and winery) and low density residential; of these land uses, the residential land use is considered the most sensitive to noise. Following construction of the roadway, noise associated with the proposed project would result from passenger vehicles and vineyard maintenance vehicles and equipment traveling on the roadway. As these vehicles currently travel in the area (on the existing paved road on APN 049-270-019 and in the existing unpaved vineyard road in place where the project roadway is proposed), and no new development is proposed that would result in increase in vehicle trips in the vicinity of the project site, there would be no change in the noise environment with the project as compared to existing conditions without the project.

e/f. The proposed roadway site is not within two miles of any public airport or airstrip. Napa County Airport, the closest airport to the site, is over seven miles southwest of the site, and the proposed project site is outside of the boundaries of the land use compatibility plan for that airport. At the time of writing of this initial study, there is a pending application for a use permit for a personal use heliport on the property at 4031 Hagen Road; if approved, that use permit request would allow construction of a helicopter landing pad and hangar building approximately one quarter of a mile northeast of the eastern terminus of the proposed roadway. However, as noted above, no new development is proposed that would increase vehicle trips in the vicinity of the project site, and there would be no change in the noise environment with the project as compared to existing conditions without the project.

Mitigation Measures: None required.

	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporation	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
<b>XIII. POPULATION AND HOUSING.</b> 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 proposed project is not growth-inducing; rather, it would provide improved access to existing residential and agricultural development on two adjacent parcels (APN 049-270-013 and 049-270-014). Where access is currently provided (APN 049-270-019), the roadway is narrow and does not meet current County standards for two-way traffic. The proposed roadway would be constructed within an existing, 25-foot wide access easement on APN 049-270-014. Other than the access road within the existing access easement, no new infrastructure is proposed that might induce growth by extending accessibility or public utilities outside of the private property boundaries of the subject site. The proposed project does not increase capacity of any existing public roadway, nor does it include construction or demolition of any residential structure, so that no residents would be displaced and no residences would be lost as a result of the project.

Mitigation Measures: None required.

	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporation	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
<b>XIV. PUBLIC SERVICES.</b> 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 listed below:				
i) Fire protection?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
ii) Police protection?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
iii) Schools?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
iv) Parks?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
v) Other public facilities?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>

Discussion:

- a. The proposed project would have a less than significant impact on public services. The property on which the road would be built, as well as the property to which the road would provide improved vehicular access, are located within the service areas of both the Napa County Sheriff's Department (Beat 5) as well as the Napa County Fire Department. The proposed project includes no new land uses nor any buildings or structures intended for human occupancy, that would increase population in the area and thereby result in an increase in demand for schools and recreational facilities. The proposed road would be wider than the existing road providing access to the residential property at 4100 Hagen Road, and by meeting current County Road and Street Standards, would facilitate improved emergency response access to the property and its residents in an emergency situation. Also see discussion under Section XV, below.

Mitigation Measures: None required.

	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporation	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
<b>XV. RECREATION.</b> 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:

- a/b. The proposed project consists of paving of a roadway within an existing access easement, to provide access to an existing residence. The project includes no residential units nor accompanying introduction of permanent new residents who would utilize existing parks in the area and potentially accelerate those recreational facilities' deterioration. No new parks or other public recreational amenities are proposed to be built with the proposed road.

Mitigation Measures: None required.

	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporation	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
<b>XVI. TRANSPORTATION/TRAFFIC.</b> 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 and/or conflict with General Plan Policy CIR-16, which seeks to maintain an adequate Level of Service (LOS) at signalized and unsignalized intersections, or reduce the effectiveness of existing transit services or pedestrian/bicycle facilities?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
b) Conflict with an applicable congestion management program, including, but not limited to level of service standards and travel demand measures, or other standards established by the Napa County Transportation and Planning 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"/>

	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporation	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
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) Conflict with General Plan Policy CIR-23, which requires new uses to meet their anticipated parking demand, but to avoid providing excess parking which could stimulate unnecessary vehicle trips or activity exceeding the site's capacity?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
g) Conflict with adopted policies, plans, or programs regarding public transit, bicycle, or pedestrian facilities, or otherwise decrease the performance or safety of such facilities?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>

Discussion:

The property has its sole access to the County road network via a driveway at the eastern terminus of Hagen Road, a two-lane, County-managed roadway that extends westerly from the property toward the city of Napa municipal boundary. The proposed project consists of a new roadway on private property, with no modification to the public road or the point at which the public road terminates at the property line.

a/b. Level of service standards for roads in the unincorporated areas have been established by the County in its General Plan (2008). As described on page CIR-15 of the General Plan, "Level of service (LOS) is a measure of how well an intersection or roadway is able to carry traffic. LOS is usually designated with a letter grade A-F, where 'A' is best and 'F' is worst." General Plan policy CIR-16 establishes the County's desired LOS on all County roadways as LOS D, which represents "[t]he level where traffic nears an unstable flow. Intersections still function, but short queues develop and cars may have to wait through one cycle during short peaks" (CIR-15).

The requested use permit is not anticipated to have a significant impact to the transportation network in the vicinity of the site because the proposed project includes no new land uses or other development that would have the effect of permanently adding vehicle trips to the local roadway network. Rather, the proposed project to construct a roadway is requested to provide improved access to an existing single-family residence on the property adjoining that on which the road would be built. As no increase in vehicle trips is associated with the built project, no changes in the level of service of surrounding streets are anticipated, and no mitigation is required for the proposed project.

c. The proposed project includes no tall structures, uplighting, or air travel component that would affect air traffic.

d/e. In 1971, Napa County adopted its initial iteration of the Napa County Road and Street Standards (RSS). The intent of the RSS was to establish a uniform set of standards for public and private roads that strive to preserve the natural landscape and water quality, minimize impacts to environmentally sensitive areas and native habitats, and provide adequate safety and service in the interest of protecting public health and welfare. As further described in the RSS Objectives, the RSS "attempt to meet the related interests of several other agencies, including the Resource Conservation District, Cal Fire, the Federal Emergency Management Agency, the Napa County Planning, Building and Environmental Services Department, and the California Department of Fish and Wildlife" (RSS, page 5). The RSS has since been amended to reflect changes in the best practices and regulations of the respective agencies, with the most recent amendment occurring in November 2016.

As referenced in prior sections of this initial study, the proposed project site has its direct access to and from Hagen Road. The proposed private roadway would provide access between Hagen Road and the residential property at 4100 Hagen Road, approximately one-half mile east of the end of the public road. The proposed project would meet the minimum 20-foot width and asphalt-surface paving requirements of the RSS, and therefore would provide improved emergency and large vehicle access to the residential property as compared to current conditions (i.e., the existing roadway immediately to the south of the proposed road is also paved with asphalt but is narrower and lacks turnouts to allow vehicles to pass along the narrow roadway).

f. The proposed project does not include any new land use or off-street parking component; therefore, there would be no impact with respect to traffic generation from an excessive number of parking stalls.

- g. All improvements proposed with the project would occur on private property. No bicycle facilities or bus routes, which occur along public rights-of-way, would be impacted by the proposed roadway improvement.

Mitigation Measures: None required.

		Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporation	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
<b>XVII.</b>	<b>TRIBAL CULTURAL RESOURCES.</b> Would the project cause a substantial adverse change in the significance of a tribal cultural resource, defined in Public Resources Code section 21074 as either a site, feature, place, cultural landscape that is geographically defined in terms of the size and scope of the landscape, sacred place, or object with cultural value to a California Native American tribe, and that is:				
	a) Listed or eligible for listing in the California Register of Historical Resources, or in a local register of historical resources as defined in Public Resources Code section 5020.1(k), or	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
	b) A resource determined by the lead agency, in its discretion and supported by substantial evidence, to be significant pursuant to criteria set forth in subdivision (c) of Public Resources Code section 5024.1. In applying the criteria set forth in subdivision (c) of Public Resources Code section 5024.1, the lead agency shall consider the significance of the resource to a California Native American tribe.	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>

**Discussion:**

a/b. As discussed in section V of this initial study, there are no existing structures on the property that are listed in a local, state or federal register of historic resources. A cultural resources analysis prepared for the property as part of the use permit application identified no historic structures or other architectural resources on the property on which the roadway would be built; the County has no record of known cultural resources on the site; and the property has been previously disturbed as part of existing agricultural activities. Consultation with representatives of local Native American tribes who have a cultural interest in the area in accordance with Public Resources Code section 21080.3.1 did not conclude in the identification of any previously unknown resources on the site or in the immediate area of the proposed project site. As discussed in Section V of this initial study, if any resources, not previously uncovered during prior ground disturbance, are found during any earth disturbing activities associated with the proposed project, construction of the project is required to cease, and a qualified archaeologist must be retained to investigate the site in accordance with the standard county conditions of approval.

Mitigation Measures: None required.

		Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporation	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
<b>XVIII.</b>	<b>UTILITIES AND SERVICE SYSTEMS.</b> Would the project:				
	a) Exceed wastewater treatment requirements of the applicable Regional Water Quality Control Board?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input 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 checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input 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 checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input 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 checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>

	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporation	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
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"/>
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 checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
g) Comply with federal, state, and local statutes and regulations related to solid waste?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>

Discussion:

a-g. The proposed private roadway project does not include any land use or development component that would have ongoing needs for water use (as for consumption, irrigation or cleaning), nor for disposal of refuse or treatment of wastewater generated by the project. The proposed project would therefore have no significant impacts in these areas.

Extensive stormwater treatment facilities, such as detention basins or ponds, that would require extensive grading or installation of infrastructure, are not proposed with this project. Proposed improvements include construction of a landscaped bioswale along the proposed roadside, which would serve to capture and treat stormwater runoff from the new roadway surface before discharging it to Hagen Creek via a catch basin near the western end of the road. The swale would be landscaped with native grasses for enhanced sediment absorption and filtration, within an approximately three-foot wide space alongside the paved road surface. Construction of the swale would occur concurrently with construction of the roadway such that it would not result in significant water quality impacts, as construction of the road and swale would be subject to the dust suppression measures listed in section III, Air Quality, of this initial study.

Mitigation Measures: None required.

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

Discussion:

a. The proposed project consists of construction of a new roadway within an area of prior ground disturbance that includes roadway construction and vineyard plantings, and proposed improvements include landscaped bioswales along the roadside that would serve to capture and treat runoff from the new impervious roadway surface.

As the property has been in agricultural use since at least the 1990s, and with the exception of the banks of Hagen Creek to the south of the roadway, native vegetation – and the native species habitat that would have been fostered by that vegetation – has long been removed from the property to introduce wine grape vines, roads and other agricultural accessory structures. The property in



the vicinity of the proposed roadway is generally flat and lacking any unique geological features such as rock outcroppings or other landforms. There are no known archaeological or paleontological resources on the property, and the property has a history of ground disturbance. However, if any resources not previously uncovered during this prior disturbance are found during any earth disturbing activities associated with the proposed project, construction of the project is required to cease, and a qualified archaeologist must be retained to investigate the site in accordance with standard County conditions of development.

- b. As described in the sections above, noise and air quality impacts associated with construction of the roadway would be temporary in nature, and so would be less than significant. Operational noise, air quality and traffic impacts are also anticipated to be less than significant due to the limited use of the roadway for a single, existing residence and ongoing vineyard maintenance. There would be no ongoing groundwater needs for the project, and the new roadway would result in no increases in vehicle trips beyond those in the current condition, as the new roadway would serve an existing single-family residence that is currently served by a proximate, parallel private drive.
- c. There are no schools or hospitals housing sensitive receptors within a quarter-mile of the site. Noise that would occur with construction and installation of the proposed site improvements would be temporary, lasting approximately two to three months, would be limited to day time hours, and would be subject to best management practices intended to limit fugitive dust and protect stormwater quality. Ongoing operations of the roadway are also anticipated to have comparable noise and traffic impacts when compared to the existing condition, and the proposed project includes no construction of new structures that might be occupied and potentially subject to damage from natural occurrences such as earthquakes or floods.

Mitigation Measures: None required.

---