

“C”

Initial Study/Negative Declaration

COUNTY OF NAPA  
PLANNING, BUILDING AND ENVIRONMENTAL SERVICES DEPARTMENT  
1195 THIRD ST., SUITE 210  
NAPA, CA 94559  
(707) 253-4416

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

1. **Project Title:** Blossom Creek Farm Horse Boarding Facility, Use Permit P17-00140
2. **Property Owner/Project Sponsor Name and Address:** Blossom Creek LLC, Robert Fish, General Manager, 3417 St. Helena Hwy North, St. Helena, CA 94574
3. **Representative Name and Address:** Robert Fish, General Manager, 3417 St. Helena Hwy North, St. Helena, CA 94574
4. **County Contact Person, Phone Number, and Email:** Emily Hedge; (707) 259-8226; [emily.hedge@countyofnapa.org](mailto:emily.hedge@countyofnapa.org)
5. **Project Location and APN:** The project is located on a 6.85-acre parcel on the west side of State Highway 128, northwest of the city of Calistoga. 3574 State Highway 128, Calistoga, CA. APN: 017-110-052.
6. **General Plan Description:** Split designation Agricultural Resource (AR) and Agriculture, Watershed, and Open Space (AWOS).
7. **Zoning:** Agricultural Watershed (AW).
8. **Background/Project History:**

The parcel is currently developed with a residence, garage, barn, covered arena, and round pen. There are approximately four acres of pastures.

P10-00013 – On May 20, 2010, the Director approved a Home Occupation permit to conduct a wholesale wine business from a home office.

CE16-00294 – On October 10, 2016, a code enforcement case was opened when it was discovered that the owner was conducting commercial horse boarding and providing training lessons without benefit of a Use Permit. The property owner has stopped all commercial boarding and training and is in the process of obtaining the necessary permits and resolving the case.

P17-00138 – On April 4, 2017, the Director approved a Home Occupation permit for mobile consulting to golf courses, including providing fertilizer programs, training, and related product sales, from a home office.

9. **Description of Project:** Approval of a use permit to operate a commercial facility for the board and care of horses to include:
  - a) The boarding of a maximum of 12 horses (property owner's horses and horses boarded by outside owners);
  - b) Horse training and lessons for horse owners and visitors;
  - c) Summer camp consisting of three (3) one-week training sessions (approximately 8 students, Monday-Friday; individual lessons are not given during the week of camp; Saturday schedule is normal);
  - d) Two employees;
  - e) Use of the existing barn, arena, and round pen;
  - f) Use of eight existing parking stalls;
  - g) Improvements to the existing barn restroom to bring it into compliance with current CA Building Code; and
  - h) Daily hours of operation: boarding 24 hours a day; employees 8:00 a.m.- sunset; non-residence boarder access 8:00 a.m.- sunset; training Monday through Saturday 8:00 a.m. – 6 p.m.
10. **Describe the environmental setting and surrounding land uses:**

The a 6.85-acre parcel is located on the west side of State Highway 128, northwest of the city of Calistoga. The parcel is currently developed with a residence, garage, two sheds, barn, covered arena, and round pen. There are approximately four acres of pastures. The property is accessed via a driveway off of Highway 128. The driveway also provides access to one of the residential units on the property east of the parcel.

There are currently four horses boarded onsite, but the owner has had up to 14 horses on the site in the past. The owner currently collects the manure in a trailer and removes it from the site approximately once per week.

The existing structures on the property did not suffer any damage during the October 2017 Napa Fire Complex. There was limited damage to vegetation on the property, and repair to some fence area along the property lines will be required.

Surrounding land uses include rural residential properties, agriculture, vineyards, and wineries. The nearest offsite residences are located approximately 150 feet to the south of the barn, approximately 350 feet east of the round pen, and approximately 650 feet northwest of the barn. The structure to the south was damaged in the October 2017 Napa Fire Complex and the structures to the west and east were both destroyed. Most structures in the surrounding area were damaged or destroyed.

The property is located in the Blossom Creek watershed. Blossom Creek runs adjacent to the west side of the property, more than 200 feet west of the existing development. The property is located at approximately 460 feet above mean sea level and is relatively flat (0- 5% slope). The property is made up of a combination of soils including bale clay loam (2-5% slopes) on the western half of the property and Perkins gravelly loam (2-5% slopes) on the eastern half of the property.

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

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

**Other Agencies Contacted**

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?**

Pursuant to Public Resources Code section 21080.3.1, invitation for tribal consultation was completed. A response was received from the Director of Cultural Resources at the Yocha Dehe Wintun Nation on December 18, 2017, with a determination the the project is not within their aboriginal territories and declining comment on the project. No other responses were received.

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.

**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.

Emily Hedge

Emily Hedge, Planner III  
County of Napa Planning, Building and Environmental Services Department

3/27/18

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 which would adversely affect day or nighttime views in the area?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>

Discussion:

Visual resources are those physical features that make up the environment, including landforms, geological features, water, trees and other plants, and elements of the human cultural landscape. A scenic vista, then, would be a publicly accessible vantage point such as a road, park, trail, or scenic overlook from which distant or landscape-scale views of visually appealing or otherwise important assembly of visual resources can be taken in.

As generally described in the **Environmental Setting and Surrounding Land Uses** section above, the surrounding land uses include rural residential properties, agriculture, vineyards, and wineries. The project will utilize the existing barn, covered arena, and round pen, and parking will occur on a previously paved area north of the arena. Proposed improvements include construction of a new restroom within the existing barn.

a-c. The proposed improvements would consist of internal construction that would not substantially change the existing appearance of the site. Although State Highway 128 is a County designated Viewshed Road, none of the proposed improvements are located on slopes greater than 15 percent, and therefore, the project is not subject to the County's Viewshed Protection Program (County Code Chapter 18.106). The project would not have a substantial adverse effect on a scenic vista, substantially damage scenic resources, or substantially degrade the visual quality of the site or its surroundings. Impacts would be less than significant.

d. The project does not propose the installation of any additional lighting fixtures. There are existing light fixtures on the exterior of the barn, including four light fixtures under the eaves at each corner and one downward shielded light on each gable end of the barn. No lights are installed or proposed to be installed at the round pen.

The property owner and property manager currently board their horses on the property, and on occasion, lights have been used at night for the emergency care of horses. Occasional use of lighting at night for emergencies is expected to continue. The project is not expected to significantly increase nighttime lighting. Impacts would be less than significant.

Although the project is in an area that has a certain amount of existing nighttime lighting, the installation of new sources of lights, if they were to remain on past daylight hours, may affect nighttime views. Pursuant to standard Napa County conditions of approval, any future, proposed or replacement outdoor lighting will be required to be installed and maintained in a design that is shielded and directed downwards, with only low-level lighting allowed in parking areas. As designed, and as subject to the standard conditions of approval, below, the project will not have a significant impact resulting from new sources of outside lighting.

6.3 **LIGHTING – PLAN SUBMITTAL**

- a. *Two (2) copies of a detailed lighting plan showing the location and specifications for all lighting fixtures to be installed on the property shall be submitted for Planning Division review and approval. All lighting shall comply with the CBC.*
- b. *All exterior lighting, including landscape lighting, shall be shielded and directed downward; located as low to the ground as possible; the minimum necessary for security, safety, or operations; on timers; and shall incorporate the use of motion detection sensors to the greatest extent practical. All lighting shall be shielded or placed such that it does not shine directly on adjacent properties or impact vehicles on adjacent streets. No flood-lighting or sodium lighting of the building is permitted, including architectural highlighting and spotting. Low-level lighting shall be utilized in parking areas as opposed to elevated high-intensity light standards.*

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

a. All lighting shall be permanently maintained in accordance with the lighting and building plans approved by the County.

**Mitigation Measures:** None required.

	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporation	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
<b>II. AGRICULTURE AND FOREST RESOURCES.<sup>1</sup> Would the project:</b>				
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 type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
b) Conflict with existing zoning for agricultural use, or a Williamson Act contract?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" 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 type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>

**Discussion:**

a/b/e. Based on GIS layer FMMP Farmlands (2012), the property is designated "Other Land". Therefore, the project would not convert Prime Farmland, Unique Farmland, or Farmland of Statewide Important (Farmland) to non-agricultural use. Napa County Code Section 18.20.030 provides that "horse boarding and/or training stables" may be permitted within the AW district upon grant of a use permit. The proposed project does not conflict with the agricultural zoning. There is not an agricultural or Williamson Act contract on the property. The proposed project does not involve other changes in the existing environment which, due to their location or nature, could result in conversion of Farmland to non-agricultural use. There would be no impact.

c/d. The proposed project will not conflict with existing zoning for or cause rezoning of forest land, timberland, or timberland zoned Timberland Production. The property is zoned for agricultural and not forest or timberland use. There would be no impact.

**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. <b>AIR QUALITY.</b> 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's (BAAQMD) Board of Directors unanimously adopted thresholds of significance to assist in the review of projects under the California Environmental Quality Act. These Thresholds are designed to establish the level at which BAAQMD believed air pollution emissions would cause significant environmental impacts under CEQA and were posted on BAAQMD's website and included in BAAQMD's updated CEQA Guidelines (updated May 2012). The Thresholds are advisory and may be followed by local agencies at their own discretion.

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

In view of the Supreme Court's opinion, local agencies may rely on Thresholds designed to reflect the impact of locating development near areas of toxic air contamination where such an analysis is required by CEQA or where the agency has determined that such an analysis would assist in making a decision about the project. However, the Thresholds are not mandatory and agencies should apply them only after determining that they reflect an appropriate measure of a project's impacts. These Guidelines may inform environmental review for development projects in the Bay Area, but do not commit local governments or 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 Thresholds 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-c. The mountains bordering Napa Valley block much of the prevailing northwesterly winds throughout the year. Sunshine is plentiful in Napa County, and summertime can be very warm in the valley, particularly in the northern end. Winters are usually mild, with cool temperatures overnight and mild-to-moderate temperatures during the day. Wintertime temperatures tend to be slightly cooler in the northern end of the valley. Winds are generally calm throughout the county. Annual precipitation averages range from about 24 inches in low elevations to more than 40 inches in the mountains.

Ozone and fine particle pollution, or PM2.5, are the major regional air pollutants of concern in the San Francisco Bay Area. Ozone is primarily a problem in the summer, and fine particle pollution in the winter. In Napa County, ozone rarely exceeds health standards, but PM2.5 occasionally does reach unhealthy concentrations. There are multiple reasons for PM2.5 exceedances in Napa County. First, much of the county is wind-sheltered, which tends to trap PM2.5 within the Napa Valley. Second, much of the area is well north of the moderating temperatures of San Pablo Bay and, as a result, Napa County experiences some of the coldest nights in the Bay Area. This leads to greater fireplace use and, in turn, higher PM2.5 levels. Finally, in the winter easterly winds often move fine-particle-laden air from the

Central Valley to the Carquinez Strait and then into western Solano and southern Napa County (BAAQMD, *In Your Community: Napa County*, April 2016).

Ambient air quality standards have been established by state and federal environmental agencies for specific air pollutants most pervasive in urban environments. These pollutants are referred to as criteria air pollutants because the standards established for them were developed to meet specific health and welfare criteria set forth in the enabling legislation. The criteria air pollutants emitted by development, traffic and other activities anticipated under the proposed development include ozone, ozone precursors oxides of nitrogen and reactive organic gases (NOx and ROG), carbon monoxide (CO), nitrogen dioxide (NO2), and suspended particulate matter (PM10 and PM2.5). Other criteria pollutants, such as lead and sulfur dioxide (SO2), would not be substantially emitted by the proposed development or traffic, and air quality standards for them are being met throughout the Bay Area.

BAAQMD has not officially recommended the use of its thresholds in CEQA analyses and CEQA ultimately allows lead agencies the discretion to determine whether a particular environmental impact would be considered significant, as evidenced by scientific or other factual data. BAAQMD also states that lead agencies need to determine appropriate air quality thresholds to use for each project they review based on substantial evidence that they include in the administrative record of the CEQA document. One resource BAAQMD provides as a reference for determining appropriate thresholds is the *California Environmental Quality Act Air Quality Guidelines* developed by its staff in 2010 and as updated through May 2017. These guidelines outline substantial evidence supporting a variety of thresholds of significance.

The existing agricultural uses on site would continue and the project would not result in operational changes. The proposed changes may result in additional traffic to the site.

As mentioned above, in 2010, the BAAQMD adopted and later incorporated into its 2011 CEQA Guidelines project screening criteria (Table 3-1 – Operational-Related Criteria Air Pollutant and Precursors Screening Level Sizes) and thresholds of significance for air pollutants, which have now been updated by BAAQMD through May 2017. The closest related operational criteria land use type comparison was determined to be a City park. The project size of 6.85 acres falls well below all of the screening criteria for a City park - Operational Criteria Pollutant Screening Size: 2613 acres (ROG); Operational GHG Screening Size: 600 acres; Construction-Related Screening Size: 67 acres (PM10).

There are no projected or existing air quality violations in the project area, to which the project would contribute, nor would the project result in any violations of any applicable air quality standards. The proposed project would not result in a cumulatively considerable net increase in any criteria pollutant for which the project region is in non-attainment under an applicable federal or state ambient air quality standard. The proposed project would not conflict with or obstruct the implementation of any applicable air quality plan. The impacts associated with implementation of the Project were evaluated consistent with guidance provided by BAAQMD. The project falls well below the screening criteria as noted above, and consequently will not significantly affect air quality individually or contribute considerably to any cumulative air quality impacts.

- d. The project proposes to continue existing ranch and residential horse boarding activities with the addition of commercial boarding and training. The proposed project would allow an increase in the number of horses that are currently boarded on site and would permit activities that may increase visitation and result in additional traffic. The ITE generally recognizes 10 daily trips for a single family residence. The forecasted daily trips are estimated at approximately 18 trips on a weekday and 11 trips on a weekend. The estimated trips are less than the number of trips generally associated with two single-family residences. Pollutant concentrations associated with the project would be less than significant. The proposed project would not include operational components that would expose sensitive receptors to substantial pollutant concentrations. To reduce impacts from dust, the property owner waters down areas, such as the arena, on an as-needed basis depending on the time of year and moisture of the soil.

In the short term, potential air quality impacts are most likely to result from construction activities required for site improvements. Construction emissions would have a temporary effect; consisting mainly of dust and exhaust emissions from construction related equipment and vehicles. The Air District recommends incorporating feasible control measures as a means of addressing construction impacts. If the proposed project adheres to these relevant best management practices identified by the Air District and the County's standard conditions of project approval, construction-related impacts will not expose sensitive receptors to substantial pollutant concentrations and are considered less than significant:

7.1 *SITE IMPROVEMENTS*  
c. *AIR QUALITY*

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

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



2. *Water all exposed surfaces (e.g., parking areas, staging areas, soil piles, grading areas, and unpaved access roads) two times per day.*
3. *Cover all haul trucks transporting soil, sand, or other loose material off-site.*
4. *Remove all visible mud or dirt 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 off equipment when not in use or reducing the maximum idling time to five (5) 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 *SITE IMPROVEMENTS*  
 b. *DUST CONTROL*

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

- e. Construction-phase pollutants will be reduced to a less than significant level by the above-noted standard condition of approval. While the Air District defines public exposure to offensive odors as a potentially significant impact, agricultural uses are the primary use in the zoning district and related agricultural odors are expected. The ranch and horse boarding operations, including odors associated with the agricultural uses, are existing. There are currently four horses boarded onsite, but the owner has had up to 14 horses on the site in the past. The owner currently collects the manure in a trailer and removes it from the site approximately once per week. Although there will be a potential increase in the number of horses (up to 12 horses), the agricultural odors are not expected to increase significantly as a result of the proposed project. The owner has previously had up to 14 horses on site. The project will not create pollutant concentrations or objectionable odors affecting a substantial number of people. The impact would be less than significant.

**Mitigation Measures:** None required.

	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporation	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
IV. <b>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 Game or U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
b) Have a substantial adverse effect on any riparian habitat or other sensitive natural community identified in local or regional plans, policies, regulations or by the California Department of Fish and Game or US Fish and Wildlife Service?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
c) Have a substantial adverse effect on federally protected wetlands as defined by Section 404 of the Clean Water Act (including, but not limited to, marsh, vernal pool, Coastal, etc.) through direct removal, filling, hydrological interruption, or other means?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input 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 type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" 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:

The 6.85-acre parcel is currently developed with a residence, garage, two sheds, barn, covered arena, and round pen. There are approximately four acres of pastures. Blossom Creek runs adjacent to the west side of the property, more than 200 feet west of the existing development. The proposed physical improvements associated with the project include construction of a new restroom within the existing barn. No work is proposed near the creek. The owner currently collects the manure in a trailer and removes it from the site approximately once per week.

- a./d. As noted in the discussion, physical improvements would be limited to areas previously disturbed by construction. The proposed project will not disturb natural habitat or have a substantial adverse effect on any species identified as a candidate, sensitive, or special status species in local or regional plans, policies, or regulations, or by the California Department of Fish and Game or U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service. The proposed improvements would not interfere with the movement of any native resident or migratory fish or wildlife species or with established native resident or migratory wildlife corridors, or impede the use of native wildlife nursery sites. Continuation and expansion of existing horse boarding uses on site is not anticipated to have an affect on the creek. The potential for this project to have an impact on special status species is less than significant.
- b. No work is proposed near the creek. The project will not have a substantial adverse effect on any riparian habitat or other sensitive natural community identified in local or regional plans, policies, regulations or by the California Department of Fish and Game or US Fish and Wildlife Service. The potential for this project to have an impact on any riparian habitat or other sensitive natural community is less than significant.
- c. According to the Napa County Environmental Resource Maps (based on the following layers – wetlands (NWI) and wetlands & vernal pools) there are no wetlands on the property or neighboring properties that would be affected by this project. The potential for this project to have an impact on federally protected wetlands is less than significant.
- e/f. The proposed project would not conflict with the provisions of an adopted Habitat Conservation Plans, Natural Community Conservation Plans or other approved local, regional or state habitat conservation plans. The project does not conflict with any County ordinance or requirement to preserve existing trees, and therefore is considered as not having potential for a significant impact.

**Mitigation Measures:** None required.

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

Discussion:

a-c. According to the Napa County Environmental Resource Maps (based on the following layers – Cultural Resources: Historical sites, Historical Sites – Lines, Arch sensitive areas, Arch sites, Arch surveys) archaeological sites have been identified in proximity to the site. Proposed physical improvements would be limited to improvements to the existing restroom in the barn. Continuation and expansion of existing horse boarding uses on site is not anticipated to have a significant impact on historical or paleontological resources, sites or unique geological features, or archaeological resources.

However, if resources are found during any future earth disturbing activities associated with the project, construction of the project is required to cease, and a qualified archaeologist will be retained to investigate the site in accordance with the following standard condition of approval. The proposed project will not have a significant impact on any historical resource, archaeological resource, paleontological resource or site or unique geological feature.

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.*

d. No human remains have previously been encountered on the property and no information has been encountered that would indicate that this project would encounter human remains. However, if resources are found during, construction of the project is required to cease, and a qualified archaeologist will be retained to investigate the site in accordance with standard condition of approval noted above. Impacts would be less than significant.

**Mitigation Measures:** None required.

	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporation	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
VI. <b>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:

The a 6.85-acre parcel is currently developed with a residence, garage, two sheds, barn, covered arena, and round pen. There are approximately four acres of pastures. Blossom Creek runs adjacent to the west side of the property, more than 200 feet west of the existing development. The proposed physical improvements associated with the project include construction of a new restroom within the existing barn.

a. The areas of the property to be disturbed for the improvements are previously disturbed areas that are generally flat and under five percent. Given that the area of disturbance is predominantly flat 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).

According to the Napa County Environmental Resource Maps (based on the following layers – Landslides – line; Landslides – polygon; Landslide Geology) there is no landslide data on the property. County Environmental Resource Maps indicate a “Low” risk for liquefaction.

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.

The applicant has building permits for all structures on the property, and any future construction on site will be required to comply with all the latest building standards and codes, including the California Building Code. Continuation and expansion of existing horse boarding uses on site is not anticipated to expose people or structures to increased potential substantial adverse effects, including the risk of loss, injury, or death; potential impacts would be less than significant level.

b. Proposed improvements are limited to installation of a new restroom within the existing barn. The Engineering Division will review the associated building permit and apply the Napa County Stormwater Ordinance, which addresses sediment and erosion control measures and dust control, as applicable. Impacts would be less than significant.

- c/d. The applicant has building permits for all structures on the property, and any future construction on site will be required to comply with all the latest building standards and codes, including the California Building Code. All proposed improvements will be reviewed by the appropriate County divisions to ensure compliance with County and State regulations. Based on the Napa County Environmental Sensitivity Maps (layer – liquefaction) the property is generally subject to a “Low” tendency to liquefy. Potential impacts would be less than significant level.
- e. The applicant is not proposing any changes to the existing wastewater system, which has been reviewed and permitted by the Napa County Environmental Health Division. The existing system has been sized for a three-bedroom residence. The system currently serves the 2-bedroom residence and the existing restroom in the barn. The proposed increases can be accommodated with the existing onsite system. The Napa County Environmental Health Division has reviewed the report and concurred with their conclusion. No information has been encountered that would indicate a substantial impact to water quality. Potential impacts would be less than significant.

**Mitigation Measures:** None required.

	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporation	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
<b>VII. GREENHOUSE GAS 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:**

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

In July 2015, the County re-commenced preparation of the CAP to: i) account for present day conditions and modeling assumptions (such as but not limited to methods, emission factors, and data sources), ii) address the concerns with the previous CAP effort as outlined above, iii) meet applicable State requirements, and iv) result in a functional and legally defensible CAP. On April 13, 2016 the County, as the part of the first phase of development and preparation of the CAP, released Final Technical Memorandum #1: 2014 Greenhouse Gas Emissions Inventory and Forecast, April 13, 2016. This initial phase included: i) updating the unincorporated County's community-wide GHG emissions inventory to 2014, and ii) preparing new GHG emissions forecasts for the 2020, 2030, and 2050 horizons. Additional information on the County CAP can be obtained at the Napa County Department of Planning, Building and Environmental Services or <http://www.countyofnapa.org/CAP/>.

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

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

In 2011, the Bay Area Air Quality Management District (BAAQMD) released California Environmental Quality Act (CEQA) Project Screening Criteria and Significance of Thresholds [1,100 metric tons per year (MT) of carbon dioxide and carbon dioxide equivalents (CO<sub>2</sub>e)]. This threshold of significance is appropriate for evaluating projects in Napa County.

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

GHGs are the atmospheric gases whose absorption of solar radiation is responsible for the greenhouse effect, including carbon dioxide, methane, ozone, and the fluorocarbons, that contribute to climate change (a widely accepted theory/science explain human effects on the atmosphere). Carbon Dioxide (CO<sub>2</sub>) gas, the principal greenhouse gas (GHG) being emitted by human activities, and whose concentration in the atmosphere is most affected by human activity, also serves as the reference gas to compare other greenhouse gases. Agricultural sources of carbon emissions include forest clearing, land-use changes, biomass burning, and farm equipment and management activity emissions ([http://www.climatechange.ca.gov/glossary/letter\\_c.html](http://www.climatechange.ca.gov/glossary/letter_c.html)). Equivalent Carbon Dioxide (CO<sub>2</sub>e) is the most commonly reported type of GHG emission and a way to get one number that approximates total emissions from all the different gasses that contribute to GHG (BAAMD CEQA Air Quality Guidelines, May 2017). In this case, carbon dioxide (CO<sub>2</sub>) is used as the reference atom/compound to obtain atmospheric carbon CO<sub>2</sub> effects of GHG. Carbon stocks are converted to carbon dioxide equivalents (CO<sub>2</sub>e) by multiplying the carbon total by 44/12 (or 3.67), which is the ratio of the atomic mass of a carbon dioxide molecule to the atomic mass of a carbon atom (<http://www.nciasi2.org/COLE/index.html>).

One time "Construction Emissions" associated with a development project include: i) the carbon stocks that are lost (or released) when existing vegetation is removed and soil is ripped in preparation for a new structure and associated infrastructure; and ii) emissions associated with the energy used to develop and prepare the project area and construction, 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 any existing vegetation that is proposed to be removed. As previously stated, the agricultural buildings are existing and the project does not include construction of any new structures. Improvements would be made to the restroom in the existing barn.

In addition to the one time Construction Emissions, "Operational Emissions" are also considered and include: i) any reduction in the amount of carbon sequestered by existing vegetation that is removed as part of the project compared to a "no project" scenario (hereinafter referred to as Operational Sequestration Emissions); and ii) ongoing emissions from the energy used to maintain and function the operation, including vehicle trips associated with employee and visitor trips (hereinafter referred to as Operational Emissions). See Section XVI, Transportation/Traffic, for anticipated number of operational trips. Operational Emissions would be the primary source of emissions over the long-term when compared to one time construction emissions.

As discussed in the Air Quality section of this Initial Study, in 2010, the BAAQMD adopted and later incorporated into its 2011 CEQA Guidelines project screening criteria (Table 3-1 – Criteria Air Pollutants and Precursors & GHG Screening Level Sizes) and thresholds of significance for air pollutants, including GHG emissions, which have now been updated by BAAQMD through May 2017. The closest related operational criteria land use type comparison was determined to be a City park. The project size of 6.85 acres falls well below all of the screening criteria for a City park - Operational Criteria Pollutant Screening Size: 2613 acres (ROG); Operational GHG Screening Size: 600 acres; Construction-Related Screening Size: 67 acres (PM10).

Greenhouse Gas Emission reductions from local programs and project level actions, such as application of the Cal Green Building Code and vehicle fuel efficiency standards would combine to further reduce emissions below BAAQMD thresholds.

As indicated above the County is currently preparing a CAP and as the part of the first phase of development and preparation of the CAP has released Final Technical Memorandum #1 (2014 Greenhouse Gas Emissions Inventory and Forecast, April 13, 2016). Table 1 of the Technical Memorandum indicates that 2% of the County's GHG emissions in 2014 were a result of land use change.

The increase in emissions expected as a result of the project would be relatively modest and the project is in compliance with the County's efforts to reduce emissions as described above. For these reasons, project impacts related to GHG emissions are considered less than significant.

**Mitigation Measures:** None required.

	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporation	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
VIII. <b>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. The proposed project will not involve the transport of hazardous materials other than those small amounts normally used in agricultural operations. A Business Plan will be filed with the Environmental Health Division should the amount of hazardous materials reach reportable levels. However, in the event that the proposed use or a future use involves the use, storage, or transportation of greater the 55 gallons or 500 pounds of hazardous materials, a use permit and subsequent environmental assessment would be required in accordance with the Napa County Zoning Ordinance prior to the establishment of the use. There are no foreseeable reasons the project would result in the release of hazardous materials into the environment. Given the quantities of hazardous materials and the limited duration, they will result in a less-than-significant impact.
- c. There are no schools located within one-quarter mile from the proposed project site. No impacts would occur.
- d. The project site is not on any known list of hazardous materials sites. No impacts would occur.
- e-f. The project site is not located within two miles of any public airport or within the vicinity of any private airports. No impacts would occur.
- g. The proposed project will not impair the implementation of or physically interfere with an adopted emergency response plan or evacuation plan. No impacts would occur.
- h. According to the Napa County Environmental Resource Maps the project is partially located in the wildland urban interface. The property and surrounding areas to the north, east, and south are developed with residential, agricultural uses, and vineyards. The parcel is bordered by Blossom Creek and undeveloped forested land on the west. The project would continue to comply with current California Department of Forestry and California Building Code requirements for fire safety. The project would not increase exposure of people and/or structures to a significant loss, injury or death involving wild land fires. Impacts would be less than significant.

**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 checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
h) Place within a 100-year flood hazard area structures which would impede or redirect flood flows?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
i) Expose people or structures to a significant risk of loss, injury or death involving flooding, including flooding as a result of the failure of a levee or dam?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
j) Inundation by seiche, tsunami, or mudflow?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>

Discussion:

On January 14, 2014, Governor Jerry Brown declared a drought emergency in the state of California. That declaration was followed up on April 1, 2015, when the Governor directed the State Water Resources Control Board to implement mandatory water reductions in cities and town across California to reduce water usage by 25 percent. These water restrictions do not apply to agricultural users. However, on April 7, 2017, Governor Jerry Brown signed an executive order lifting California's drought emergency in all but four counties (Fresno, Kings, Tulare and Tuolumne). The County of Napa had not adopted or implemented any additional mandatory water use restrictions. The County requires all Use Permit applicants to complete necessary water analyses in order to document that sufficient water supplies are available for the proposed project and to implement water saving measures to prepare for periods of limited water supply and to conserve limited groundwater resources.

In general, recent studies have found that groundwater levels in the Napa Valley Floor exhibit stable long-term trends with a shallow depth to water. Historical trends in the Milliken-Sarco-Tulucay (MST) area, however, have shown increasing depths to groundwater, but recent stabilization in many locations. Groundwater availability, recharge, storage and yield is not consistent across the County. More is known about the resource where historical data have been collected. Less is known in areas with limited data or unknown geology. In order to fill existing data gaps and to provide a better understanding of groundwater resources in the County, the Napa County Groundwater Monitoring Plan recommended 18 Areas of Interest for additional groundwater level and water quality monitoring. Through the well owner and public outreach efforts of the Groundwater Resources Advisory Committee (GRAC) approximately 40 new wells have been added to the monitoring program within these areas. Groundwater Sustainability Objectives were recommended by the GRAC and adopted by the Board of Supervisors. The recommendations included the goal of developing sustainability objectives, provided a definition, explained the shared responsibility for Groundwater Sustainability and the important role monitoring as a means to achieving groundwater sustainability.



In 2009 Napa County began a comprehensive study of its groundwater resources to meet identified action items in the County's 2008 General Plan update. The study, by Luhdorff and Scalmanini Consulting Engineers (LSCE), emphasized developing a sound understanding of groundwater conditions and implementing an expanded groundwater monitoring and data management program as a foundation for integrated water resources planning and dissemination of water resources information. The 2011 baseline study by LSCE, which included over 600 wells and data going back over 50 years, concluded that "the groundwater levels in Napa County are stable, except for portions of the MST district". Most wells elsewhere within the Napa Valley Floor with a sufficient record indicate that groundwater levels are more affected by climatic conditions, are within historical levels, and seem to recover from dry periods during subsequent wet or normal periods. The LSCE Study also concluded that, on a regional scale, there appear to be no current groundwater quality issues except north of Calistoga (mostly naturally occurring boron and trace metals) and in the Carneros region (mostly salinity).

Minimum thresholds for water use have been established by the Napa County Department of Public Works, using reports by the United States Geological Survey (USGS) and the studies prepared by LSCE. These reports are the result of water resources investigations performed by the USGS in cooperation with the Napa County Flood Control and Water Conservation District. Any project which reduces water usage or any water usage which is at or below the established threshold is assumed not to have a significant effect on groundwater levels.

In response to regional drought and the general statewide need to protect groundwater resources, the Governor enacted new legislation requiring local governments to monitor and management groundwater resources. Napa County's prior work on the Napa Valley Groundwater Management Plan provides a strong foundation for Napa County to comply with this State mandated monitoring and management objective. As a direct result, the project site is now subject to this new legislation requiring local agencies to monitor groundwater use. Assembly Bill - AB 1739 by Assembly member Roger Dickinson (D-Sacramento) and Senate Bills 1168 and 1319 by Senator Fran Pavley (D-Agoura Hills) establish a framework for sustainable, local groundwater management for the first time in California history. The legislation requires local agencies to tailor sustainable groundwater plans to their regional economic and environmental needs. The legislation prioritizes groundwater basin management Statewide, which includes the Napa Valley/Napa River Drainage Basin, and sets a timeline for implementation of the following:

- By 2017, local groundwater management agencies must be identified;
- By 2020, overdrafted groundwater basins must have sustainability plans;
- By 2022, other high and medium priority basins not currently in overdraft must have sustainability plans; and
- By 2040, all high and medium priority groundwater basins must achieve sustainability.

The State has classified the Napa River Drainage Basin as a medium priority resource. Additionally, the legislation provides measurable objectives and milestones to reach sustainability and a State role of limited intervention when local agencies are unable or unwilling to adopt sustainable management plans. Napa County supports this legislation and has begun the process of developing a local groundwater management agency which is anticipated to be in place and functioning within the timeline prescribed by the State.

- a. The applicant is not proposing any changes to the existing wastewater system, which has been reviewed and permitted by the Napa County Environmental Health Division. The existing system has been sized for a three-bedroom residence. The system currently serves the 2-bedroom residence and the existing restroom in the barn. The proposed increases can be accommodated with the existing onsite system. The Napa County Environmental Health Division has reviewed the report and concurred with their conclusion. The proposed project is not expected to violate any water quality standards or waste discharge requirements. As applicable, any earth disturbing activities will be subject to the County's Stormwater Ordinance which complies with State requirements, would include measures to prevent erosion, sediment, and waste materials from entering waterways both during and after any construction activities. By following the above mentioned measures the project does not have the potential to significantly impact water quality and discharge standards. Potential impacts would be less than significant.
- b. The project is located in an area denoted as "All Other Areas" as described in the Napa County Water Availability Analysis, requiring a Tier 1 and Tier 2 analysis. For this project a Water Availability Analysis was prepared by Stitt Engineering (Initial submittal: January 2, 2017; Revision #1: May 11, 2017; Revision #2: November 6, 2017; Revision #3-Final: January 16, 2018) to determine the estimated water use of the existing development and proposed project. The property is served by one well and has a 7,500 gallon storage tank.

#### Tier 1 Analysis

Existing water usage consists of a main residence with landscaping and a residential garden, pasture irrigation, storage for fire protection, and the current horses boarded on site (four horses). The residential uses on the property (estimated at 0.57 acre-feet of water per year), the pasture irrigation (estimated at 1.69 acre-feet of water per year), and the fire protection (estimated at 0.03 acre-feet of water per year) will not change as a result of the proposed project.

Water uses associated with the horse boarding (estimated at 0.40 acre-feet of water per year) would increase with the proposed increase in number of horses proposed to be boarded (up to 12 horses). An additional water use for employees, visitors, and students would also increase the overall water use.

According to the analysis, the project would create an increase in annual water demand, from 2.70 acre-feet per year to 3.53 acre-feet per year, totaling an approximate increase of 0.83 acre-feet per year.

Usage Type	Existing Acre feet per Year	Proposed Acre feet per Year
House	0.34	0.34
Landscaping	0.23	0.23
Pasture Irrigation	1.69	1.69
Fire Protection	0.03	0.03
Equine Water (current: 4 horses; proposed: up to 12 horses)	0.40	1.21
Employees, Visitors, Students	0.01	0.03
<b>Total</b>	<b>2.70</b>	<b>3.53</b>

Tier 2 Analysis

The Water Use Analysis prepared a groundwater recharge calculation based on the "Soil Water Balance" Method, which considers local precipitation, local evaporation transpiration, change in soil water storage, and run-off. The calculation totaled 15.4 inches per year. Over the 6.85-acre parcel, the calculation results in 8.8 acre-feet of recharge per year. The estimated total water usage is less than the calculated parcel recharge rate; therefore the project complies with the Napa County Water Availability Analysis requirements. The report initially noted that there may be offsite, non-project wells located within 500 feet of the project well. Further review concluded that no adjacent property wells were within 500 feet of the project well; therefore a Tier 3 analysis is not required.

The proposed project would not result in a substantial increase in the demand of ground water supplies or interfere with groundwater recharge or lowering of the local groundwater level. Potential impacts from the project would be less than significant.

- c-e. Blossom Creek runs adjacent to the west side of the property, more than 200 feet west of the existing development. The project does not include construction of any new structures. The proposed physical improvements associated with the project include improvements to an existing restroom inside of the existing barn.

The project proposal will not substantially alter any drainage patterns on site or cause an increase in erosion on or off site. All earth disturbing activities will be subject to the County's Stormwater Ordinance as applicable, which would include measures to prevent erosion, sediment, and waste materials from entering waterways both during and after any construction activities. Given the County's Best Management Practices, which comply with RWQCB requirements, the project does not have the potential to significantly impact water quality and discharge standards. Potential impacts would be less than significant.

- f. The proposed project would implement standard stormwater quality treatment controls to treat runoff prior to discharge from the project site. The incorporation of these features into the project would ensure that the proposed project would not create substantial sources of polluted runoff. As discussed above, the Division of Environmental Health has reviewed the application and determined that the existing wastewater system is adequate to serve the facility's septic needs. In addition, the proposed project does not have any unusual characteristics that create sources of pollution that would degrade water quality. Impacts would be less than significant.

- g-i. According to the Napa County Environmental Resource Maps (based on the following layer – Flood Zones) the parcel is not located in a flood zone. The parcel is not within a dam levee inundation area (based on the following layer – Dam Levee Inundation). The existing development would not impede or redirect flood flows or expose structures or people to flooding. Potential impacts from the project would be less than significant.

- j. In coming years, higher global temperatures are expected to raise sea level by expanding ocean water, melting mountain glaciers and small ice caps, and causing portions of Greenland and the Antarctic ice sheets to melt. The Intergovernmental panel on Climate change estimates that the global average sea level will rise between 0.6 and 2 feet over the next century (IPCC, 2007). The property is located at approximately 460 feet above mean sea level. There is no known history of landslides or mud flow on the property. The project will not subject people or structures to a significant risk of inundation by tsunamis, seiche, or mudflows. There would be no impacts.

Mitigation Measures: None.

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

Discussion:

- a. The parcel is located on the west side of State Highway 128, northwest of the city of Calistoga. The parcel is currently developed with a residence, garage, two sheds, barn, covered arena, and round pen. There are approximately four acres of pastures. As an establishment engaged in the boarding and training of horses, the project is complementary to the ongoing agricultural uses in the area. The proposed project will not divide an established community. No impacts would occur.
- b. The project site is zoned Agricultural Watershed (AW), which allows horse boarding and/or training stables upon grant of a use permit. The proposed project is compliant with the use limitations of the Napa County Zoning Ordinance. The parcel has a split General Plan land use designation of Agricultural Resource (AR) and Agriculture, Watershed, and Open Space (AWOS). The General Plan land use designations allows "agriculture, processing of agricultural products, and single-family dwellings." Agricultural Preservation and Land Use Goal AG/LU-1 of the 2008 General Plan states that the County shall, "preserve existing agricultural land uses and plan for agriculture and related activities as the primary land uses in Napa County." Policy AG/LU-2 defines agriculture as "the raising of crops, trees and livestock," also including agricultural product processing and farm management uses. The project would allow the boarding of horses, a domesticated livestock, and is therefore consistent with the continuation of agriculture as a dominant land use within the county, as envisioned in the Napa County General Plan. There are no applicable habitat conservation plans or natural community conservation plans applicable to the property. No impacts would occur.
- c. There are no applicable habitat conservation plans or natural community conservation plans applicable to the property. No impacts would occur.

**Mitigation Measures:** None required.

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

**Mitigation Measures:** None required.

	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporation	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
XII. <b>NOISE.</b> Would the project result in:				
a) Exposure of persons to or generation of noise levels in excess of standards established in the local general plan or noise ordinance, or applicable standards of other agencies?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
b) Exposure of persons to or generation of excessive groundborne vibration or groundborne noise levels?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
c) A substantial permanent increase in ambient noise levels in the project vicinity above levels existing without the project?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
d) A substantial temporary or periodic increase in ambient noise levels in the project vicinity above levels existing without the project?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
e) For a project located within an airport land use plan or, where such a plan has not been adopted, within two miles of a public airport or public use airport, would the project expose people residing or working in the project area to excessive noise levels?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
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. The project will result in a temporary increase in noise levels during limited project construction. Construction activities will be limited to daylight hours using properly muffled vehicles. Noise generated during this time is not anticipated to be significant. The project would not result in potentially significant temporary construction noise impacts or operational impacts. The nearest offsite residences are located approximately 150 feet to the south of the barn, approximately 350 feet east of the round pen, and approximately 650 feet northwest of the barn. Given the proximity to the residential neighbors and the fact that construction would take place within the existing barn, there is a relatively low potential for impacts related to construction noise to result in a significant impact. Further, construction activities would generally occur during the period of 7 a.m. to 7 p.m. on weekdays, during normal hours of human activity. All construction activities will be conducted in compliance with the Napa County Noise Ordinance (Napa County Code Chapter 8.16). The proposed project will not result in long-term significant construction noise impacts. Conditions of approval identified below would require construction activities to be limited to daylight hours, vehicles to be muffled, and backup alarms adjusted to the lowest allowable levels. Impacts would be less than significant.

7.3. CONSTRUCTION NOISE

*Construction noise shall be minimized to the greatest extent practical and feasible under State and local safety laws, consistent with construction noise levels permitted by the General Plan Community Character Element and the County Noise Ordinance. Construction equipment muffling and hours of operation shall be in compliance with the County Code. Equipment shall be shut down when not in use. Construction equipment shall 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.*

The proposed construction should not result in the generation of excessive groundborne vibrations or ground born noise levels greater than those created by general farm plowing activities. The proposed project will not result in long-term significant construction noise impacts.

c/d. Community noise is commonly described in terms of the "ambient" noise level which is defined as the all-encompassing noise level associated with a given noise environment. The proposed project is located in an area dominated by agricultural uses and rural residences. Audibility of a new noise source and/or increase in noise levels within recognized acceptable limits are not usually considered to be significant noise impacts, but these concerns should be addressed and considered in the planning and environmental review processes. The primary on-site activity of horse boarding would continue; any increases in noise levels would generally be limited to people visiting their horses and attending training sessions.

Daily hours of operation: boarding 24 hours a day; employees 8:00 a.m.- sunset; non-residence boarder access 8:00 a.m.-sunset; training Monday through Saturday 8:00 a.m. – 6 p.m.; with project-related activity starting after and ending well before the noise sensitive nighttime hours (10:00 p.m. to 7:00 a.m.) identified in Napa County Code sections 8.16.060 and 8.16.070. The main parking spaces area would be on the north side of the existing barn, which is situated between the parking area and the nearest residence.

The proposed project would not result in long-term significant permanent noise impacts. Potential impacts would be less than significant. A standard noise condition of approval applied to Use Permits is as follows.

**4.2 AMPLIFIED MUSIC**

*There shall be no amplified sound system or amplified music utilized outside of approved, enclosed, buildings.*

The proposed project would not result in long-term significant permanent noise impacts.

e/f. The project site is not located within an airport land use plan or within two miles of a public airport or within the vicinity of a private airstrip. No impacts would occur.

**Mitigation Measures:** None required.

	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporation	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
XIII. <b>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 type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" 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. The Association of Bay Area Governments' *Projections 2003* figures indicate that the total population of Napa County is projected to increase some 23 percent by the year 2030 (*Napa County Baseline Data Report*, November 30, 2005). Additionally, the County's *Baseline Data Report* indicates that total housing units currently programmed in county and municipal housing elements exceed ABAG growth projections by approximately 15 percent. The project proposes up to 2 employees. Any improvements requiring building permits will be subject to the County's housing impact mitigation fee, as applicable, which provides funding to meet local housing needs.

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

b/c. The existing residence will not be impacted by the proposed project. This project will not displace a substantial volume of existing housing or a substantial number of people and will not necessitate the construction of replacement housing elsewhere. Therefore, no impacts would occur.

**Mitigation Measures:** None required.

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

XIV. **PUBLIC SERVICES.** Would the project result in:

- a) Substantial adverse physical impacts associated with the provision of new or physically altered governmental facilities, need for new or physically altered governmental facilities, the construction of which could cause significant environmental impacts, in order to maintain acceptable service ratios, response times or other performance objectives for any of the public services:

Fire protection?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Police protection?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Schools?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Parks?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Other public facilities?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>

Discussion:

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

**Mitigation Measures:** None required.

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

XV. **RECREATION.** Would the project:

- a) Increase the use of existing neighborhood and regional parks or other recreational facilities such that substantial physical deterioration of the facility would occur or be accelerated?
- 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"/>
	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>

Discussion:

- a/b. The project would not significantly increase the use of recreational facilities, nor does the project include recreational facilities that may have a significant adverse effect on the environment. No impact would occur.

**Mitigation Measures:** None required.

	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporation	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
XVI. TRANSPORTATION/TRAFFIC. Would the project:				
a) Cause an increase in traffic which is substantial in relation to the existing traffic load and capacity of the street system 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"/>
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 type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
e) Result in inadequate emergency access?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" 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 type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" 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 type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>

Discussion:

The project proposes to continue existing ranch and residential horse boarding activities with the addition of commercial boarding and training. The proposed project would allow an increase in the number of horses that are currently boarded on site and would permit activities that may generate visitation and result in additional traffic.

a/b. Under the Napa County General Plan, traffic volumes are projected to increase and will be caused by a combination of locally generated traffic as well as general regional growth. The General Plan EIR indicates that much of the forecasted increase in traffic on the arterial roadway network will result from traffic generated outside of the County; however the project will contribute a small amount toward the general overall increase. General Plan Policy CIR-16 states that "The County will seek to maintain an arterial Level of Service D or better on all County roadways, except where the level of Service already exceeds this standard and where increased intersection capacity is not feasible without substantial additional right of way."

Maintaining Level of Service ("LOS") D or better at all signalized intersections would sometimes require expanding the physical footprint of an intersection. In some locations around the County, expanding physical transportation infrastructure could be in direct conflict with the County's goals of preserving the area's rural character, improving safety, and sustaining the agricultural industry, making these potential improvements infeasible. The County's Circulation Element lists intersections that are slated for improvement or expansion in unincorporated Napa County. Transportation studies should individually consider the feasibility of potential mitigation measures with respect to right-of-way acquisition, regardless of the intersection's place in the Circulation Element's identified improvement lists, and present potential alternative mitigation measures that do not require right-of-way acquisition. County staff would then review that information and make the decision about the feasibility of the identified potential mitigations. For intersections that cannot be improved without substantial additional right-of-way according to both the Circulation Element and the individual transportation impact study, and where other mitigations such as updating signal timing, signal phasing and operations, and/or signing and striping improvements do not improve the LOS, an LOS E or F will be considered acceptable and the one percent threshold (See Significance Criteria below) would not apply. Analysis of signalized intersection LOS should still be presented for informational purposes, and there should still be an evaluation of effects on safety and local access, per Policy CIR-18.

Traffic calculations were prepared for the proposed weekday and weekend operations. Trip calculations included employees, horse owner visits, weekday lessons (4 per day) and weekend lessons (6 per day), and veterinary/hay delivery/farrier visits (not scheduled on weekends). The owner currently removes the manure from the site approximately once per week. The forecasted daily trips are estimated

at approximately 18 trips on a weekday and 11 trips on a weekend. The ITE generally recognizes 10 daily trips for a single family residence. The estimated trips are less than the number of trips generally associated with two single-family residences and therefore are not anticipated to significantly increase traffic.

Napa County Public Works Department staff reviewed the project and determined that based on the project description, location, access, and anticipated trip generation, a traffic study was not required and the project is not expected to create any significant impacts related to transportation. Due to the limited increase in traffic, the proposed project would not cause a substantial increase in traffic or conflict with an applicable congestion management program. The impact would be less than significant.

- c. No air traffic is proposed and there are no new structures proposed for this project that would interfere with or require alteration of air traffic patterns. No impact would occur.
- d-e. The site will continue to use the existing driveway connection to State Highway 128. No changes proposed to the location or design. Napa County Public Works Department staff reviewed the sight distance assessment submitted by the applicant on November 22, 2017, which showed adequate sight distance for the project driveway. Staff agreed with findings based on Caltrans Highway Design Manual (HDM) minimal acceptable sight distance standards. The project will not result in any increased hazards or in inadequate emergency access. The Fire Department, Engineering Services Division, and Public Works Department have reviewed the application and recommend approval, as conditioned.
- f. The project is proposing use of eight parking spaces, located to the north of the existing barn. The area is currently paved and the applicant has demonstrated that the parking spaces can be accommodated. Staff believes this number of parking spaces is commensurate with the proposed number of employees and visitation. The proposed parking will meet the anticipated parking demand and will avoid providing excess parking, and will therefore have no impact.
- g. There is no aspect of this proposed project that would conflict with any adopted policies, plans, or programs supporting alternative transportation, and will therefore have no impact.

**Mitigation Measures:** None required.

	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporation	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
<b>XVII. 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 type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" 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 type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>

Discussion:

- a-b. According to the Napa County Environmental Resource Maps (based on the following layers – Cultural Resources: Historical sites, Historical Sites – Lines, Arch sensitive areas, Arch sites, Arch surveys) archaeological sites have been identified in proximity to the site. Pursuant to Public Resources Code section 21080.3.1, invitation for tribal consultation was completed. A response was received from the Director of Cultural Resources at the Yocha Dehe Wintun Nation on December 18, 2017, with a determination the the project is not within their aboriginal territories and declining comment on the project. No other responses were received. No impact would occur.

**Mitigation Measures:** None required.



	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporation	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
<b>XVII. 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 type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
d) Have sufficient water supplies available to serve the project from existing entitlements and resources, or are new or expanded entitlements needed?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
e) Result in a determination by the wastewater treatment provider which serves or may serve the project that it has adequate capacity to serve the project's projected demand in addition to the provider's existing commitments?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
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, b, e. As discussed in Section IX. Hydrology and Water Quality, the applicant is not proposing any changes to the existing wastewater system, which has been reviewed and permitted by the Napa County Environmental Health Division. The proposed increases can be accommodated with the existing onsite system. The Napa County Environmental Health Division has reviewed the report and concurred with their conclusion. The proposed project is not expected to violate any water quality standards or waste discharge requirements. As applicable, any earth disturbing activities will be subject to the County's Stormwater Ordinance which complies with State requirements, would include measures to prevent erosion, sediment, and waste materials from entering waterways both during and after any construction activities. By following the above mentioned measures the project does not have the potential to significantly impact water quality and discharge standards. Potential impacts would be less than significant.
- c. The project will not require or result in the construction of new storm water drainage facilities or expansion of existing facilities, which would cause a significant impact to the environment. No impact would occur.
- d. As discussed in Section IX. Hydrology and Water Quality, according to the Water Availability Analysis, the proposed water use associated with the project will increase in annual demand, from 2.70 acre-feet per year to 3.53 acre-feet per year, totaling an approximate increase of 0.83 acre-feet per year. The Water Availability Analysis prepared a groundwater recharge calculation based on the "Soil Water Balance" Method, which considers local precipitation, local evaporation transpiration, change in soil water storage, and run-off. The calculation totaled 15.4 inches per year. Over the 6.85-acre parcel, the calculation results in 8.8 acre-feet of recharge per year. The estimated total water usage is less than the calculated parcel recharge rate; therefore the project complies with the Napa County Water Availability Analysis requirements. The project will have a less than significant impact on groundwater supply and recharge rates.
- f. According to the Napa County Baseline Data Report, all of the solid waste landfills where Napa County's waste is disposed have more than sufficient capacity related to the current waste generation. Therefore, impacts would be less than significant.
- g. The project would comply with federal, state, and local statutes and regulations related to solid waste. Impacts would be less than significant.

**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. As discussed in Section IV above, the project site has previously been disturbed with residential development, agricultural uses, ranching operations, and horse boarding, and does not contain any special-status plant or wildlife species. Although archaeological sites have been identified in proximity to the site, the proposed physical improvements would be limited to areas previously disturbed by construction. Continuation and expansion of existing horse boarding uses on site is not anticipated to have an affect on historical or paleontological resources, sites or unique geological features, or archaeological resources; nor will the proposed project eliminate important examples of the major periods of California history or prehistory. In the event archaeological artifacts are found, a standard County condition of approval would be enacted requiring cessation of work and evaluation of the find. Impacts would be less than significant.
- b. The project would increase the demands for public services to a limited extent, and would increase traffic and air pollutants, all of which contribute to cumulative effects when future development in Napa Valley is considered. Cumulative impacts of these issues are discussed in previous sections of this Initial Study. Staff concluded that the traffic information provided demonstrated that the project would result in no significant impacts related to transportation. Air quality impacts would generally be limited to the minor increase in traffic resulting from the project. The project does not have impacts that are individually limited, but cumulatively considerable. The analysis determined that all potential impacts were less than significant and would not contribute significantly to cumulative impacts. The project does not propose new development that would have a significant impact on the environment or substantially change the existing conditions. With the imposition of standard and project specific conditions of approval, the project does not have impacts that are individually limited, but cumulatively considerable.
- c. All impacts identified in this Initial Study/Negative Declaration are less than significant. Therefore, the proposed project would not result in environmental effects that cause substantial adverse effects on human beings either directly or indirectly. Impacts would be less than significant.

**Mitigation Measures:** None required.