

“H”

**Initial Study/Negative Declaration
JAMCAN Tentative Parcel Map
P19-00456-TPM**

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

Initial Study Checklist
(form updated January 2019)

1. **Project Title:** Parcel Map of the Lands of JAMCAN, LLC – Tentative Parcel Map P19-00456-TPM
2. **Property Owner:** JAMCAN, LLC
3. **County Contact Person, Phone Number and email:** Trevor Hawkes, Planner III, 707-253-4388, trevor.hawkes@countyofnapa.org
4. **Project Location and Assessor's Parcel Number (APN):** In its current configuration the subject parcel is 521.62 acres in size. Located east of the City of American Canyon, approximately 1,000 feet from the eastern terminus of Watson Lane, a public road running east from its intersection with Paoli Loop Road. City of America Canyon, APN 059-020-004. No address is currently assigned.
5. **Project sponsor's name and address:** Jeffrey L. Jaeger, managing member and owner of the LLC, 2180 Oak Knoll Avenue, Napa, CA 94558. 707-255-4456, jeff@jaegervineyards.com.
6. **General Plan description:** AWOS (Agriculture, Watershed, and Open Space)
7. **Zoning:** AW:AC (Agricultural Watershed: Airport Compatibility)
8. **Background/Project History:** On October 16, 2018, the City Council of the City of American Canyon considered recommendations from their Planning Commission, certified the Final Watson Ranch Specific Plan (WRSP) Project EIR, adopted associated General Plan Amendments, and introduced the WRSP Ordinance. On November 6, 2018, the City Council of the City of American Canyon returned for a second reading of the Ordinance thereby adopting the WRSP. Watson Ranch covers 309 acres of area, referred to as the Town Center in American Canyon's General Plan, situated adjacent to the northeast boundaries of the City, east of the Union Pacific rail line. The WRSP envisions a community of 1,253 residential units, commercial retail, offices, restaurants, event and community centers, an elementary school, and public parks.

The WRSP EIR included habitat preservation mitigation measures for several impacted species, including California Red-Legged Frog (CLRF, *Rana draytonii*), Swainson's hawk (*Buteo swainsoni*), Callippe Silverspot butterfly (*Speyeria callippe callippe*), badger (*Taxidea taxus*), and pond turtle (*Actinemys marmorata*). The WRSP applicant identified 321 acres in the eastern half of the Jaeger property (subject property) for the application of a Conservation Easement (CE) in order to implement this off-site habitat preservation mitigation measure. Prior to implementing the mitigation action, the owner/applicant seeks to subdivide the subject property into three smaller parcels. The subdivision will allow for the potential development of single-family residential structures within designated building envelopes of the three parcels. The CE will be conveyed over the majority of the two resulting parcels which make up the majority of the eastern half of the subject property and would make up the majority of parcels two (2) and three (3).
9. **Description of Project:** Request for approval of a Tentative Parcel Map, proposing to subdivide a 521.62-acre parcel into three (3) parcels measuring 191.7 acres (Parcel one (1)), 160.38 acres (Parcel two (2)), and 169.54 acres (Parcel three (3)). Foreseeable future development on the resulting three (3) parcels is expected to be single-family residential structures, associated accessory buildings, access road, and infrastructure. The layout of the Tentative Parcel Map includes proposed private road alignments and residential building envelopes for each of the resulting three (3) parcels but no specific residential development is currently proposed as part of this project. As proposed, the Tentative Parcel Map also includes a waiver of NCC §17.34.020.H, which is a requirement for secondary parcel access. The Tentative Parcel Map has also been designed for the implementation of a Conservation Easement permanently protecting 321 acres of the eastern portion of the property and constituting a majority of parcels two (2) and three (3).
10. **Describe the environmental setting and surrounding land uses:** The property to be subdivided measures 521.62 acres in area and is located east of Napa Junction and northeast of the Watson Ranch Specific Plan area in southern Napa County. The primary soil type is

Fagan Clay Loam, and this covers virtually the entire property. The general habitat of the subject property is annual grassland with a few scattered woodlands. In the western half of the property, vineyards and agricultural infrastructure are prevalent. The property contains no perennial stream, however approximately 1.8 miles of intermittent stream run north from the center of the property, forming the upper reaches and tributaries to North Slough, a designated stream channel that enters Napa River west of the City of American Canyon. Riparian habitat is limited, and adjacent to, these intermittent stream channels. The lowest point of the subject property is at the western edge, approximately 145 feet above mean sea level. Its highest point resides close to the eastern boundary of the property at approximately 870 feet above mean sea level. Average slope of the entire property is approximately 26.6%. Vineyards, agriculture, single-family residences and open space make up the land north of the property. A majority of the property is within Compatibility Zone E of the Napa County Airport, while a small sliver of the western side of Parcel two's (2) building envelope resides in Zone D. The subject property is adjacent to Newell Open Space Preserve along its southern and eastern boundary. The western boundary of the property includes vineyards, agriculture, and single-family residences. Although not currently present, the southwestern boundary of the subject property is adjacent to the Watson Ranch Specific Plan project area, indicating the potential for future adjacency to a higher density single-family residential community.

11. **Other agencies whose approval is required** (e.g., permits, financing approval, or participation agreement).
None identified at this time.

Responsible (R) and Trustee (T) Agencies

None

Other Agencies Contacted

City of American Canyon

12. **Tribal Cultural Resources:** Have California Native American tribes traditionally and culturally affiliated with the project area requested consultation pursuant to Public Resources Code section 21080.3.1? If so, is there a plan for consultation that includes, for example, the determination of the significance of impacts to tribal cultural resources, procedures regarding confidentiality, etc.?

On March 18, 2020, County Staff sent invitations to consult on the proposed project to Native American Tribes who had a cultural interest in the area and who as of that date had requested to be invited to consult on projects, in accordance with the requirements of Public Resources Code Section 21080.3.1. County Staff received two replies. The first reply was received on March 27, 2020, from Ryan Peterson of the Middletown Rancheria of Pomo Indians thanking Staff for the notice but declining to comment or consult on the project. The second reply was received on April 13, 2020, from Leland Kinter of the Yocha Dehe Wintun Nation requesting to review the project's Cultural Resource Study and for the County to organize a site visit with the Yocha Dehe to evaluate cultural concerns. On April 4, 2020, County Staff, Jeffrey Jaeger (the applicant), and Laverne Bill, Cultural Resources Manager for the Yocha Dehe Wintun Nation, visited the subject property. The site visit consisted primarily of the building envelopes of Parcels one (1) and two (2). At the conclusion of the site visit, Laverne Bill informed County Staff that the Yocha Dehe Wintun Nation would not be seeking Tribal Consultation with the County of Napa, and instead intended to work directly with the applicant to provide Cultural Resource Sensitivity training for any future work crews within the areas that would fall within the Conservation Easement, as well as on notification prior to development within the building envelopes.

Note: Conducting consultation early in the CEQA process allows tribal governments, lead agencies, and project proponents to discuss the level of environmental review, identify and address potential adverse impacts to tribal cultural resources, and reduce the potential for delay and conflict in the environmental review process. (See Public Resources Code section 21080.3.2.) Information may also be available from the California Native American Heritage Commission's Sacred Lands File per Public Resources Code section 5097.96 and the California Historical Resources Information System administered by the California Office of Historic Preservation. Please also note that Public Resources Code section 21082.3(c) contains provisions specific to confidentiality.

ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACTS AND BASIS OF CONCLUSIONS:

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

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 (SUBSEQUENT) MITIGATED NEGATIVE DECLARATION will be prepared.
- I find that the proposed project MAY have a significant effect on the environment, and an ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACT REPORT is required.
- I find that the proposed project MAY have a "potentially significant impact" or "potentially significant unless mitigated" impact on the environment, but at least one effect 1) has been adequately analyzed in an earlier document pursuant to applicable legal standards, and 2) has been addressed by mitigation measures based on the earlier analysis as described on attached sheets. An ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACT REPORT is required, but it must analyze only the effects that remain to be addressed.
- I find that although the proposed project could have a significant effect on the environment, because all potentially significant effects (a) have been analyzed adequately in an earlier EIR or NEGATIVE DECLARATION pursuant to applicable standards, and (b) have been avoided or mitigated pursuant to that earlier EIR or NEGATIVE DECLARATION, including revisions or mitigation measures that are imposed upon the proposed project, nothing further is required.

Signature Trevor Hawkes Date 6/19/2010

Name: Trevor Hawkes
Napa County
Planning, Building and Environmental Services Department

I. AESTHETICS. Except as provided in Public Resources Code Section 21099, would the project:	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporation	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
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) In non-urbanized areas, substantially degrade the existing visual character or quality of public views of the site and its surroundings? (Public views are those that are experienced from a publicly accessible vantage point.) If the project is in an urbanized area, would the project conflict with applicable zoning and other regulations governing scenic quality?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
d) Create a new source of substantial light or glare which would adversely affect day or nighttime views in the area?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>

Discussion:

a-c. Visual resources are those physical features that make up the environment, including landforms, geological features, water, trees and other plants, and elements of the human cultural landscape. A scenic vista, then, would be a publicly accessible vantage point such as a road, park, trail, or scenic overlook from which distant or landscape-scale views of a beautiful or otherwise important assembly of visual resources can be taken in. As generally described in the Environmental Setting and Surrounding Land Uses section, above, the area is defined by agriculture and vineyards in the eastern portion of the property while hillsides, annual grasslands and scattered woodlands are in the western portion of the property.

The project is a land division and includes no development that would damage or cause an adverse effect on a scenic vista or resources, nor would it substantially degrade the existing visual character. The land division will increase the number of legal parcels from 1 to 3, thereby increasing the number of single-family residential dwellings that can be developed. The existing visual character of the area surrounding the subject property is characterized by active vineyard/agricultural operations, and open space/grazing activity. The proposed parcels that would be created from the land division are over 160 acres in size and have an AW:AC (Agricultural Watershed: Airport Compatibility) zoning designation. Traditionally speaking, the development pattern as described tends to be interlaced with low-density residential uses. Furthermore, due to the location of proposed access road and the building envelopes, future structures, grading, or earthmoving will likely be subject to the county's Viewshed Protection Ordinance, which acts to ensure that the visual impacts of hillside development are less than significant. Seen as a whole, nothing in this project will substantially alter a scenic vista or substantially degrade the existing visual character of the site or its immediate surroundings.

d. The proposed project is a land division and does not include any development that would result in the creation of any new sources of light or glare. The project will increase the number of legal parcels on which future ministerial residential development is possible. There are currently zero single-family residential dwellings on the property, and the conclusion of this project could allow up to three plus their associated accessory structures such as accessory dwelling units and guest cottages. While the potential future residential dwellings will be close to Highway 29, the City of American Canyon and the future Watson Ranch community, a combination of several factors will prevent impacts associated with light and glare from being significant including; the size of the parcels relative to the number of structures, the distribution of the building envelopes in the parcel map and the county's Viewshed Protection Ordinance.

Mitigation Measures: No mitigation measures are required.

II.	AGRICULTURE AND FOREST RESOURCES. ¹ Would the project:	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporation	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
	a) Convert Prime Farmland, Unique Farmland, or Farmland of Statewide Important (Farmland) as shown on the maps prepared pursuant to the Farmland Mapping and Monitoring Program of the California Resources Agency, to non-agricultural use?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
	b) Conflict with existing zoning for agricultural use, or a Williamson Act contract?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input 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 the conversion of Farmland to non-agricultural use?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>

Discussion:

- a. Based on a review of Napa County environmental resource mapping (*Department of Conservation Farmlands, 2016*), existing vineyards on the property are designated as Unique Farmland. A small sliver of the existing vineyard in the north-western portion of the property is designated as Prime Farmland. Portions of the property to the west of the Greenhouse and to the west of the most southern vineyard are designated as Farmland of Local Importance. The remainder of the property outside of these areas is designated Grazing Land. The proposed parcels are consistent with the 160-acre minimum lot size requirements of the property's AW:AC zoning, a parcel size that accommodates agricultural operations of both the irrigated and non-irrigated variety. While the building envelopes of the proposed Tentative Parcel Map do include some of the areas designated as Unique Farmland and Prime Farmland (building envelope of Parcel two (2) contains 3.5 acres of vineyards, building envelope of Parcel three (3) contains 1.7 acres of vineyards, approximately 9,000 square feet of vineyard fall within the proposed access roads), no development is proposed as a function of this land division. Future development, to the extent it conforms to the Zoning Code, would be limited in scope and consistent with the property's agricultural use.
- b. The property is not subject to Williamson Act Contract and, as noted above, the project is consistent with the area's AW:AC zoning and the 160-acre minimum lot size. No development is presently proposed and any future development must be consistent with the parcel's agricultural zoning. The project will not conflict with existing zoning for agricultural use.
- c-d. The subject property is not subject to timberland or forestland zoning. The project will not 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). The proposed project includes only a land division; no development is actually proposed at this time. The property contains only scattered woodlands, and no trees appear to be within any of the areas proposed for private roads, driveways, and building envelopes. The project will not result in a loss or conversion of forest or timberland.
- e. Similar to items "a." and "b." above, this project is consistent with the property's AW:AC zoning. It will not cause changes to the existing environment which could result in the conversion of farmland to non-agricultural use. The approval of the land division will increase the

¹ "Forest land" is defined by the State as "land that can support 10-percent native tree cover of any species, including hardwoods, under natural conditions, and that allows for management of one or more forest resources, including timber, aesthetics, fish and wildlife, biodiversity, water quality, recreation, and other public benefits." (Public Resources Code Section 12220(g)) The Napa County General Plan anticipates and does not preclude conversion of some "forest land" to agricultural use, and the program-level EIR for the 2008 General Plan Update analyzed the impacts of up to 12,500 acres of vineyard development between 2005 and 2030, with the assumption that some of this development 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 in 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.

amount of single-family residential structures and associated accessory structures from one (1) to three (3), however, this type of low-density residential land use is commonly interlaced with agricultural land uses.

Mitigation Measures: No mitigation measures are required.

III. AIR QUALITY. Where available, the significance criteria established by the applicable air quality management or air pollution control district may be relied upon to make the following determinations. Would the project:	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporation	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
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) 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?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
c) Expose sensitive receptors to substantial pollutant concentrations?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
d) Result in other emissions (such as those leading to odors adversely 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-b. 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)

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

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 proposed project is a land division which is an action that will not affect an applicable air quality plan or result in a net increase of criteria pollutants. However, it is foreseeable that the resulting parcels from the land division could be developed for single-family residential dwellings. Under Napa County Code, three (3) parcels in the AW:AC zoning designation could develop a total of nine (9) dwelling units (three (3) single-family dwelling units, three (3) accessory [second] dwelling units, and three (3) guest cottages). When compared to the BAAQMD's screening criterion for single-family development for both operational criteria (325 dwelling units) and construction criteria (114 dwelling units) the project would contribute an insignificant amount of air pollution and would not result in a conflict or obstruction of an air quality plan. The project falls well below the screening criteria as noted above, and consequently will not significantly affect air quality individually or contribute considerably to any cumulative air quality impacts.

- c-d. The land division itself will not result in the exposure of sensitive receptors to any pollutant concentrations or emissions. Potential air quality impacts are most likely to result from the future development of single-family residential dwellings on the resulting three (3) parcels. Any minor earthmoving and construction emissions to complete the construction would have a temporary effect; consisting mainly of dust generated during grading and other construction activities, exhaust emissions from construction-related equipment and vehicles, and relatively minor emissions from paints and other architectural coatings. 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 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 by State Regulations). Clear signage shall be provided for construction workers at all access points.
8. All construction equipment shall be maintained and properly tuned in accordance with manufacturer's specifications. All equipment shall be checked by a certified visible emissions evaluator. Any portable engines greater than 50 horsepower or associated equipment operated within the 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/perpfact_04-16-15.pdf or the PERP website <http://www.arb.ca.gov/portable/portable.htm>.

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

7.1 SITE IMPROVEMENTS

b. DUST CONTROL

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

While the Air District defines public exposure to offensive odors as a potentially significant impact, single-family residential dwellings are not known operational producers of pollutants capable of causing substantial negative impacts to sensitive receptors. The parcels that will result as a product of this land division are all over 160 acres in size, and the building envelopes are all approximately well over 500 feet from each other. Construction-phase pollutants would be reduced to a less than significant level by the above-noted standard condition of approval. The project would not create pollutant concentrations or objectionable odors affecting a substantial number of people. Impacts would be less than significant.

Mitigation Measures: No mitigation measures are required.

IV. BIOLOGICAL RESOURCES. Would the project:	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporation	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
a) Have a substantial adverse effect, either directly or through habitat modifications, on any species identified as a candidate, sensitive, or special status species in local or regional plans, policies, or regulations, or by the California Department of Fish and Wildlife or the 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, and regulations or by the California Department of Fish and Wildlife or U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
c) Have a substantial adverse effect on state or federally protected wetlands (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:

As part of the application for this Tentative Parcel Map, and due to the generally undisturbed nature of major portions of the subject property, the applicant completed a Biological Resource Assessment in compliance with Napa County Guidelines (LSA, "Biological Resources Assessment, Jaeger Property, Napa County, California", April 2nd, 2020). To determine which special-status plant species and animal species could potentially occur on or in the vicinity of the property, a search of the California Natural Diversity Database (CNDDDB) and the California Native Plant Society's database was conducted for the Cordelia and Cuttings Wharf 7.5-minute U.S. Geological Survey quadrangles. Additional records review also consisted of the results of previous assessments and botanical/wildlife surveys of the property and general surrounding area, the Watson Ranch Specific Plan (WRSP) EIR Biological Resources section, and the results of field surveys conducted on the WRSP area. The Biological Resources Assessment includes five (5) field reconnaissance surveys. Two rare plant surveys were conducted on the property, in April and June of 2018. Two CRLF focused surveys were conducted in 2015 and 2018. A general wildlife habitat and rangeland survey was conducted in 2019. Finally, a biological reconnaissance survey of the building envelopes and proposed access roads was conducted in March of 2020.

- a-b. Approximately 49% of the subject property is within the United States Fish and Wildlife Service designated critical habitat for California Red-legged Frog (CRLF). This designation in the eastern half of the property was the primary driver for the identification of off-site habitat preservation required under the WRSP EIR, given that habitat needs of impacted species identified in the WRSP EIR closely overlap with the habitat needs of CRLF. Record searches and reconnaissance surveys between 2015 and 2020, did not find any special status plant, animal, or sensitive natural vegetation communities occurring within the subject site. Foreseeable future development on the resulting three (3) parcels is expected to be single-family residential structures, associated accessory buildings, access road, and infrastructure. This future development would take place primarily in areas that have already been disturbed due to agricultural development and are not expected to have an adverse impact on the environment. All proposed building envelopes and access roads are outside of the designated CRLF critical habitat area; the building envelope of parcel three (3) is the closest area and measures approximately 150 feet from the critical habitat area. The potential future action of placing 321 acres of Parcels two (2) & three (3) under a Conservation Easement, overlapping with CRLF critical habitat, would have a beneficial impact on biological resources in the area under habitat preservation. This project is not expected to have an adverse impact on candidate, sensitive, or special status species or sensitive natural communities.
- c-d. According to the Napa County GIS Sensitivity Maps and the field reconnaissance surveys conducted in the Biological Resources Assessment, 1.8 miles of intermittent streams, which form the upper reaches and tributaries of the North Slough, run north from the center of the subject property. With the exception of these intermittent streams and agricultural drainage ditches found in the western portion of the property, there are no other wetlands, ponds, vernal pools found on the property. The above mentioned intermittent streams are outside of the proposed building envelopes and access roads, and intended future actions on the subject property would include these water features within the habitat preservation Conservation Easement. All current agriculture activities and the proposed building envelopes and access roads are located in the western half of the subject property and in areas that have mostly already been disturbed due to agricultural activities. The absence of current and proposed man-made barriers in the eastern half of the property maintains a high level of habitat connectivity within the designated critical habitat for CRLF and surrounding contiguous habitat of adjacent properties. The land division and foreseeable future development of residential structures within the building envelopes would not interfere with the movement of any native resident or migratory fish or wildlife species or with their corridors or nursery sites.
- e-f. This project would not interfere with any ordinances protecting biological resources. None of the proposed building envelopes or access roads impact streams channels or trees as currently proposed. 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 because there are no plans applicable to the subject site. No impacts would occur.

Mitigation Measures: No mitigation measures are required.

V.	CULTURAL RESOURCES. Would the project:	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporation	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
	a) Cause a substantial adverse change in the significance of a historical resource pursuant to CEQA Guidelines §15064.5?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
	b) Cause a substantial adverse change in the significance of an archaeological resource pursuant to CEQA Guidelines §15064.5?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
	c) 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. According to Napa County Environmental Resource Mapping (*historic sites layer, historic sites – lines*) no known historic resources are located on the project site. Neither this project nor any foreseeable resulting ministerial activity will cause a substantial adverse change in the significance of a historic resource.
- b. According to Napa County Environmental Resource Mapping (archaeology surveys, archeology sites, archeologically sensitive areas), no known archaeological resources are located on the project site. The Resource Mapping layers do indicate adjacent archaeological sensitive areas, some approximate archaeological sites, and a small segment of an archaeological survey that overlaps the project boundaries. As part of the application process for a Tentative Parcel Map with the County of Napa, the applicant submitted a Cultural Resource Study (LSA, *Cultural Resources Study for the Jaeger Property Project*, November 2019) that included a records search with literature review, a Sacred Lands file search with the Native American Heritage Commission with consultation outreach, and a pedestrian field survey of the proposed building envelopes and access roads. The study was unable to identify any cultural resources within the project and concluded that it was unlikely that any archaeological deposits would be discovered given the subject property's history and land uses. In the event any previously undiscovered resources are found during future construction, grading or earthmoving activities of those projects would be required to cease, and a qualified archaeologist would be retained to investigate the site in accordance with the following standard condition of approval that will be imposed on the project:

7.2 ARCHEOLOGICAL FINDING

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

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

- c. No human remains have been encountered on the property and no information has been encountered that would indicate that this project would encounter human remains. Most construction activities would occur on previously disturbed portions of the site. However, if resources are found during construction activity, the project is required to cease, and a qualified archaeologist would be retained to investigate the site in accordance with the County's standard condition of approval, Public Resource Code §5097.98, Health and Safety Code §7050.5 and CEQA §15064.5€. Impacts would be less than significant.

Mitigation Measures: No mitigation measures are required.

VI. ENERGY. Would the project:	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporation	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
a) Result in potentially significant environmental impact due to wasteful, inefficient or unnecessary consumption of energy resources during project construction or operation?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
b) Conflict with or obstruct a state or local plan for renewable energy or energy efficiency?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>

Discussion:

- a. The proposed project is a land division and does not include any physical development. Any potential future development on the resulting parcels would comply with Title 24 energy use requirements and would not result in significant environmental impacts due to wasteful, inefficient or unnecessary consumption of energy resources during project construction or operation. Impacts would be less than significant.
- b. The proposed project would not conflict with the provisions of a state or local plan for renewable energy or energy efficiency because there are no plans applicable to the subject site. No impacts would occur.

Mitigation Measures: No mitigation measures are required.

VII. GEOLOGY AND SOILS. Would the project:	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporation	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
a) Directly or indirectly cause potential substantial adverse effects, including the risk of loss, injury, or death involving:				
i) Rupture of a known earthquake fault, as delineated on the most recent Alquist-Priolo Earthquake Fault Zoning Map issued by the State Geologist for the area or based on other substantial evidence of a known fault? Refer to Division of Mines and Geology Special Publication 42.	<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 direct or indirect risks to life or property? Expansive soil is defined as soil having an expansive index greater than 20, as determined in accordance with ASTM (American Society of Testing and Materials) D 4829. | <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"/> |
| f) Directly or indirectly destroy a unique paleontological resource or site or unique geologic feature? | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> |

Discussion:

- ai. There are no known faults on the project site as shown on the most recent Alquist-Priolo Earthquake Fault Zoning Map. As such, any future development that would potentially result as a result of this project would result in a less than significant impact with regards to rupturing a known fault.
- aii. All areas of the Bay Area are subject to strong seismic ground shaking. Any future structure or improvement constructed as a result of this land division would be required to comply with the latest building standards and codes, including the California Building Code that would reduce any potential impacts to a less than significant level.
- aiii. No subsurface conditions have been identified on the project site that indicated susceptibility to seismic-related ground failure or liquefaction. Napa County Environmental Resource Mapping (liquefaction layer) indicates that the majority of the property, and 100% of the proposed building sites, are generally subject to a “very low” tendency to liquefy. Compliance with the latest edition of the California Building Code for seismic stability would result in less than significant impacts.
- aiv. A review of Napa County Environmental Resource Mapping (*landslide line, landslide polygon, landslide geology, contours, and slope layers*) indicated a number of impacts related to landslides and slope instability within or near to the proposed building envelopes. In an attempt to address concerns raised about the potential impacts of future development within the proposed building envelopes the applicant submitted a geotechnical study drafted by Miller Pacific Engineering Group (Nathan Klemin and Rusty Arend, *Geotechnical Feasibility Report Watson Lane Subdivision*, November 11, 2019). Klemin and Arend identified several scarps along slopes near Building Envelopes one (1) and three (3) as well as in other areas of the property. Klemin and Arend recommend that additional geotechnical analysis be performed once actual locations of potential buildings and access roads are determined. Geotechnical reports are requirements for County of Napa Grading and Building applications. Preparation of additional site-specific analysis and implementation of report recommendations plus review of these reports by the County of Napa Engineering and the Building Divisions will reduce the risk that future development will expose people or structures to potential substantial adverse effects, including the risk of loss, injury, or death involving landslides to less than significant.
- b. Based on Napa County Environmental Resource Mapping the project includes soil classified as Fagan clay loam (30 to 50 percent slopes). Clayey soils on steep slopes are susceptible to erosion when exposed to concentrated surface water flow. Construction of future development and grading will change existing surface drainage patterns. In order to prevent concentrated water flows and increased erosion from future development of the resulting parcels, any applicant of a building or grading plan will be required to submit an Erosion Control Plan per the current guidelines of the Napa Countywide Storm water Pollution Prevention Program (NCSPPP), which will be reviewed by the county Engineering Division. The design of an Erosion Control Plan compliance with the NCSPPP will maintain all impacts resulting from erosion or loss of topsoil from to being less than significant.
- c-d. Based upon the Napa County Environmental Resource Mapping (*liquefaction, soil types*), the site consists of Fagan clay loam (30 to 50 percent slopes) and includes areas generally subject to very low tendencies to liquefy. Any future construction will be required to comply with all the latest building standards and codes at the time of construction. Compliance with the latest editions of the California Building Code for seismic stability would reduce any potential impacts to the maximum extent possible, resulting in less than significant impacts.
- e. The Napa County Environmental Health Division has reviewed this application and recommends approval as conditioned. When future development is proposed plans for water and septic systems will be reviewed for compliance with Napa County Code. Impacts are less

than significant.

- f. No paleontological resources or unique geological features have been identified on the property. If resources are found during any earth disturbing activities associated with future development, construction is required to cease, and a qualified archaeologist will be retained to investigate the site in accordance with the Standard Condition of Approval 7.2 identified in **Section V** above.

Mitigation Measures: No mitigation measures are required.

VIII. GREENHOUSE GAS EMISSIONS. Would the project:	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporation	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
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 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/>.

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 the 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 (CO2e)]. 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 single-family residential 'construction' and

'development' and with 'ongoing' single-family residence 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 (CO₂) 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). Equivalent Carbon Dioxide (CO₂e) 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 (BAAQMD CEQA Air Quality Guidelines, May 2017). In this case, carbon dioxide (CO₂) is used as the reference atom/compound to obtain atmospheric carbon CO₂ effects of GHG. Carbon stocks are converted to carbon dioxide equivalents (CO₂e) 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>)

The project is a land division and does not technically include one time "Construction Emissions". Subdivision of the property will potentially lead to an increase of the amount of ministerial approved single-family residential dwellings units, associated accessory structure, access roads, and infrastructure creating emissions associated with the energy used to develop and prepare the future roads and buildings sites, construction, and construction equipment and worker vehicle trips (hereinafter referred to as Equipment Emissions). These emissions also include underground carbon stocks (or Soil carbon) associated with any existing vegetation that is proposed to be removed.

In addition to the one time Construction Emissions, "Operational Emissions" of the single-family residences 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 operate the single-family residences. See Section XVI, Transportation/Traffic, for anticipated number of operational trips. Operational Emissions from the single family residences 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 potential nine (9) dwelling units (three (3) parcels with one (1) single family residence, one (1) accessory (second) dwelling unit, and one (1) guest cottage each) that may foreseeably occur on the parcels resulting from the land division were compared to the BAAQMD's GHG screening criteria of 56 dwelling units. The project was determined not to exceed the 1,100 MT of CO₂e/yr GHG threshold of significance.

The proposed project has been evaluated against the BAAQMD thresholds and determined that the project would not exceed the 1,100 MT/yr of CO₂e. GHG Emission reductions from local programs and project level actions, such as application of the Cal Green Building Code, tightened vehicle fuel efficiency standards, and more project-specific on-site programs including those winery features noted above 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: No mitigation measures are required.

IX.	HAZARDS AND HAZARDOUS MATERIALS. Would the project	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporation	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
	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 checked="" type="checkbox"/> | <input 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 or excessive noise for people residing or working in the project area? | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> |
| f) Impair implementation of or physically interfere with an adopted emergency response plan or emergency evacuation plan? | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> |
| g) Expose people or structures, either directly or indirectly, to a significant risk of loss, injury or death involving wild-land fires? | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> |

Discussion:

- a. Approval of the land division, in and of itself, will not involve routine transport, use, or disposal of hazardous materials. Future development of residential dwellings and their associated accessory structures could include limited quantities of miscellaneous hazardous substances, such as gasoline, diesel fuel, hydraulic fluid, solvents, oils, etc., used to maintain vehicles and motorized equipment during the construction-related activities. Standard conditions associated with grading and building operations would be issued with permits to decrease the hazard to a less than significant impact. Small quantities of publicly-available hazardous materials, such as paint or maintenance supplies, may be routinely used within the project site for residential or agricultural maintenance and cleaning. These materials would not be used in sufficient strength or quantity to create a substantial risk to the public or environment.
- b. It is not anticipated that construction or operation of future residential development on the parcels would create significant hazards to the public or the environment due to the accidental release of hazardous materials. No existing schools have been identified with a one-quarter mile of the project site. The Watson Ranch Specific Plan includes a proposed school site that is potentially just within one-quarter mile of the south-western corner of the project site. However, the potential school site is further than one-quarter mile from the proposed private roads, driveways, and building envelopes that may be associated with hazardous emissions, materials, or substances associated with construction or operation activities. The potential for the emission or handling of hazardous materials, substances, or waste within one-quarter mile of a school would be less than significant.
- c. No existing schools have been identified with a one-quarter mile of the project site. The Watson Ranch Specific Plan includes a proposed school site that is potentially just within one-quarter mile of the south-western corner of the project site. However, the potential school site is further than one-quarter mile from the proposed private roads, driveways, and building envelopes that may be associated with hazardous emissions, materials, or substances associated with construction or operation activities. The potential for the emission or handling of hazardous materials, substances, or waste within one-quarter mile of a school would be less than significant.
- d. Based on a search of the California Department of Toxic Substances Control database, the project site does not contain any known EPA National Priority List sites, State response sites, voluntary cleanup sites, or any school cleanup sites. No impact would occur, as the project site is not on any known list of hazardous materials sites.
- e. The proposed project is within two (2) miles of the Napa County Airport. All three proposed building envelopes fall within Zone E (Other Airport Environs) of the Napa County Airport Land Use Compatibility Plan (ALUCP) and a small section of the eastern portion of the building envelope for Parcel two (2) falls within Zone D (Common Traffic Pattern) of the ALUCP. Impact elements for Zone E of the ALUCP are described as primarily resulting from overflight annoyance while the risk of accident is very low. Zone D potential for accident is described as low to moderate with frequent noise intrusion. Both zones allow for residential uses within agricultural land use and zoning designations. The proposed land division and the foreseeable future development fall within the County of Napa Agricultural Watershed: Airport Compatibility zoning designation and have a General Plan designation of Agriculture, Watershed and Open Space. Napa County Code section §18.80.030 (ALUCP Zone E regulations) and §18.80.040 (ALUCP Zone D regulations) require as a condition of approval for subdivisions recordation of overflight easements. Finally future development would be reviewable by the ALUC for

compatibility review. Taken together these factors reduce the impacts of safety hazards and noise from being within two (2) miles of an airport to a less than significant impact.

- f. The land division, in and of itself, does not include any actions that physically interfere with any emergency response or emergency evacuation plans. Roads and driveways associated with future development would be designed, constructed, and maintained to Napa County Road and Street Standards in order to provide adequate emergency access and evacuation. Development of the resulting three parcels would add a small number of trips to Watson Lane, of the amount associated with single-family residential dwellings, but adjacent roadways and intersections would continue to operate at acceptable levels of service. The project has been reviewed by the County Fire Department and Engineering Services Division and found acceptable, as conditioned.
- g. The land division itself does not include any actions that would expose people or structures directly or indirectly to a significant risk of loss, injury, or death involving wildland fires. Future development will be required to comply with all current building and fire codes, reducing impacts to less than significant.

Mitigation Measures: No mitigation measures are required.

X.	HYDROLOGY AND WATER QUALITY. Would the project:	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporation	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
	a) Violate any water quality standards or waste discharge requirements or otherwise substantially degrade surface or groundwater quality?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
	b) Substantially decrease groundwater supplies or interfere substantially with groundwater recharge such that the project may impede sustainable groundwater management of the basin?	<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 or through the addition of impervious surfaces which would:				
	i) result in substantial erosion or siltation on- or off-site?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
	ii) 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"/>
	iii) create or contribute runoff water which would exceed the capacity of existing or planned storm water drainage systems or provide substantial additional sources of polluted runoff?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
	iv) impede or redirect flood flows?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
	d) In flood hazard, tsunami, or seiche zones, risk release of pollutants due to project inundation?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
	e) Conflict with or obstruct implementation of a water quality control plan or sustainable groundwater management plan?	<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 discretionary 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-Tuluca (MST) area, however, have shown increasing depths to groundwater, but recent stabilization in many locations. Groundwater availability, recharge, storage and yield are 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 understand of groundwater resources in the County, the Napa County Groundwater Monitoring Plan recommended 18 Areas of Interest (AOIs) 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 developed and recommended by the GRAC and adopted by the Board. The recommendations included the goal of developing sustainability objectives, providing a definition, and explaining the shared responsibility for Groundwater Sustainability and the important role of 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). The subject property is located within the Western Mountains subarea of Napa County according to the Napa County Groundwater Monitoring Plan 2013.

Minimum thresholds for water use have been established by the Department of Public Works using reports by the United States Geological Survey (USGS). 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.

The proposed project is a land division and does not include any actual development. Foreseeable future development on the resulting three (3) parcels would be single family residences, associated accessory structures, access roads and infrastructure. The typical water use associated with a primary residence is 0.50 to 0.75 acre-feet per year and includes minor to moderate landscaping. A secondary residence typical water use is 0.20 to 0.50 acre-feet per year.

- a. The proposed project will not violate any water quality standards or waste discharge requirements. No new or enlarged wastewater treatment or disposal facilities are proposed. Future systems to serve potential development will be reviewed for compliance with the Napa County Code to ensure the systems do not create a significant impact on water quality standards or waste discharge requirements.
- b. The proposed project is a land division that includes no development. The parcel location falls within an area defined by the Napa County Water Availability Analysis Guidance Document as 'All Other Areas', which requires parcel specific analysis to determine the water availability of a parcel. Future development on the resulting parcels would likely be single-family residences, associated accessory structures, access roads and infrastructure. Non-discretionary project such as a single-family residence are not subject to CEQA, and their water usage is not considered a significant impact on groundwater supplies or recharge when on code-compliant parcels outside of the MST.
- ci-iv. The project would not substantially alter the drainage pattern on-site or cause a significant increase in erosion or siltation on or off the project site. Improvement plans prepared prior to the issuance of a building permit would ensure that the proposed project does not increase runoff flow rate or volume as a result of project implementation. The preliminary grading and drainage plan have been reviewed by the Engineering Division. The proposed project would implement standard storm water quality treatment controls to treat runoff prior to discharge from the project site. The incorporation of these features into the project would ensure that the proposed project would not create substantial sources of polluted runoff. In addition, the proposed project does not have any unusual characteristics that create sources of pollution that would degrade water quality. Impacts would be less than significant.

- d. The proposed project is not located within the designated floodplain area. The parcel is not located in an area that is subject to inundation by tsunamis, seiches, or mudflows. No impacts would occur.
- e. The proposed project would not conflict with a water quality control plan or sustainable groundwater management plan. No impacts would occur.

Mitigation Measures: No mitigation measures are required.

XI.	LAND USE AND PLANNING. Would the project:	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporation	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
	a) Physically divide an established community?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
	b) Cause a significant environmental impact due to a conflict with any land use plan, policy, or regulation adopted for the purpose of avoiding or mitigating an environmental effect?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>

Discussion:

- a. The project is located in rural Napa County, adjacent to the City of American Canyon, and currently surrounded by agriculture, open space, and single family residential homes on large parcels (smallest adjacent parcel is approximately 38 acres). The division of the subject property into three parcels and the subsequent development of single family residential structures would not physically divide an established community.
- b. The subject parcel and the three (3) parcels which would result from the proposed land division are designated AWOS (Agriculture, Watershed, and Open Space) in the Napa County General Plan and are located within the AW:AC (Agricultural Watershed: Airport Compatibility) zoning district. A majority of the subject property is within Compatibility Zone E of the Napa County Airport, while a small sliver of the western side of Parcel two's (2) building envelope resides within Zone D. Section 1.3 (Types of Action Reviewed) of the Napa County Airport Land Use Compatibility Plan (ALUCP) does not require a consistency determination by the Airport Land Use Commission for land divisions, however the Tentative Parcel Map complies with ALUCP requirements of overflight deed noticing and Final Parcel Map approval will include a requirement to record an overflight easement. The three (3) parcels created from this land division are compliant with restrictions on the creation of new parcels found within Title 17 and Title 18 of the Napa County Code. No new uses are proposed in this tentative parcel map and any future development on the resulting parcels would have to comply with restrictions of the General Plan and zoning code.

Mitigation Measures: No mitigation measures are required.

XII.	MINERAL RESOURCES. Would the project:	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporation	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
	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 has become economically valuable. Mines and Mineral Deposits mapping included in the Napa County Baseline Data Report (Mines and Mineral Deposits, BDR Figure 2-2) indicates that there are no known mineral resources nor any locally important mineral resource recovery sites located on the project site. No impacts would occur.

Mitigation Measures: No mitigation measures are required.

XIII.	NOISE. Would the project result in:	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporation	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
	a) Generation of a substantial temporary or permanent increase in ambient noise levels in the vicinity of the project in excess of standards established in the local general plan or noise ordinance, or applicable standards of other agencies?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
	b) Generation of excessive ground borne vibration or ground borne noise levels?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
	c) For a project located within the vicinity of a private airstrip or an airport land use plan or, where such a plan has not been adopted, within two miles of a public airport or public use airport, would the project expose people residing or working in the project area to excessive noise levels?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>

Discussion:

- a-b. The project involves the division of a parcel into three (3) resulting parcels and does not include any activity that would generate a substantial temporary or permanent increase in ambient noise levels or generate excessive ground-borne vibration or noise levels. The property is presently zoned AW:AC (Agricultural Watershed: Airport Compatibility) and will remain available to the land uses allowed within those zoning designations. The parcels that will result from this land division have been designed with building envelopes, and it is foreseeable that up to three (3) new single-family residential dwelling units, accessory structures, and any appurtenant improvements could develop subsequent to this project. Residential development on parcels in excess of 160 acres is not typically associated with sources of noise or vibration that would cause a significant impact on the environment.
- c. Please see the **HAZARDS AND HAZARDOUS MATERIAL** section above. Foreseeable future single-family development resulting from the proposed land division would potentially expose people within the project area to noise from overflights. Future development would be compatible with Napa County Code, which would reduce residential development to low density single-family residential. The parcels which result from the proposed land division are also required to record an overflight easement as a condition of approval for the project. Impacts would be less than significant.

Mitigation Measures: No mitigation measures are required.

XIV.	POPULATION AND HOUSING. Would the project:	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporation	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
	a) Induce substantial unplanned population growth in an area, either directly (for example, by proposing new homes and businesses) or indirectly (for example, through extension of roads or other infrastructure)?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
	b) Displace substantial numbers of existing people or housing, 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' Protections 2003 figure indicates that the total population of Napa County is projected to increase some 23% 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 the county and municipal housing elements exceed ABAG growth projections by approximately 15%. The proposed project is a land division and does not include any residential or employment land use activities. The land division will create three new parcels in a rural area of the county and it is foreseeable that these parcels could be developed in the future for single-family residential development. The net increase to the population from three residentially-developable parcels in a rural area of Napa County does not rise to a level that is considered a significant environmental impact.
- b. The subject property is currently defined by open space and agricultural uses. No existing residences are present on the property and the approval of this land division will not displace any existing people or housing necessitating the construction of replacement housing elsewhere.

Mitigation Measures: No mitigation measures are required.

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

- | | | | | |
|-----------------------------|--------------------------|--------------------------|-------------------------------------|--------------------------|
| iv) Parks? | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> |
| v) Other public facilities? | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> |

Discussion:

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

Mitigation Measures: No mitigation measures are required.

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

Discussion:

This project includes no development and will not, in and of itself, result in an increased demand for recreational facilities. Should the land division be approved, the project could foreseeably result in a net increase of three (3) residential dwelling units and their associated accessory structures. That limited number of additional residential structures may incrementally increase the use of nearby recreational facilities. Given the location of the project to the City of American Canyon, it seems likely that impacts (to the extent they exist) will fall more heavily on the parks and recreational facilities of that jurisdiction. The City of American Canyon was provided advance notice of this application and had no comments regarding the Tentative Parcel Map. Given the limited scale of the population growth resulting from the potential future development of the resulting parcels, impacts on recreational facilities are expected to be negligible. The project does not include recreational facilities that would have a significant adverse effect on the environment.

Mitigation Measures: No mitigation measures are required.

XVII.	TRANSPORTATION. Would the project:	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporation	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
	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-38, 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 a program, plan, ordinance or policy addressing the circulation system, including transit, roadway, bicycle and pedestrian facilities?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
	c) Would the project conflict or be inconsistent with CEQA Guidelines section 15064.3, subdivision (b)?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
	d) Substantially increase hazards due to a geometric design feature, (e.g., sharp curves or dangerous intersections) or incompatible uses (e.g., farm equipment)?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
	e) Result in inadequate emergency access?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
	f) Conflict with General Plan Policy CIR-14, which requires new uses to meet their anticipated parking demand, but to avoid providing excess parking which could stimulate unnecessary vehicle trips or activity exceeding the site's capacity?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>

Discussion:

a. The subject property is accessed from the eastern end of Watson Lane, approximately .43 miles from the intersection of Watson Lane and Paoli Loop Road, where access northbound and southbound access to Highway 29 can be achieved. The Circulation Element of the City of American Canyon General Plan designates Watson Lane as a Local Street which "provide(s) direct access to abutting properties and allow for localized movement of traffic". Local street is the lowest roadway classification in the City of American Canyon General Plan. Beginning from its intersection with Paoli Loop Road and heading east towards the subject site, the 33 foot wide Watson Lane is under the jurisdiction of the City of American Canyon for approximately 600 feet. It then enters the jurisdiction of the County of Napa for 900 feet where it crosses the Union Pacific Railroad and reenters the jurisdiction of the City of American Canyon before meeting the private access road which provides access to the subject property. The private access road covers approximately 1,000 feet before coming to the boundary of the subject property. Roadway capacity and access to the subject property are likely to be improved a buildout of the WRSP.

There are no transit, bicycle or pedestrian facilities on or within the vicinity of the subject property. The proposed project is a land division and includes no actual development, but foreseeable future development could include new single-family residences on the resulting parcels. Full dwelling unit build-out of the resulting parcels would include three (3) new single-family residences and potentially (3) new accessory (second) dwelling units. Vehicle traffic for a single-family residence is estimated to be approximately 9.52 vehicle trips per day (ITE, 1997), which works out to approximately 57 total vehicle trips per day as a result of the land division and foreseeable future development. This increase in vehicle trips is relatively minor and would not result in substantial impacts to operating conditions of the local roadway system.

Construction activities associated with the construction of any future single-family residences have the potential to generate short-term changes to traffic volumes on the area network. Daily vehicle trips would be generated with the arrival and departure of construction workers. Construction activities associated with a single-family residence would be small-scale and of short-duration. As a result, the proposed project would not cause long-term degradation in, or create substantial impacts to, the operating conditions or level of service on any roadways in the project area.

b. There is currently no bus service in the vicinity of the subject property; the proposed project would therefore not impair the use of public transit facilities in its vicinity. Currently, Watson Lane does not contain any bicycle facilities. According to the Napa Countywide Bicycle

Plan, adopted by the Board of Supervisors in June 2012, a Class I shared-use path (Vine Trail) is recommended for Watson Lane as currently configured. The Watson Ranch Specific Plan also contained bicycle and pedestrian facilities for the extension of Newell Drive, which would run north along the eastern perimeter of the subject property and intersect with the private access drive currently providing access to the subject property. Nothing in the proposed project would conflict with these facilities or plans for future facilities.

- c. The transition to VMT is not required of lead agencies until July 1, 2020. However, in anticipation of the transition, the Circulation Element includes new policies that reflect this new regulatory framework for transportation impact assessment, along with a draft threshold of significance that is based on reduction of VMT compared to the unmitigated project rather than the regional average VMT (Policies CIR-7 through CIR-9). Staff believes this alternative approach to determining the significance of a project's transportation impacts would be better suited to Napa County's rural context, while still supporting the efforts of the County to achieve the greenhouse gas emissions goals of its pending Climate Action Plan. The reduction in VMT and, correspondingly, GHG emissions from the transportation sector, is also necessary for Napa County, the region, and the state to achieve long-term, statewide mandates targeted toward reducing GHG emissions. Such mandates include, but are not limited to Executive Orders S-3-05 and B-16-12, which respectively, set a general statewide GHG emissions reduction target of 80 percent below 1990 levels by 2050, and an 80 percent GHG emissions reduction below 1990 levels (also by 2050) specifically for the transportation sector.

As a land division, the proposed project does not contain any actual development. The foreseeable future development of the resulting three parcels would potentially add three new single-family residences and associated accessory (second) dwelling units to the resulting parcels. VMT would be increased slightly due to the addition of these residences when compared to the current non-developed property. While technically a rural property and within the county's AW:AC zoning designation, these three (3) new dwelling units would be adjacent to the City of American Canyon and the services provided including transit access at the intersection of Napa Junction and Highway 29. VMT from the potential future buildout of this project would be significantly smaller when compared to the median rural single-family development in the County and so the project is not thought to significantly conflict or be inconsistent with CEQA Guidelines section 15064.3, subdivision (b).

- d-e. The resulting parcels from the proposed land division would still continue to be accessed via the existing Watson Lane. The proposed layout and initial design of private access roads for the three resulting parcels were reviewed and approved by the Napa County Fire Department, Engineering Services Division, and Public Works Department. Access to the subject property would be maintained during the construction of the Watson Ranch community.
- f. The proposed project is a land division and includes no development. Foreseeable future development of single-family residences would be reviewed for compliance with the Napa County Code. Napa County Code requires two parking spaces per dwelling unit (N.C.C. §18.104.130.B)

Mitigation Measures: No mitigation measures are required.

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

Discussion:

On March 18, 2020, County Staff sent invitations to consult on the proposed project to Native American Tribes who had a cultural interest in the area and who as of that date had requested to be invited to consult on projects, in accordance with the requirements of Public Resources Code Section 21080.3.1. County Staff received two replies. The first reply was received on March 27, 2020, from Ryan Peterson of the Middletown Rancheria of Pomo Indians thanking Staff for the notice but declining to comment or consult on the project. The second reply was received on April 13, 2020, from Leland Kinter of the Yocha Dehe Wintun Nation requesting to review the project's Cultural Resource Study and for the County to organize a site visit with the Yocha Dehe in order to evaluate cultural concerns. On April 4, 2020, County Staff, Jeffrey Jaeger (the applicant), and Laverne Bill, Cultural Resources Manager for the Yocha Dehe Wintun Nation, visited the subject property. The site visit consisted primarily of the building envelopes of Parcels one (1) & two (2). At the conclusion of the site visit, Laverne Bill informed County Staff that the Yocha Dehe Wintun Nation would not be seeking Tribal Consultation with the County of Napa, and instead intended to work directly with the applicant to provide Cultural Resource Sensitivity training for any future work crews operating within the areas that would fall within the intended Conservation Easement, as well as on notification prior to development within the building envelopes.

Mitigation Measures: No mitigation measures are required.

XIX.	UTILITIES AND SERVICE SYSTEMS. Would the project:	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporation	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
	a) Require or result in the relocation or construction of a new or expanded water, wastewater treatment or storm water drainage, electric power, natural gas or telecommunications facilities, the construction or relocation of which could cause significant environmental effects?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
	b) Have sufficient water supplies available to serve the project and reasonably foreseeable future development during normal, dry and multiple dry years?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
	c) Result in a determination by the wastewater treatment provider which serves or may serve the project that it has adequate capacity to serve the project's projected demand in addition to the provider's existing commitments?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
	d) Generate solid waste in excess of State or local standards, or in excess of the capacity of local infrastructure, or otherwise impair the attainment of solid waste reduction goals?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
	e) Comply with federal, state, and local management and reduction statutes and regulations related to solid waste?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>

Discussion:

- a. The project is a land division and no relocation, construction, or expansion of water, wastewater, storm water, electrical, natural gas or telecommunication facilities is proposed. It is foreseeable that the parcels which result from the land division would be developed with single-family residential structures, their associated accessory structures, and infrastructure. Before any of the above facilities could be constructed on the parcels, oversight from the applicable regulatory agency in order to issue a permit would be required. Review of plans with applicable codes and regulations will ensure that the environmental impact from the addition of any of the above facilities to the resulting parcels will be less than significant.
- b. Please see the **HYDROLOGY AND WATER QUALITY** section above. Groundwater usage will remain well below the property's fair share volume. No new expanded entitlements are necessary.

- c. The subject property is not served by a wastewater treatment provider.
- d. The project is a land division and includes no development which would generate solid waste. Future development of single-family residential structures will be served by a landfill with sufficient capacity to meet the project's demands. No significant impact will occur from the disposal of solid waste generated by the project.
- e. Future development of the project will be required to comply with all federal, state, and local reduction statutes and regulations related to solid waste.

Mitigation Measures: No mitigation measures are required.

XX.	WILDFIRE. If located in or near state responsibility areas or lands classified as very high fire hazard severity zones, would the project:	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporation	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
	a) Substantially impair an adopted emergency response plan or emergency evacuation plan?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
	b) Due to slope, prevailing winds and other factors, exacerbate wildfire risks and thereby expose project occupants to pollutant concentrations from a wildfire or the uncontrolled spread of a wildfire?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
	c) Require the installation or maintenance of associated infrastructure (such as roads, fuel breaks, emergency water sources, power lines or other utilities) that may exacerbate fire risk or that may result in temporary or ongoing impacts to the environment?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
	d) Expose people or structures to significant risks, including downslope or downstream flooding or landslides, as a result of runoff, post-fire slope instability, or drainage changes?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>

Discussion:

- a-d. A majority of the subject site is located within a high fire hazard severity zone and in the Napa County Local Responsibility Area (LRA district). There are no project features that would substantially impair an adopted emergency response plan or emergency evacuation plan. The subject property does include some areas with steep slopes, but the proposed project is a land division and includes not actual development. Foreseeable future development would be single-family residential structures on parcels in excess of 160 acres, which would reduce the risk of pollutant concentrations or uncontrolled spread of wildfire on occupants to a less than significant impact. Future foreseeable development of the project would comply with the current California Department of Forestry and California Building Code requirements for fire safety, reducing the risks from fire, flooding and landslides as a result of fire, to a less than significant impact.

Mitigation Measures: No mitigation measures are required.

XXI.	MANDATORY FINDINGS OF SIGNIFICANCE	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporation	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
------	------------------------------------	--------------------------------	---	------------------------------	-----------

- | | | | | |
|--|--------------------------|--------------------------|-------------------------------------|--------------------------|
| a) Does the project have the potential to substantially degrade the quality of the environment, substantially reduce the habitat of a fish or wildlife species, cause a fish or wildlife population to drop below self-sustaining levels, threaten to eliminate a plant or animal community, substantially reduce the number or restrict the range of a rare or endangered plant or animal or eliminate important examples of the major periods of California history or prehistory? | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> |
| b) Does the project have impacts that are individually limited, but cumulatively considerable? ("Cumulatively considerable" means that the incremental effects of a project are considerable when viewed in connection with the effects of past projects, the effects of other current projects, and the effects of probable future projects)? | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> |
| c) Does the project have environmental effects that will cause substantial adverse effects on human beings, either directly or indirectly? | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> |

Discussion:

- a. The proposed project is a land division and includes no actual development. Foreseeable future development would consist of single-family residential structures, associated accessory buildings, access roads and infrastructure. As discussed above the project would have a less than significant impact on wildlife resources. No sensitive resources or biologic areas will be converted or affected by this project. Also as analyzed above, the project would not result in a significant loss of native trees, native vegetation, or important examples of California's history or pre-history. The potential future Conservation Easement placed on 321 acres of Parcels two (2) & three (3) would have positive impacts on the features mentioned above.
- b. As described in the sections above, air quality, transportation/traffic impacts, and population and housing, the proposed project which consists primarily of a new barrel storage building, increase in production, employees, visitation and marketing activities do not have impacts that are individually limited, but cumulatively considerable.
- c. There are no schools or hospitals housing sensitive receptors within a quarter-mile of the building envelopes. Noise from construction that would occur with construction and installation of potential future single-family residential structures would be temporary, limited to day time hours, and would be subject to best management practices intended to limit fugitive dust and protect storm water quality. The operation of single-family residences would have a less than significant noise impact on nearby residences due to distance between those residences and the building envelopes.

Mitigation Measures: No mitigation measures are required.