

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

**Notice of Intent to Adopt a Negative Declaration**

1. **Project Title:** Laird Family Estates Winery, Use Permit #P08-00564-MOD-Major
2. **Property Owner:** Kenneth and Gail Laird
3. **Contact person and phone number:** Mary Doyle, Planner, 299-1350, [mdoyle@co.napa.ca.us](mailto:mdoyle@co.napa.ca.us)
4. **Project location and APN:** The project site is located on a 40.06-acre parcel on the west side of Solano Avenue approximately 700 feet north of its intersection with Oak Knoll Avenue at SR 29 within an Agricultural Preserve (AP) zoning district (Assessor's Parcel Number 034-031-031 ) 5055 Solano Avenue, Napa.
5. **Project Sponsor's Name and Address:** Kenneth and Gail Laird, 5055 Solano Avenue, Napa, 94558
6. **Hazardous Waste Sites:** The project is not included on a list of hazardous materials sites compiled pursuant to Government Code Section 65962.5.
7. **Project Description:** **(A) Approval of Use Permit Major Modification P08-00564-MOD** to Use Permit Nos. 97526-UP and 02193-UP to: (1) increase maximum total production capacity from 650,000 gallons per year to 900,000 gallons per year; (2) construction of a new 34,437 sq. ft. production building with an approximately 18,500 sq. ft. covered roof work area surrounding the building; (3) installation of a recessed loading dock on the east side of the new building; (4) addition of a covered outdoor work area on the east side of the existing barrel storage building; (5) construction of a new mechanical pad on the west of the existing barrel storage building; and (6) removal of the condition of approval regarding alternating proprietor/custom crush clients. **(B) Adoption of a Resolution Rescinding Approval of Use Permit Modification No. P07-00587-MOD-MAJ** and the Related Negative Declaration.

**PRELIMINARY DETERMINATION:**

The Conservation, Development and Planning Director of Napa County has tentatively determined that the following project would have a significant effect on the environment and the County intends to adopt a **Negative Declaration**. Documentation supporting this determination is contained in the attached Initial Study Checklist and is available for inspection at the Napa County Conservation, Development and Planning Department Office, 1195 Third St., Room 210, Napa, California 94559 between the hours of 8:00 AM and 4:45 PM Monday through Friday (except holidays).

DATE: November 13, 2008

\_\_\_\_\_  
BY: M. Doyle

**WRITTEN COMMENT PERIOD: Thursday, November 13, 2008 to Tuesday, December 2, 2008**

Please send written comments to the attention of Mary Doyle at 1195 Third St., Room 210, Napa, California 94559, or via e-mail to [mdoyle@co.napa.ca.us](mailto:mdoyle@co.napa.ca.us). A public hearing on this project is tentatively scheduled for the Napa County Planning Commission on Wednesday, December 3, 2008, 9:00 a.m.. You may confirm the date and time of this hearing by calling (707) 253-4416.

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

**Initial Study Checklist**  
(reference CEQA, Appendix G)

1. **Project Title:** Laird Family Estates Winery Use Permit # 08-0564-MOD-major
2. **Property Owner:** Kenneth and Gail Laird
3. **Contact person and phone number:** Mary Doyle, Planner 707-253-4417, mdoyle@co.napa.ca.us
4. **Project location and APN:** The project site is located on a 40.06-acre parcel on the west side of Solano Avenue, approximately 700 feet north of its intersection with Oak Knoll Avenue at SR 29 within an Agricultural Preserve (AP) zoning district (APN 035-031-031) 5055 Solano Avenue, Napa
5. **Project Sponsor's Name and Address:** Kenneth and Gail Laird, 5055 Solano Ave., Napa, 94558
6. **General Plan description:** Agriculture, Watershed, Open Space (AWOS)
7. **Zoning:** Agricultural Preserve (AP)
8. **Project Description:** **(A) Approval of Use Permit Major Modification P08-00564-MOD** to Use Permit Nos. 97526-UP and 02193-UP to: (1) increase maximum total production capacity from 650,000 gallons per year to 900,000 gallons per year; (2) construction of a new 34,437 sq. ft. production building with an approximately 18,500 sq. ft. covered roof work area surrounding the building; (3) installation of a recessed loading dock on the east side of the new building; 4) addition of a covered outdoor work area on the east side of the existing barrel storage building; 5) construction of a new mechanical pad on the west of the existing barrel storage building; and 6) removal of the condition of approval regarding alternating proprietor/custom crush clients. **(B) Adoption of a Resolution Rescinding Approval of Use Permit Modification No. P07-00587-MOD-MAJ** and the Related Negative Declaration.

This action will supercede Use Permit Major Modification No. P07-00587-MOD granted by the Planning Commission on March 5, 2008. That approval occurred without benefit of required notice being provided to all property owners within 300 ft. of the project, and therefore that approval will be rescinded in concert with this action.

The new production building will be located adjacent to the rear of the existing winery facility generally north and west of the existing production building. The existing production building is located to the rear and west of existing tasting room. The existing tasting room is setback approximately 600 ft. from the centerline of Solano Avenue. The new production building will be placed immediately north of two existing winery wastewater treatment ponds. Building materials will feature metal siding and roofing matching the existing building. The applicant is proposing a row of screening trees adjacent to the northern elevation of the building to soften view of the building wall. In addition to the building, an approximately 18,500 sq. ft. covered outdoor work area will surround the building including a recessed loading dock on the east side of the building. The outdoor work area will be used to store grape picking bins, empty barrels and tanks, and other agricultural processing equipment, and be used for barrel rotation, blending and harvest-related activities. Minimal site improvements will occur beyond the surrounds of the new building, however a new loading dock will be constructed on the east side of the existing production building and a mechanical pad will be constructed on the east of the existing production building.

The project involves no changes to visitation levels or marketing events.

9. **Environmental setting and surrounding land uses:** The subject property is zone AP – Agricultural Preserve. Agricultural Preserve zoning allows agriculture, which includes wineries, and construction of a single family home and related accessory structures. Presently there is no home on the property, and the applicant has indicated no intention to build a home in the foreseeable future. The property is currently developed solely with agricultural uses in compliance with County standards. The 40 acre property contains approximately 30 acres of producing vineyards and approximately 10 acres of site improvements with buildings for the winery facility. Site improvements include paved drive aisles, a crush pad, outdoor storage and work areas, a winery wastewater system with aeration ponds, parking areas and existing winery buildings for production, fermentation, bottling, and storage of wine. The winery also includes a public tours and

tasting hospitality building which is located on the eastern portion of the complex. Other improvements include decorative landscaping, and entrance feature, signage and lighting.

The winery has direct access off of Solano Avenue approximately 700 ft. north of Oak Knoll Avenue at State Highway 29. The existing driveway connection to Solano Avenue complies with County standards, and includes acceleration and deceleration tapers within the Solano Avenue right-of-way. Solano Avenue is a County-maintained public road. The Solano Avenue/Oak Knoll intersection is a two-way Stop-sign controlled intersection located immediately adjacent to Oak Knoll's intersection with State Highway 29. There is a fully actuated traffic signal and a dedicated left turn lane off of northbound SR 29 at its intersection with Oak Knoll Avenue. There is a traffic signal and left turn lane at the intersection of northbound Solano and SR 29.

The project site is surrounded by a variety of land uses. East of the project site is Solano Avenue, the Wine Train tracks and State Route 29. Beyond are large vineyard tracks primarily owned and operated by Trefethen Vineyards. Northeast of the subject property is the Red Hen commercial complex. The site is zoned CL - Commercial Limited, and contains a currently vacant restaurant and retail complex. Adjoining the property to the north is West Oak Knoll Avenue, a private street serving approximately 10 properties. Immediately north of West Oak Knoll are two residences which front on the private road. The nearest residence approximately 500 ft. from the proposed winery expansion. A second residence, located closer to the Red Hen complex is located approximately 750 ft. from the proposed winery expansion. Northwest of the subject property and accessed from West Oak Knoll Avenue is the Lamoreaux Estate, which contains several parcels and several hundred acres of land and featuring a historic residence set at the edge of the Napa Valley floor. The proposed winery expansion is located approximately 400 ft. from the nearest point of the Lamoreaux property. The historic Lamoreaux residence is located approximately 1,750 ft. from the proposed winery. West of the project site are 6 vineyard parcels ranging in size from 8.7 acres to 42 acres. The 42 acre parcel adjoins the subject property and is owned by the project applicant, Kenneth Laird. A large vineyard residence is located beyond the 42 acre parcel, with the residence located approximately 1,500 ft. from the proposed winery expansion. South of the project site is a 40 acre vineyard parcel owned by the project applicant, and beyond is a mobile home park located approximately 1,300 ft. from the existing winery complex. South of the proposed project and west of the mobile home park are three addition vineyard residences located between 1,600 ft. and 2,200 ft. from the existing winery complex.

The subject property is general level with slopes of less than 1% trending downhill from west to east. The project sits on rich volcanic alluvial deposits suitable for premium wine grape cultivation and production. The site contains no native vegetation. Ornamental landscaping is located in the vicinity of the winery buildings, and the remainder of the site is planted in producing vineyards. On the Lamoreaux property adjoining the northern boundary of the site, there is a row of mature evergreen trees.

10. **Other agencies whose approval is required:**

Napa County Department of Public Works (grading permit)  
Napa County Department of Environmental Management (process & wastewater permits, HMBP)

Responsible (R) and Trustee (T) Agencies

Other Agencies Contacted

San Francisco Bay Regional Water Quality Control Board

**ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACTS AND BASIS OF CONCLUSIONS:**

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

On the basis of this initial evaluation:

- I find that the proposed project COULD NOT have a significant effect on the environment, and a NEGATIVE DECLARATION will be prepared.
- I find that although the proposed project could have a significant effect on the environment, there will not be a significant effect in this case because revisions in the project have been made by or agreed to by the project proponent. A MITIGATED NEGATIVE DECLARATION will be prepared.
- I find that the proposed project MAY have a significant effect on the environment, and an ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACT REPORT is required.

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

\_\_\_\_\_  
Signature  
  
\_\_\_\_\_  
Mary Doyle, Planner

\_\_\_\_\_  
November 13, 2008  
Date  
  
\_\_\_\_\_  
Napa County Conservation, Development and Planning Department

**ENVIRONMENTAL CHECKLIST FORM**

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

Discussion:

a-d. The proposed 34,437 sq. ft. new winery production building will be constructed adjacent to the rear of the existing winery complex. The building will generally be north and west of the existing winery production building, and north of the existing wastewater treatment ponds. The building will be 31 ft. in height (as measured pursuant to the International Building Code) and have building materials matching the existing production building. Building materials consist of standing seam metal roofing and metal siding. An awning roof cover and new outdoor work area are proposed surrounding the new building and on the east side of the existing production structure and would be visible to the east side of the existing winery building.

The proposed project is not located in close proximity to any scenic vista, or scenic resource. The project will result in existing vineyards being removed and replaced with a winery production building. Napa County zoning and General Plan (Goal AG/LU-1) encourages agricultural uses as the primary land use of agriculturally designated land, and that agriculture, including grape growing and winemaking are necessary to ensure the preservation of agricultural lands (Goal AG/LU-3). Wineries, by definition, are considered part of the agricultural landscape. The General Plan (Policy AG/LU-10) requires wineries to convey their permanence and attractiveness in support of Napa’s agricultural aesthetic. The existing winery has obtained a use permit and has been developed in accordance with these long-standing General Plan Goals and Policies. The existing facility has a somewhat typical design for large Napa Valley wineries. Public tasting areas are ornate and have setback view from the public right of way. Production areas are located behind the public visitation building and are largely obscured from general view. The proposed additional building continues this theme and is consistent with the design of other large winery facilities found acceptable by the County. The proposed expansion to the winery will match the design used on the current production building. Therefore, staff concludes that the proposed building addition will not substantially effect the scenic character of the Napa Valley nor degrade the visual character or quality of the site and its surrounding uses.

Views of the new building will be obstructed from most vantage points. Views of the building from Solano Avenue and Highway 29 will be virtual non-existent due to screening by the existing winery complex, the Red Hen development, homes sites north of the Red Hen complex, and the mobile home complex located south of the subject property. The 7 vineyard estates, including the large Lamoreaux estate located generally to the northwest will continue to have views across the property and the new building will be visible. Given the rather large distances the building will be from these other properties (423 ft. from the nearest point of the Lamoreaux Estate and over 1,700 ft. from the Lamoreaux residence), the addition of the building is not considered to substantially altered neighbors views across this property.

Staff concludes that the change to visual character and the quality of the site and its surroundings will not substantially be altered for the following reasons: 1) The nearest home is located approximately 500 ft. away and the remaining homes range from 750 ft. to 2,200 ft. away which substantially exceeds winery setback requirements. Napa County General Plan and Zoning provide no entitlement to surrounding property owners to views across another privately owned property. However, Napa County established winery setbacks in 1990 as part of the Winery Definition Ordinance adopted by-in-large to preserve the pristine agricultural character and setting of Napa Valley. The ordinance requires 600 ft. setbacks from major roads, 300 ft. setbacks from minor roads and 20 ft. setback from all other property lines. The project’s existing and proposed buildings exceed these setbacks which were intended to reduce wineries visual effects on surrounding land uses. 2) The project meets building height limits. Like the Winery Definition Ordinance, the County has very stringent building height regulations intended to limit the visual impact of structures. The proposed project has a building height of 31 ft. matching the building height of other structures on the property. The height of the building is consistent with the standards applied to all other structures in the County. 3) Building materials will match the existing materials which are not highly reflective and do not create a source of glare. 4) Project lighting will be consistent with existing lighting which does not cause substantial nightmare glare of off-site spillage. The County requires all lighting to be shielded and directed downward in keeping the agricultural setting. 5) The applicant is proposing to place a row of screening trees on the north side of the property to break up the massing of the new building. As the trees mature, they will soften the view of the structure although they are not considered

necessary given the rather large distances the project is from the homes in the general vicinity. 6) As a standard condition of development, the County requires landscaping and/or fencing to screen outdoor storage areas.

Mitigation Measures:

None

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

Discussion:

a-c. The project site is not classified as state farmland and does not have a Williamson Act contract associated with it. The zoning for the parcel is Agricultural Preserve (AP). Existing on the parcel the winery and associated facilities, parking area, waste water system and 30± acre vineyard. No other changes are anticipated that would result in a conversion of Farmland to non-agricultural use, although approximately 2 acres of vineyard will be removed to accommodate the 34,437 sq ft structure. The winery supports the agricultural use (winery and vineyard) on the property. Therefore, no effects would be anticipated with respect to (a-c)

Mitigation Measures:

None

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

Discussion:

a-e. The project site is located in the northwesterly portion of Napa County within the San Francisco Bay Area Air Basin as designated by and in the jurisdiction of the Bay Area Air Quality Management District (BAAQMD). The San Francisco Bay Area Air Basin is currently classified as nonattainment for both state and federal ozone precursors and for state PM10 standards. The proposed project would not conflict with or obstruct applicable air quality plans. Temporary, short-term construction equipment emissions are included in the emission inventory basis for the regional air quality plans. The construction activities of the proposed project would create short-term temporary air emissions. The BAAQMD CEQA Guidelines recommends that determination of significance with respect to "construction" impacts be based not on quantification of emissions and comparison to thresholds, but upon inclusion of feasible control measures for PM-10.

Surrounding land uses are similar to what is on the existing parcel and the proposed project (rural residential, vineyard, winery). Post construction, air emissions would result from vehicles associated with the routine winery daily operations and the seasonal activities for a maximum 900,000 gallon winery. There are no sensitive receptors located in the vicinity of the proposed project and the proposed project will not create objectionable odors affecting a substantial number of people. The nearest resident is approximately 1000 feet north of the proposed construction. The proposed project would not result in a considerable net long-term increase of any criteria pollutants. It is anticipated this proposed project in its entirety would not contribute substantially to any air quality violation nor would it result in a cumulatively considerable net increase of any criteria pollutant. Therefore, less than significant effects would be anticipated with respect to (a-e).

f. Neither the State Air Resources Board (CARB) nor the BAAQMD have yet identified a significant threshold for green house gas emissions or a methodology for analyzing impacts related to greenhouse gas emissions. However, through Assembly Bill 32 (2006) and Senate Bill 375 (2008), the State has identified a goal of rolling-back house gas emissions to 1990 levels by 2020, and has set in motion a number of transportation, land use, and air quality planning efforts that are expected to affect regional and local decision making in the future. In Napa County, the County has quantified emissions associated with County operations, and is currently working with the Napa County Transportation and Planning Agency on a community-wide emission inventory. Once this inventory is complete, the County has committed to develop an emissions-reduction plan, and will be prepared to respond when CARB establishes the region's Sustainable Community Strategy pursuant to SB375.

Although it is possible to generally estimate a project's incremental contribution of CO2 into the atmosphere, it is not possible to determine how a project's incremental contribution might translate into physical effects on the environment. Also, there is currently no simple metric available to determine quantitatively whether a single project's contribution would be considered "considerable" in a CEQA context whether it would hinder meeting the AB32 goals. Qualitatively, however, the proposed project would incrementally increase greenhouse gas emissions if it would result in increased auto traffic and increase energy use without somehow off-setting those increases. Prior to approval, the project would be reviewed for conformance with building code standards related to energy conservation, and would also comply with County requirements related to storm water management. With these reduction measures and the limited number of vehicle trips anticipated as a result of project implementation, the project's contribution to global climate change is considered less than significant. (f)

Mitigation Measures:  
None

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

	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporation	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
c) Have a substantial adverse effect on federally protected wetlands as defined by Section 404 of the Clean Water Act (including, but not limited to, marsh, vernal pool, Coastal, etc.) through direct removal, filling, hydrological interruption, or other means?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
d) Interfere substantially with the movement of any native resident or migratory fish or wildlife species or with established native resident or migratory wildlife corridors, or impede the use of native wildlife nursery sites?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" 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:**

(a-f) The project site is a developed environment with the existing winery facilities, vineyards and parking area. There are no natural or other sensitive habitat, wetlands, wildlife nursery sites or corridors and no preservation policies or ordinances associated with the project site or the vicinity. No new fencing is proposed. There are no local or state conservation plans currently associated with the project or in the vicinity. Therefore, no effect would be anticipated with respect to (a-f).

**Mitigation Measure:**

None.

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

**Discussion:**

(a-d) There are no known historically sensitive sites or structures located within the proposed project site. There are no known archaeological resources, sensitive areas or sites, no known paleontological resources or unique geologic features on or associated with the site. (Reference: Napa County BDR and GIS) The improvements will occur in areas that have been previously disturbed and no cultural resources were found during those constructions activities. Therefore, no effects would be anticipated with respect to (a-d).

While not anticipated, should a discovery of unknown cultural resources occur, the proposed project will include the following "condition of approval": In the event that cultural resources or prehistoric artifacts are discovered, uncovered, or otherwise detected during soil-disturbing activities, work on the immediately affected portion of the site shall cease immediately and Napa County be notified, and a qualified archaeologist shall be brought to the site to assess whether the resources at issue are either "historical resources" or "unique archaeological resources." The archaeologist shall recommend appropriate mitigation to Napa County, which shall determine what measures are appropriate and feasible. Such measures may include avoidance, removal and preservation, and/or recordation in accordance with accepted professional archaeological practice. California law recognizes the need to protect Native American human



burials, skeletal remains, and items associated with Native American burials from vandalism and inadvertent destruction. The procedures for the treatment of Native American human remains are contained in California Health and Safety Code §7050.5 and §7052 and California Public Resources Code §5097. The California Health and Safety Code requires that if human remains are found in any location other than a dedicated cemetery, work is to be halted in the immediate area, and the county coroner is to be notified to determine the nature of the remains. The coroner is required to examine all discoveries of human remains within 48 hours of receiving notice of a discovery on private or state lands (Health and Safety Code §7050.5[b]). If the coroner determines that the remains are those of a Native American interment, then the Native American Heritage Commission shall be consulted to identify the most likely descendants and the appropriate disposition of the remains.

Mitigation Measures:  
None

		Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporation	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
VI.	<b>GEOLOGY AND SOILS.</b> Would the project:				
	a) Expose people or structures to potential substantial adverse effects, including the risk of loss, injury, or death involving:				
	i) Rupture of a known earthquake fault, as delineated on the most recent Alquist-Priolo Earthquake Fault Zoning Map issued by the State Geologist for the area or based on other substantial evidence of a known fault? Refer to Division of Mines and Geology Special Publication 42.	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
	ii) Strong seismic ground shaking?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
	iii) Seismic-related ground failure, including liquefaction?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
	iv) Landslides?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
	b) Result in substantial soil erosion or the loss of topsoil?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
	c) Be located on a geologic unit or soil that is unstable, or that would become unstable as a result of the project, and potentially result in on- or off-site landslide, lateral spreading, subsidence, liquefaction or collapse?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
	d) Be located on expansive soil, as defined in Table 18-1-B of the Uniform Building Code (1997), creating substantial risks to life or property?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
	e) Have soils incapable of adequately supporting the use of septic tanks or alternative waste water disposal systems where sewers are not available for the disposal of waste water?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>

**Discussion:**

a-e. The proposed project site is located in the seismically active San Francisco Bay Area (California Building Code 2007). The proposed project is not located in an area of susceptible to ground failure, liquefaction, or land slides. The terrain is relatively flat (less than 5% slope). There are no known faults that traverse the project site. No substantial loss of top soil is anticipated; a construction SWPPP/NOI shall be prepared. The proposed project is not located in an area of susceptible to ground failure, liquefaction, or land slides. The soil type is considered Pleasanton Loam. With the elimination of alternating proprietor/custom crush clients, it is anticipated the existing winery wastewater disposal system has the capacity to accommodate the proposed project and no expansion of existing system will occur. The proposed project has been reviewed and conditioned by the Department of Environmental Management to assure the existing system will accommodate the winery waste requirement. (Reference: Napa County Resource Maps, BDR and GIS) Therefore less than significant effects would be anticipated with respect to (a-e).

Mitigation Measure:  
None

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

	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporation	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
<b>VII. HAZARDS AND HAZARDOUS MATERIALS.</b> Would the project:				
a) Create a significant hazard to the public or the environment through the routine transport, use, or disposal of hazardous materials?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
b) Create a significant hazard to the public or the environment through reasonable foreseeable upset and accident conditions involving the release of hazardous materials into the environment?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
c) Emit hazardous emissions or handle hazardous or acutely hazardous materials, substances, or waste within one-quarter mile of an existing or proposed school?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
d) Be located on a site which is included on a list of hazardous materials sites compiled pursuant to Government Code Section 65962.5 and, as a result, would it create a significant hazard to the public or the environment?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
e) For a project located within an airport land use plan or, where such a plan has not been adopted, within two miles of a public airport or public use airport, would the project result in a safety hazard for people residing or working in the project area?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
f) For a project within the vicinity of a private airstrip, or, where such a plan has not been adopted, within two miles of a public airport or public use airport, would the project result in a safety hazard for people residing or working in the project area?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
g) Impair implementation of or physically interfere with an adopted emergency response plan or emergency evacuation plan?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
h) Expose people or structures to a significant risk of loss, injury or death involving wild-land fires, including where wild-lands are adjacent to urbanized areas or where residences are intermixed with wild-lands?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>

Discussion:

- (a,b,h) The proposed project is not anticipated to involve the use, routine transport or disposal of significant amounts of hazardous materials. Wineries do not utilize significant amounts of hazardous materials in the wine making process. Hazardous materials typically consist of fuel for machinery, and small amounts of chemicals and/or cleaning agents associated with maintenance and food processing hygiene. The existing winery currently uses minor amounts of the about-noted hazardous materials. As a result of the addition, the winery will need to update their Hazardous Materials Business Plan with the County Department of Environmental Management. The Hazardous Materials Business Plan authorized by the County establishes limits on the quantity and use of hazardous materials at the facility. The winery will operate within the limits allowed under local and State levels, and therefore the project is not considered to have any potential impact resulting from hazardous materials use. The proposed use is not anticipated to create significant hazard from releases of hazardous materials. The existing winery structures have fire suppression systems including water tanks, sprinklers systems, etc and these types of systems shall be included into the proposed project. Therefore, less than significant effects would be anticipated with respect to (a, b, h).
- (c-g) There are no schools located within one-quarter mile from the proposed project site. The proposed site is not a known hazardous materials site. The project site is not located within the vicinity of any public or private airports. The proposed project would not interfere with emergency response or evacuation plans. Therefore, no effects would be anticipated with respect to (c-g).

Mitigation Measures:  
None

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

Discussion:

- (a-f) The proposed site is a built environment developed with the existing winery and associated facilities, existing well, and 30- acre vineyard. The building addition and associated improvements will be constructed on level land currently planted in vines. Localized drainage surrounding the new building will be altered as a result of creating a building pad. Additional run-off will occur as a result of increased impervious surfaces. However, the increased run-off is considered less-than-significant because it will not result in a discernable change to the amount of off-site surface drainage nor discernibly interrupt groundwater recharge given the comparatively small amount of additional impervious surface when compared to the effected drainage basin and related aquifer. Given the flat terrain, the amount of grading necessary to create a building pad will be quite minor, and will have no potential to impact off-site drainage characteristics due to extensive property line setbacks and surrounding level ground. The applicant is required to submit a Notice of Intent (NOI) for a Storm Water Pollution Prevention Plan permit (SWPPP) from the Regional Water Quality Control Board for pre and post construction activities and a Napa County Public Works grading permit. The source of water will be the existing wells. A Phase 1 Water Availability Analysis was prepared (reviewed by Napa County Public Works), the proposed project would use approximately 4.68 acre feet per year (af/yr). The threshold for this parcel is 40 af/yr. The current use is 13.6 af/yr. The total projected use including the proposed project is 18.28 af/yr below at the established threshold of 40 af/yr. The proposed project is not anticipated to substantially alter the drainage pattern to cause on or off site flooding. Therefore, less than significant effects would be anticipated with respect to (a-f).
- (g,h,i) The proposed site is not located within a 100-year floodplain and is not anticipated to impede or redirect flood flows. No housing is proposed as part of the project. The project site is not area known to be inundated by seiche, tsunami or mudflow. Therefore, no effects would be anticipated with respect to (g, h, i).
- (i) No housing is proposed as part of the project, though employees, staff, visitors would be on-site throughout business/work hours. The proposed site is not anticipated to be subject to significant risk from flooding due to dam or levee failure. Therefore, less than significant effects would be anticipated with respect to (i).

Mitigation Measures:

None

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

Discussion:

(a-c) The proposed project site is located on a 40.06 acre parcel developed with the existing winery and associated facilities and existing vineyard. The proposed project would not physically divide an established community. The proposed project is located in an Agriculture Watershed Open Space (AWOS) area as designated in the Napa County General Plan and in an Agricultural Preserve (AP) area as designated in Napa County Code. The proposed project will not conflict with any other applicable regulations, nor will the proposed project conflict with any applicable habitat conservation plans or natural community conservation plans. Therefore no effects would be anticipated with respect to (a-c).

Mitigation Measures:

None

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

Discussion:

(a-b) The proposed project site is not in an area of a known valuable mineral of state, regionally or locally important resource or mineral resource recovery site. (Reference: Napa County Resource maps, BDR and GIS) Therefore, no effects would be anticipated with respect to (a-b).

Mitigation Measures:

None

	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporation	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
<b>XI. NOISE.</b> Would the project result in:				
a) Exposure of persons to or generation of noise levels in excess of standards established in the local general plan or noise ordinance, or applicable standards of other agencies?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>

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

Discussion:

(a-d) The proposed project would result in a short-term temporary increase in noise levels during the construction activities. Construction activities would occur between 7 a.m. and 7 p.m. as set forth in County Code, Section 8.16. The project would not result in the exposure of persons to or generate noise levels in excess of Napa County standards due to the project's setback from property lines and noise sensitive uses located on properties beyond. As noted in the settings section at the beginning of this document, the nearest residence is located approximately 500 ft. north of the proposed addition. The next nearest residence is approximately 750 ft. northeast. Given these large setbacks from the construction zone, and County noise standards that limit the hours and volume of construction-related noise production, the project will not result in significant short-term noise level increases to any noise-sensitive uses in the vicinity. During the construction, there would be noise louder than the existing ambient levels, however this would be localized and of a short-term temporary duration only. After completion of construction the proposed project would not result in the generation of excessive groundborne vibrations or groundborne noise levels. With the exception of a few days out of every year, noise generation from wineries is very low as a result of the characteristics of the wine-making process. The vast majority of the year, wine production buildings and outdoor work areas generate effectively no off-site noise. Wine is aged for lengthy periods of time in various tanks and barrels, and only minor amounts of noise is generated when wine is moved between tanks and barrels, is blended, and eventually bottled for shipping off site. Wineries generate the greatest amount of noise in the fall during harvest when fruit is being crushed and moved into fermentation tanks. The length of the harvest season varies from winery to winery and from year to year, but it can generally be characterized as a period of high activity typically lasting 6 to 8 weeks. Many wineries will operate for 24 hours a day during several days during the harvest as a result of the need to pick and crush fruit when it reaches an optimum level of ripeness. This high activity period is recognized in the County General Plan (Agricultural Land Use Element) as a critically necessary component of Napa County's established, and sustainable agricultural-based economy and land use pattern. The General Plan promotes the "right to farm" which notes that persons choosing to reside in agricultural areas may be temporarily inconvenienced by these activities. Temporary noise intrusion will result to noise-sensitive uses, such as residences, which are located on or near agriculturally-zoned land. These temporary inconveniences and noise intrusions are considered a less-than-significant impact. No substantial permanent increase in the ambient noise level would occur. Upon completion of construction, the anticipated level of noise associated with the proposed addition will be similar to the noise levels and operational characteristics of the existing facility. The County has no record of noise violations occurring at the existing facility. No substantial temporary or periodic increase in ambient noise levels are anticipated with the day-to-day operations of the proposed project. Therefore, less than significant effects would be anticipated with respect (a-e).

(e-f) The proposed project site is not located within an airport land use plan or in the vicinity of a private airstrip. Therefore no effects would be anticipated with respect to (e-f).

Mitigation Measures:  
None

	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporation	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
XII. POPULATION AND HOUSING. Would the project:				

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

Discussion:

(a-c) The proposed project would not result in a substantial increase in population growth, either directly or indirectly. No new homes or roads are associated with the proposed project. The proposed use would not have any new employees, and would not translate into need for new services. The proposed project would not displace any existing housing or people. Therefore no effects are anticipated with respect to (a-c).

Mitigation Measures:

None

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

Discussion:

(a) The proposed project is not expected to change any existing level of public services or require any new facilities. The capacities of Fire and Police services are adequate to service the proposed project. Water is available from existing well on the property. The proposed project is an expansion of the existing winery. School impact mitigation fees levied will be collected with the building permit application. Those fees assist schools with capacity building measures. The project will have little impact of public parks. County revenue resulting from building permit fee, property tax revenue and taxes from the sale of wine will help meet the cost of providing public services to the property. Therefore, less than significant effects are anticipated.

Mitigation Measures:

None

	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporation	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
XIV. <b>RECREATION.</b> 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 type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
b) Does the project include recreational facilities or require the construction or expansion of recreational facilities which might have an adverse physical effect on the environment?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>

Discussion:

a-b. The proposed project is not anticipated to change any level of use of existing recreational facilities nor necessitate any new construction or expansion of any recreational facilities. Therefore no effects would be anticipated with respect to (a-b).

Mitigation Measures:

None

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

Discussion:

The proposed project, an expansion of the existing Laird Family Estates Winery, will not have any additional employees and only an additional 4 deliveries per week. The deliveries will be off-peak period as currently occurs (COA of previous use permit). There will be no change to the existing marketing plan, and no change to the existing 51 parking spaces. No change to the existing entrance on Solano Avenue. The Laird Family Estates Winery entrance has deceleration and acceleration tapers on Solano Avenue. (see fig ...) Because this is an expansion of the existing winery, the existing health and safety systems will also be expanded.

(a-b, d-g) The proposed project site location is on west side of Solano Avenue, approximately 1000' north of its intersection with Oak Knoll Avenue at SR 29, northwest of the city of Napa. The proposed project would add vehicles to the existing traffic flow, however, these are expected to be seasonal (harvest, crush). Trips would increase by approximately 4 one-way trips. The level of service (LOS B/C) on the vicinity roadways, in this case Solano Avenue would not change. The proposed project includes fire suppression system for the winery expansion. Emergency vehicles will continue to have access to the entire perimeter of the proposed project. The proposed project would not conflict with any alternative transportation policies, plans or programs supporting alternative transportation. Therefore, less than significant effects would be anticipated with respect to (a-b, d-g)

(c) The proposed project would not affect air traffic patterns. Therefore no effects would be anticipated with respect to (c).

Mitigation Measure(s):  
None

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

Discussion:

(a-g) The proposed project does not include expansion of the existing winery wastewater system. With the elimination of alternating proprietor/custom crush clients, it is anticipated the existing winery wastewater disposal system has the capacity to accommodate the proposed project and no expansion of existing system will occur. The proposed project has been reviewed and conditioned by the Department of Environmental Management to assure the existing system will accommodate the winery waste requirement. Water is available from the existing well on site with sufficient capacity (as reviewed by Napa County Public Works department). No expansion of any other facilities is necessary to provide such service. The proposed project site drainage system is not anticipated to change. The proposed project will be served by a landfill with sufficient capacity and will comply with all regulations concerning solid waste. Therefore, less than significant effects are anticipated with respect to (a-g)

Mitigation Measures:  
None.

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



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

Discussion:

See the above discussion (I-III, V--XVI). Less than significant effects are anticipated to occur with the proposed project.