

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

**Initial Study Checklist  
(form updated September 2010)**

- 1. Project Title:** Eagle Eye Winery Use Permit – P11-00168
- 2. Property Owner:** William and Roxanne Wolf
- 3. County Contact Person, Phone Number and email:** Mary Doyle, Project Planner, 707-299-1350, [mary.doyle@countyofnapa.org](mailto:mary.doyle@countyofnapa.org)
- 4. Project Location and APN:** 6595 Gordon Valley Road, Napa; APN 033-160-018
- 5. Project sponsor's name and address:** Ms. Donna Oldford, Plans4Wine, 2620 Pinot Way, St. Helena, CA 94574
- 6. General Plan description:** AWOS (Agriculture, Watershed, and Open Space)
- 7. Zoning:** AW (Agricultural Watershed)
- 8. Description of Project:**

The project will establish a new 30,000 gallon per year production winery. The proposed winery will include the following:

- 3600sf production and accessory use structure,
- 3600sf barrel storage structure,
- 2400sf covered outdoor area, 1600sf covered crush pad and tank storage area,
- Winery wastewater system,
- 29,311sf winery access road,
- 6 parking spaces,
- 2 FTEs & 2 PTEs, and
- Marketing plan of :
  - 3 events per month with 24 guests per event,
  - 4 events per month with 50 guests per event,
  - 2 events per year with 100 guests per event,
  - 2 private tours & tastings with 8 guests per tour/tasting, and
  - on-premise consumption (AB 2004 Evans)

No changes, other than those listed above are included in this project.

**9. Describe the environmental setting and surrounding land uses.**

The project is proposed on a 13 acre parcel located on the southeast side of Napa County on Gordon Valley Road approximately 1600 feet north of its intersection with Wooden Valley Road. It is south of Lake Curry. The property is presently developed with a single family residence with associated infrastructure, residential landscaping, three accessory structures, approximately 7 acres of vineyards and olive trees. The western parcel boundary is Suisun Creek. The 500-year and 100-year floodplain is located along the western property boundary, extending onto the property by approximately 200 feet. No structures are located within the floodplain, though the parcel and the adjacent parcels are located within the Lake Curry dam inundation limits.

The surrounding land uses are rural residential, open space and vineyards.

(References: General Plan, BDR, GIS, project/parcel files, application #P11-00168 materials (wastewater disposal feasibility study, Phase one water analysis, SWPPP (pre/post construction) by Bartelt Engineering (April 2011), Preliminary Geologic & Geotechnical Report by RGH Consultants (April 2011))

**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

\_\_\_\_\_  
Date

Name: \_\_\_\_\_

Napa County Conservation, Development & Planning Department

	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 type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" 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 type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
c) Substantially degrade the existing visual character or quality of the site and its surroundings?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" 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 type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>

Discussion:

- a-d) The proposed project will not have a substantial adverse effect on a scenic vista nor substantially damage a scenic resource as there are no scenic vistas or scenic resources in this area. Gordon Valley Road is not a scenic vista area and not within a state scenic highway. The future winery would not be visible by the traveling public on Gordon Road due the intervening terrain and vineyard. There is no lighting associated with the proposed project that could be a source of substantial light or glare. Therefore, no impacts would be anticipated with respect to (a- d).

(References: General Plan, BDR, GIS-Viewshed roads/Historic sites, project/parcel files)

Mitigation Measures: (NA)

	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporation	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
II. <b>AGRICULTURE AND FOREST RESOURCES.<sup>1</sup></b> 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) 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"/>

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

	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporation	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
e) Involve other changes in the existing environment which, due to their location or nature, could result in conversion of Farmland to non-agricultural use?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>

**Discussion:** There are no Williamson Act contracts associated with the parcel. The parcel is currently a producing vineyard and has a residence with associated infrastructure.

a-e) The project site is zoned Agriculture Watershed (AW), a winery is an allowed use with a use permit. The proposed project will not convert any Farmland to a non-agriculture use. No trees are being removed, The proposed project will not conflict with existing vineyard though the winery will removal some vines. There are no other changes that could convert Farmland to non-agricultural use. Therefore, no impacts are anticipated with respect to (a-e).

**(References:** Zoning Code Chapter 18.16, BDR/GIS layer: Viticultural areas, agriculture layer, potential productive soils, project/parcel files)

**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"/>

**Discussion:** The project site is located in the southwest 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 PM<sub>10</sub> standards. The topographical and meteorological features of the Napa Valley create a relatively high potential for air pollution. In the short term, potential air quality impacts would result from construction activities. Construction-related emissions, which are temporary in nature, consist mainly of particulate matter (PM) generated from fugitive dust during grading or other earthmoving activities and other criteria pollutants generated through the exhaust from construction related equipment and vehicular haul and worker trips.

Post construction emissions from the proposed project would consist primarily of mobile sources, including production-related deliveries and visitor and employee vehicles traveling to and from the winery. The *Bay Area Air Quality Management Plan* states that projects that do not exceed a threshold of 2,000 vehicle trips per day will not impact air quality and do not require further study (*BAAQMD CEQA Guidelines*, p. 24). The proposed winery application proposes limited tours and tastings, a limited marketing plan. There will be 2-4 winery employees. The project would reduce truck trips to the extent that the grapes produced on site would be processed in the proposed facility. The maximum total trips would be approximately for the busiest day including marketing total of 106 project-related trips, well below the established threshold of significance.

**(Reference:** ARB/BAAQMD, General Plan, BDR & GIS, project/parcel files)

a-e) The existing conditions that contribute to air quality are the operation and maintenance activities of the vineyard, and the those of the single family residence. The proposed project would not conflict with or obstruct any applicable air quality plans. The construction activities of the proposed project would create short-term temporary air emissions. 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. There are no schools, hospitals or convalescent homes within the project

vicinity. The closest schools are located more than 5 miles from the parcel. The closest residence is on the parcel. There are no sensitive receptors located in the vicinity (1 mile) of the proposed project and the proposed project will not create objectionable odors affecting a substantial number of people. Therefore, less than significant effects are anticipated with respect to (a-e).

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"/>
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: No candidate, sensitive or special status species, protected wetland nor a migratory species, corridors or nursery sites known to be at the proposed project site, though there are sensitive resources including Suisun Creek and associate habitat at the western boundary of the property. The proposed site is not located in any of these areas.

(References: General Plan, BDR/GIS layers: sensitive biotic groups, vegetation, streams, project/parcel files)

- a-f) The proposed project will remove existing vineyard to become the winery facilities, no other area shall be disturbed. The proposed project will not have a substantial adverse effect on a candidate, sensitive or special status species, protected wetland nor interfere substantially with an migratory species, corridors or nursery sites. There are no Habitat Conservation Plans, Natural Community Conservation Plans or other similar plans applicable to the project site. Therefore, no effects would be anticipated with respect to (a-f).

Mitigation Measures: (none)

	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporation	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
<b>V. 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 checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
b) Cause a substantial adverse change in the significance of an archaeological resource pursuant to CEQA Guidelines §15064.5?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>

	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporation	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
c) Directly or indirectly destroy a unique paleontological resource or site or unique geological feature?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
d) Disturb any human remains, including those interred outside of formal cemeteries?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>

**Discussion:** There are known cultural resources in the area of the proposed project, however there are no cultural resources noted at the proposed site itself.

(Reference: General Plan, BDR/GIS layer: historic sites, project/parcel files)

a-d) There are known historically sensitive sites and archaeological resources, sensitive sites, in the vicinity of the project site approximately 200 feet northwest of the proposed production facility. A standard condition of approval for archaeology requires that an archaeologist monitor the construction site during any earthmoving activities. No unique paleontological or geological features are known to be located on or in the vicinity of the project site. While not anticipated, should a discovery of unknown cultural resources occur; during construction, 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. Therefore, less than significant effects are anticipated with respect to (a-d).

**Mitigation measures:** (none)

	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporation	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
<b>VI. GEOLOGY AND SOILS. Would the project:</b>				
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"/>

	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporation	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
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 preliminary geological and geotechnical study report was prepared by RGH Consultants (April 2011) with the conclusion the proposed winery is feasible. The nearest fault is Concord-Green Valley approximately 3.5 miles west of the site.

**(Reference:** General Plan, County Code Chapters 8, 13, 16 & 18, BDR/ GIS layers: geology, soils, landslides, streams, water bodies, slope; project/parcel files)

a-e) The parcel is located in the seismically active San Francisco Bay Area. The terrain is gently sloped (less than 10%). At the existing entrance on Gordon Valley Road is relatively level then rises to slightly (less than 10%) going west to the rear of the parcel where the proposed winery is. According to the geotechnical site investigation there are no known faults that traverse the project site and no slides were identified. The proposed project is located within an area delineated by USGS susceptible to ground failure and liquefaction. However, this does not preclude development on the site, but strict adherence to current standards building is required and a site specific subsurface exploration must be completed during the final design. The soil types are considered Haire loam on the eastern portion of the parcel and Yolo loam on the western portion of the parcel. The proposed winery will have a combined winery and sanitary waste water system with a pressure distribution system with wastewater pretreatment and have been reviewed and considered appropriate for the site by Environmental Management. These are not considered expansive. Therefore, less than significant effects are anticipated with respect to (a-d).

**Mitigation Measure:** (none)

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

**Discussion:**

a-b) Construction and operation of the project analyzed herein will contribute to overall increases in Greenhouse Gas (GHG) emissions by generating emissions associated with transportation to and from the site, emissions from energy used within buildings, and emissions from the use of equipment. The project-specific increase in GHG emissions would be relatively modest, given the estimated 6 new vehicle trips on an average day, and increasingly stringent Title 24 energy conservation requirements imposed as part of the building permit process.

The Bay Area Air Quality Management District (BAAQMD) has established a significance threshold of 1,100 metric tons of carbon dioxide equivalents per year and screening criteria related to greenhouse gas emissions (GHG) for new development. While the District's screening table does not specifically address wineries, it suggests that "quality restaurants" less than 9,000 square feet in size and "warehousing" uses less than 64,000 square feet in size would not generate GHG in excess of the significance criterion (BAAQD Air Quality Guidelines, Table 3.1). The proposed barrel storage building includes approximately 3,600 square feet of floor area related to wine production, which has been deemed equivalent to warehousing uses for purposes of GHG analysis. Since the proposed 3,600 square foot barrel storage building has a floor area far below the District's 64,000 square foot warehousing screening level, it is clear that the proposed winery will not generate GHG above the significance threshold established by the District, and further analysis (and quantification) of GHG emissions is not warranted.

Overall increases in GHG emissions in Napa County were assessed in the Environmental Impact Report (EIR) prepared for the Napa County General Plan Update and certified 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 is currently serving as the basis for development of a refined inventory and emission reduction plan for unincorporated Napa County.

The applicants intend to have incorporated GHG reduction methods including: solar panels, landscaping with native plants, and high efficiency HVAC systems.

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. The relatively modest increase in emissions expected as a result of the project will be well below the significance threshold suggested by BAAQMD, and in compliance with the County's General Plan efforts to reduce emissions described above. Therefore, less than effects are anticipated with respect to (a-b).

(Reference: General Plan, project/parcel files)

Mitigation Measures: (none)

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

(Reference: California Health and Safety Code Chapters 6.5 & 6.95, General Plan, County Code Chapters 8, 13, 16 & 18, BDR/GIS layers: hazardous facilities, Napa Airport, roads, Fire & fire hazard zones-CDF; project/parcel file)

a-g) The proposed project will not any hazardous materials in the course of routine use/activities, not anticipated to create significant hazard from releases of hazardous materials. 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. Therefore, no effects are anticipated with respect to (a-g).

h) The proposed project would not interfere with emergency response or evacuation plans rather the proposed project as designed would provide for FIRE emergency vehicles during any wild-land fire. The proposed project will has been designed to accommodate FIRE & emergency vehicles access. Therefore, less than significant impacts are anticipated with respect to (h).

Mitigation Measures: (none)

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

Discussion: The parcel and surrounding vicinity is south of Lake Curry (Suisun Creek). The area is in a flood hazard area and an area of dam inundation should Lake Curry fail or be overtopped.

(References: General Plan, BDR/GIS layers: flood zones, water bodies, dam levee inundation, groundwater deficient areas, streams, geology, domestic water supply drainages, contours & slope, County Code Chapters 13, 16 & 18, project/parcel files)

(a-f, h-j) The proposed project includes a site specific winery wastewater system that will not violate any water quality standards. The proposed project will alter the drainage pattern somewhat. The applicant has prepared a Notice of Intent (NOI) for a Storm Water Pollution Prevention Plan permit (SWPPP) from the Regional Water Quality Control Board for pre & post construction activities. The proposed project is located in an area subject to the 100-year flood hazard area or the 500-year hazard area. The proposed project would be constructed to the current building standards for construction in a flood hazard area. Therefore, less than significant impacts would be anticipated with respect to (a).

(g) No housing is proposed as part of the project. Therefore, no impacts are anticipated with respect to (g).

Mitigation Measures: (none)

	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporation	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
X. <b>LAND USE AND PLANNING.</b> Would the project:				
a) Physically divide an established community?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
b) Conflict with any applicable land use plan, policy, or regulation of an agency with jurisdiction over the project (including, but not limited to the general plan, specific plan, local coastal program, or zoning ordinance) adopted for the purpose of avoiding or mitigating an environmental effect?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input 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: The project site is located in unincorporated southwest Napa County. The zoning designation is Agriculture Watershed (AW). The parcel is approximately 13+ acres. The parcel is developed with a single family residence, accessory structures and infrastructure and 6 acres of vineyard.

(Reference: General Plan, County Code, BDR/GIS layers: Dept of Conservation Farmlands 2006, NDDB F&G, biological critical habitat areas, streams, project/parcel files).

(a, c) The proposed project would not physically divide an established community. The proposed project would not conflict with any applicable habitat conservation plans or natural community conservation plans. Therefore, no effects are anticipated with respect to (a, c).

(b) The proposed design and construction of the proposed project would not conflict with zoning ordinance adopted for the purpose of avoiding or mitigating an environmental effect. The proposed site avoids the Suisun Creek and associated habitat, avoids the known sensitive and cultural resources. Therefore, less than significant effects are anticipated with respect to (b)

Mitigation Measures: (none)

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

Discussion:

a-b) 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 nor would the project result in a loss of a known valuable mineral resource or loss of availability of any locally important mineral resource recovery plan. Therefore, no impacts are anticipated with respect to (a-b).

(Reference: General Plan, BDR/GIS, project/parcel files)

Mitigation Measures: (none)

		Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporation	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
XII.	<b>NOISE.</b> Would the project result in:				
a)	Exposure of persons to or generation of noise levels in excess of standards established in the local general plan or noise ordinance, or applicable standards of other agencies?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
b)	Exposure of persons to or generation of excessive groundborne vibration or groundborne noise levels?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
c)	A substantial permanent increase in ambient noise levels in the project vicinity above levels existing without the project?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
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: The existing activities that generate noise are vineyard operations and those of the residence.

(Reference: General Plan, County Code Chapters 8 & 18, BDR/GIS layers: Napa Airport compatibility zones, city boundaries, project/parcel files)

a-c, e-f) The proposed project would result in a short-term temporary increase in noise levels during the construction activities but no permanent increase in ambient noise level would occur. Construction activities would occur during daylight hours. Post construction routine winery operational activities would occur, in addition to the on-going vineyard operation and maintenance activities. The project would not result in the exposure of persons to or generate noise level in excess of Napa County standards. During the construction there would be noise louder than the existing ambient however this would be localized and of a short-term temporary duration only. The proposed project would not result in the generation of excessive groundborne vibrations or groundborne noise levels. The proposed project site is not located within an airport land use plan or in the vicinity of a private airstrip. Therefore, no impacts are anticipated with respect to (a-b, e-f).

d) There would be a short-term temporary increase in noise levels during the construction activities but no permanent increase in ambient noise level would occur. Construction activities would occur during daylight hours. Upon completion of construction, the anticipated level of noise associated with winery operations and the continuing vineyard operations. No substantial temporary or periodic increase in ambient noise levels are anticipated with the day-to-day winery operations. Construction activities would generally occur from 7 a.m. to 7 p.m. on weekdays. Therefore, less than significant impacts are anticipated with respect to (d).

Mitigation Measures: (none)

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

	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporation	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
b) Displace substantial numbers of existing housing, necessitating the construction of replacement housing elsewhere?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
c) Displace substantial numbers of people, necessitating the construction of replacement housing elsewhere?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>

Discussion:

a) The proposed project would not result in a substantial increase in population growth, either directly or indirectly. The winery will have up to 4 employees and limited visitors. Neither of which are not anticipated to induce a substantial growth in population requiring any new infrastructure. Therefore, less than impacts are anticipated with respect to (a).

b-c) The proposed winery project would not displace any housing or require any replacement housing. Therefore, no effects are anticipated with respect to (b-c).

(Reference: General Plan, BDR/GIS, County Code, project/parcel files)

Mitigation Measures: (none)

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

Discussion:

(Reference: General Plan, County Code Chapters 8, 13 & 18, project/parcel files)

Fire protection: The capacities of Fire services are adequate to service the proposed project. Therefore, less than significant effects are anticipated with respect to (a) Fire protection.

Police, Schools, Parks and Other public facilities: The proposed project is not expected to change any existing level of public services or require any new facilities. The capacities of Police services are adequate to service the proposed project. No use of water is necessary for the project. The project will have no impact of public parks or other public services. Therefore, no effects are anticipated with respect to (a) Police, Schools, Parks & other public facilities.

Mitigation Measures: (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>XV. RECREATION.</b> Would the project:				
a) increase the use of existing neighborhood and regional parks or other recreational facilities such that substantial physical deterioration of the facility would occur or be accelerated?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
b) Does the project include recreational facilities or require the construction or expansion of recreational facilities which might have an adverse physical effect on the environment?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>

Discussion:

(Reference: General Plan, BDR/GIS, project/parcel files)

a-b) The proposed project is not anticipated to substantially increase the use of existing recreational facilities nor necessitate any new construction or expansion of any recreational facilities. Therefore, no impacts are 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>XVI. TRANSPORTATION/TRAFFIC.</b> Would the project:				
a) Cause an increase in traffic which is substantial in relation to the existing traffic load and capacity of the street system and/or conflict with General Plan Policy CIR-16, which seeks to maintain an adequate Level of Service (LOS) at signalized and unsignalized intersections, or reduce the effectiveness of existing transit services or pedestrian/bicycle facilities?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
b) Conflict with an applicable congestion management program, including, but not limited to level of service standards and travel demand measures, or other standards established by the Napa County Transportation and Planning Agency for designated roads or highways?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
c) Result in a change in air traffic patterns, including either an increase in traffic levels or a change in location that results in substantial safety risks?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
d) Substantially increase hazards due to a design feature, (e.g., sharp curves or dangerous intersections) or incompatible uses (e.g., farm equipment)?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
e) Result in inadequate emergency access?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
f) Conflict with General Plan Policy CIR-23, which requires new uses to meet their anticipated parking demand, but to avoid providing excess parking which could stimulate unnecessary vehicle trips or activity exceeding the site's capacity?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
g) Conflict with adopted policies, plans, or programs regarding public transit, bicycle, or pedestrian facilities, or otherwise decrease the performance or safety of such facilities?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>

Discussion:

(References: General Plan, BDR/GIS layers: roads, County Road & Streets Standards, project/parcel files.)

a-c, f-g) The proposed access will remain at a current vineyard access entrance on Gordon Valley Road. With the limited vehicles anticipated with the proposed project, the project will not substantially increase traffic, not conflict with any traffic management plan, nor change air traffic patterns, conflict with GP CIR-23 or conflict with any other transit policies, plans or programs. No change in the level of service on the county road Gordon Valley Road. Therefore, no effects are anticipated with respect to (a-c, f-g).

d, e) The existing vineyard access will be improved by road design/alignment and surface to support emergency vehicles. Therefore, less than significant effects are anticipated with respect to (d, e).

Mitigation Measures: (none)

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

Discussion:

(Reference: General Plan, County Code Chapters 8 & 13, project/parcel files #W08-01015)

a-g) The proposed project includes a winery wastewater system and will not exceed any state requirements. No expansion of any other service facilities is necessary. The project will be served by a landfill with sufficient capacity to meet the project's demands. The project will comply with all federal, state, and local statutes and regulations related to solid waste. Therefore, no 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
XVII.	<b>MANDATORY FINDINGS OF SIGNIFICANCE</b>				
a)	Does the project have the potential to degrade the quality of the environment, substantially reduce the habitat of a fish or wildlife species, cause a fish or wildlife population to drop below self-sustaining levels, threaten to eliminate a plant or animal community, reduce the number or restrict the range of a rare or endangered plant or animal or eliminate important examples of the major periods of California history or prehistory?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
b)	Does the project have impacts that are individually limited, but cumulatively considerable? ("Cumulatively considerable" means that the incremental effects of a project are considerable when viewed in connection with the effects of past projects, the effects of other current projects, and the effects of probable future projects)?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
c)	Does the project have environmental effects that will cause substantial adverse effects on human beings, either directly or indirectly?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
a- c)	See the above discussion (I-XVI)				

