

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:** Arkenstone Vineyards Winery Major Modification – Use Permit Major Modification # P12-00338-MOD
2. **Property Owner:** Ark Ranch, LLC / F. Ron and Susan Krausz
3. **County Contact Person, Phone Number and Email:** Ronald Gee, Planner III; (707) 299-1351, ronald.gee@countyofnapa.org
4. **Project Location and APN:** The project is located on an approximately 42.53 acre parcel at the west terminus of West Lane, approximately 0.2 mile (1,100 feet) from its intersection with South White Cottage Road, 323 West Lane, Angwin, CA 94508; APN 024-450-013.
5. **Project sponsor's name and address:** F. Ron and Susan Krausz, 323 West Lane, Angwin, CA 94508
6. **General Plan description:** AWOS (Agriculture, Watershed & Open Space)
7. **Zoning:** AW (Agricultural Watershed) District
8. **Project Description:** Approval of a Use Permit Major Modification # P12-00338 to modify prior Use Permit # P10-00092-MOD, Use Permit Major Modification # P06-01424-MOD and Use Permit # 02221-UP to allow the following:
 - Increase annual wine production from 48,000 gallons/year to 60,000 gallons/year;
 - Increase daily, appointment-only tours and tastings from 10-people/day to 30-people/day with pre-packaged or caterer-prepared food pairings;
 - Expand the winery marketing plan to increase the number of catered events from six 15-person events to 12 24-person events, two 80-person events to four 80-person events and from one 50-person harvest event to two 50-person events total;
 - Increase the days of operation from Wednesday-Sunday to Monday-Sunday;
 - Increase the number of employees from three to 10 total;
 - Increase on-site parking from 11 to 17 spaces;
 - Remove the earlier permit condition limiting custom-crush; and
 - Allow on-site sale and consumption of wine pursuant to AB 2004.

No changes to the existing winery buildings, accessory-to-production use ratio or hours of operation are proposed.

Use Permit # 02221-UP was approved on April 2, 2003 for Arkenstone Vineyards Winery to allow a 15,300 sq. ft. facility with a 9,100 sq. ft. winery building and 6,200 sq. ft. cut-and-cover cave to be built in two phases. A 1,025 sq. ft. covered work area was included to produce 48,000 gallons/year; 50% of the production capacity was made available for custom production by up to 4 custom clients, either as alternating proprietors or contract customers. Retail sales, tours and tastings (with food pairings) were permitted by appointment only. The winery operated five days/week from 7:00 am-5:00 pm and seven days/week during harvest (Sept.-Oct.). There were five tours/week with a maximum of 10 persons/tour, averaging 40 people/week. There were two full-time and one part-time employees with seven parking spaces on-site. The winery's marketing plan included six annual events with 15 people, two events with 80 people, one event with 50 people and one Wine Auction event with 100 people, all catered. On June 6, 2006, Use Permit Modification # P05-0094-MOD changed the cut-and-cover cave to a 13,000 sq. ft. dug cave, deleted the winery basement and reduced the winery building size to 3,733 sq. ft., relocated the cave portal, modified floor plans and elevations, relocated the covered crush pad and increased its size to 1,642 sq. ft. Use Permit Modification # P06-01424-MOD, approved February 14, 2007, allowed modified and increased the cave size to 25,000 sq. ft., adjusted the winery building footprint and increased its size to 4,373 sq. ft., added a new, 1,700 sq. ft. mechanical building, covered the 4,000 sq. ft. crush pad and 11 parking spaces. On June 25, 2010, Use Permit Very Minor Modification # P10-00092-VMM allowed a 300 square foot addition to the hospitality building, converted existing attic space for additional office space and storage, and reduced building area envelope.

9. **Environmental setting and surrounding land uses:**

The project is located on an approximately 42.53 acre parcel located at the terminus of West Lane, a private road in the Angwin area of Napa County, about 0.2 mile (1,100 feet) from South White Cottage Road. The project site is located on the eastern portion of the parcel on Howell Mountain plateau. According to County of Napa GIS Resource Maps, the property has varying degrees of slope ranging from 4%-50% that are currently planted with vineyards. The level portions of the site are developed with the existing winery facility and a single-family residence (not a part of the permit). Site elevations range from 1,380 feet-1,640 feet Mean Sea Level (MSL). Foundation materials consist of Early or Mid Pleistocene fan or terrace deposits overlain by Class II soils of the Aiken loam (2%-15%, 15%-30% and 30%-50% slopes) and Rock outcrop-Kidd complex (50%-75% slopes) series. Runoff is slow, hazard of erosion is slight and there is very low liquefaction potential. The property is located within the Bell Canyon Reservoir municipal watershed, outside any designated groundwater deficient area, FEMA flood zone or Alquist-Priolo fault zones. Vegetation on the property consists of dense stands of fir, oak and Manzanita trees, shrubs, native grasses, weeds, cultivated vineyards and sensitive biotic coniferous forest, Douglas-fir-Ponderosa pine Alliance. The latter coniferous forest in the northeast corner of the property is undeveloped area and is not affected by existing or proposed winery operations.

Surrounding land uses include open space, agriculture/vineyard, winery and rural residential uses. The closest residences are located approximately 300 feet (to the northeast), 850 feet (to the southeast) and 990 feet (to the east) from the winery site.

10. **Other agencies whose approval is required** (e.g., permits, financing approval, or participation agreement).

Discretionary approvals required by the County include a Use Permit. The project would also require various ministerial approvals by the County, including but not limited to waste disposal permits.

Responsible (R) and Trustee (T) Agencies

None Required.

Other Agencies Contacted

None Required.

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 **SUBSEQUENT 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.

Ronald Gee, Project Planner
Napa County Planning, Building &
Environmental Services Department

Date

	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporation	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
I. AESTHETICS. 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-c. Visual resources are those physical features that make up the environment, including landforms, geological features, water, trees and other plants, and elements of the human cultural landscape. A scenic vista, then, would be a publicly accessible vantage point such as a road, park, trail, or scenic overlook from which distant or landscape-scale views of a beautiful or otherwise important assembly of visual resources can be taken in. As generally described in the **Environmental Setting and Surrounding Land Uses** section, above, the West Lane/White Cottage Road South area is defined by a mix of vineyard, winery, and rural residential uses. Physical development associated with this approval will be limited to the addition of parking spaces along existing access roads; expanded marketing and production would take place in existing winery facilities. No tree removal is proposed and all proposed or foreseeable improvements will be at-grade. The Arkenstone Winery facility is located over 0.57 mile (2,950 feet) from Deer Park Road, a designated County Viewshed road, is separated by a minor ridgeline with a significant amount of natural vegetation and vineyards buffering its visibility from any other parcels or roadways.

As part of the original Mitigated Negative Declaration for Use Permit # 02221-UP, a mitigation measure required, "...preparation of a landscaping and/or vegetation retention plan to protect and maintain existing and planted vegetation that served to visually screen the project from view of neighboring parcels and West Lane/White Cottage Road." This mitigation measure was fully implemented. Seen as a whole, nothing in this project would substantially alter a scenic vista or substantially degrade the existing visual character of the site or its immediate surroundings. Impacts related to scenic resources will be less than significant.

d. Pursuant to standard Napa County conditions of approval for wineries, outdoor lighting will be required to be shielded and directed downwards, with only low level lighting allowed in parking areas. The standard winery condition of approval relating to lighting states the following:

"All exterior lighting, including landscape lighting, shall be shielded and directed downward, shall be located as low to the ground as possible, shall be the minimum necessary for security, safety, or operations, and shall incorporate the use of motion detection sensors to the greatest extent practical. No flood-lighting or sodium lighting of the building is permitted, including architectural highlighting and spotting. Low-level lighting shall be utilized in parking areas as opposed to elevated high-intensity light standards. Lighting during harvest activities is not subject to this permit condition.

Prior to issuance of any building permit pursuant to this approval, two copies of a detailed lighting plan showing the location and specifications for all lighting fixtures to be installed on the property shall be submitted for Planning Division review and approval. All lighting shall comply with the California Building Code."

With standard conditions of approval, this project will not create a substantial new source of light or glare.

Mitigation Measure(s): No mitigation measures are required.

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

	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Significant With Mitigation Incorporation	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
II. AGRICULTURE AND FOREST RESOURCES.¹ 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"/>
e) Involve other changes in the existing environment which, due to their location or nature, could result in conversion of Farmland to non-agricultural use?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>

Discussion:

- a. Based on a review of Napa County environmental resource mapping, the entirety of the project area is located on Prime Farmland (*Department of Conservation Farmlands, 2008* layer). No new impervious surfaces are proposed; three new proposed parking spaces would be located on existing vineyard access roadway; the entirety of the proposed development will be dedicated to active wine production uses. General Plan Agricultural Preservation and Land Use policies **Ag/LU-2** and **Ag/LU-13** recognize wineries, and any use consistent with the Winery Definition Ordinance and clearly accessory to a winery, as agriculture. As a result, this application will not result in the conversion of special status farmland to a non-agricultural use.
- b. As discussed at "a." above, the proposed winery is consistent with the parcel's AW (Agricultural Watershed) District agricultural zoning. No agricultural or Williamson Act contracts are associated with this property.
- c-d. The subject parcel includes neither forestland nor timberland and is not subject to timberland zoning. There will be no impact to forest resources.
- e. As discussed at items "a." and "b.", above, the winery improvements proposed in this application are defined as agricultural by the Napa County General Plan and are allowed under the parcel's AW District zoning. Neither this project, nor any foreseeable consequence thereof, would result in changes to the existing environment which would result in the conversion of special status farmland to a non-agricultural use.

Mitigation Measure(s): No mitigation measures are required.

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

¹ "Forest land" is defined by the State as "land that can support 10-percent native tree cover of any species, including hardwoods, under natural conditions, and that allows for management of one or more forest resources, including timber, aesthetics, fish and wildlife, biodiversity, water quality, recreation, and other public benefits." (Public Resources Code Section 12220(g)) The Napa County General Plan anticipates and does not preclude conversion of some "forest land" to agricultural use, and the program-level EIR for the 2008 General Plan Update analyzed the impacts of up to 12,500 acres of vineyard development between 2005 and 2030, with the assumption that some of this development would occur on "forest land." In that analysis specifically, and in the County's view generally, the conversion of forest land to agricultural use would constitute a potentially significant impact only if there were resulting 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
III. AIR QUALITY. Where available, the significance criteria established by the applicable air quality management or air pollution control district may be relied upon to make the following determinations. Would the project:				
a) Conflict with or obstruct implementation of the applicable air quality plan?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
b) Violate any air quality standard or contribute substantially to an existing or projected air quality violation?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
c) Result in a cumulatively considerable net increase of any criteria pollutant for which the project region is non-attainment under an applicable federal or state ambient air quality standard (including releasing emissions which exceed quantitative thresholds for ozone precursors)?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
d) Expose sensitive receptors to substantial pollutant concentrations?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
e) Create objectionable odors affecting a substantial number of people?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>

Discussion:

a-c. On June 2, 2010, the Bay Area Air Quality Management District's Board of Directors unanimously adopted thresholds of significance to assist in the review of projects under the California Environmental Quality Act (CEQA). The thresholds were designed to establish the level at which the District believed air pollution emissions would cause significant environmental impacts under CEQA and were posted on the Air District's website and included in the Air District's May 2011 updated CEQA Guidelines.

On March 5, 2012 the Alameda County Superior Court issued a judgment finding that the Air District had failed to comply with CEQA when it adopted the thresholds. The court did not determine whether the 2011 thresholds were valid on the merits, but found that their adoption was a project under CEQA. The court issued a *writ of mandate* ordering the District to set aside the thresholds and cease dissemination of them until the Air District had complied with CEQA. While the Air District can no longer recommend the 2011 thresholds, they do provide substantial evidence, and the District's thresholds of significance are still applicable for evaluating projects in Napa County.

The proposed project includes up to 10 full-time and part-time employees, 30 busiest-day tours-and-tasting visitors, and 60,000 gallons/year of production; meaning that this project should account for 37 maximum daily trips on a typical weekday, and 42 trips on harvest-season day with no marketing events. The subject application also proposes marketing events, with up to 100 people at the largest event; at 2.8 persons per car that would add up to 71 additional trips on the day of a large marketing event.

The proposed project would not conflict with or obstruct the implementation of any applicable air quality plan. Wineries as proposed here are not producers of air pollution in volumes substantial enough to result in an air quality plan conflict. The project site lies within the Napa Valley, which forms one of the climatologically distinct sub-regions (Napa County Sub region) within the San Francisco Bay Area Air Basin. The topographical and meteorological features of the Valley create a relatively high potential for air pollution. Over the long term, emissions resulting 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 resulting busiest day plus marketing total is well below the threshold of significance. The proposed project would not result in a cumulatively considerable net increase in any criteria pollutant for which the project region is in non-attainment under an applicable federal or state ambient air quality standard.

d. In the short term, potential air quality impacts are most likely to result from earthmoving and construction activities required for project construction. Earthmoving and construction emissions would have a temporary effect; consisting mainly of dust generated during grading and other construction activities, exhaust emissions from construction related equipment and vehicles, and relatively minor emissions from paints and other architectural coatings. The Air District recommends incorporating feasible control measures as a means of addressing construction impacts. If the proposed project adhere to these relevant best management practices identified by the Air District and the County's standard conditions of project approval, construction-related impacts are considered less than significant:

The permittee shall comply during all construction activities with the Bay Area Air Quality Management District Basic Construction Mitigation Measures as provided in Table 8-1, May 2011 Updated CEQA Guidelines.

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

Water and/or dust palliatives shall be applied in sufficient quantities during grading and other ground disturbing activities on-site to minimize the amount of dust produced. Outdoor construction activities shall not occur during windy periods.

- e. While the Air District defines public exposure to offensive odors as a potentially significant impact, wineries are not known operational producers of pollutants capable of causing substantial negative impacts to sensitive receptors. Construction-phase pollutants will be reduced to a less than significant level by the above-noted standard condition of approval. The project will not create pollutant concentrations or objectionable odors affecting a substantial number of people.

Mitigation Measures: No mitigation measures are required.

	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Significant With Mitigation Incorporation	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
IV. BIOLOGICAL RESOURCES. Would the project:				
a) Have a substantial adverse effect, either directly or through habitat modifications, on any species identified as a candidate, sensitive, or special status species in local or regional plans, policies, or regulations, or by the California Department of Fish and Game or U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
b) Have a substantial adverse effect on any riparian habitat or other sensitive natural community identified in local or regional plans, policies, regulations or by the California Department of Fish and Game or US Fish and Wildlife Service?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
c) Have a substantial adverse effect on federally protected wetlands as defined by Section 404 of the Clean Water Act (including, but not limited to, marsh, vernal pool, Coastal, etc.) through direct removal, filling, hydrological interruption, or other means?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
d) Interfere substantially with the movement of any native resident or migratory fish or wildlife species or with established native resident or migratory wildlife corridors, or impede the use of native wildlife nursery sites?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
e) Conflict with any local policies or ordinances protecting biological resources, such as a tree preservation policy or ordinance?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
f) Conflict with the provisions of an adopted Habitat Conservation Plan, Natural Community Conservation Plan, or other approved local, regional, or state habitat conservation plan?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>

Discussion:

- a-e. Napa County Environmental Resource Mapping (*Biological Critical Habitat Areas - California Red-legged Frog, Contra Costa Goldfields, and Vernal Pool Fairy Shrimp; Vernal Pools; CNDDB; Plant Surveys; and CNPS layers*) indicates the potential presence of *Calistoga ceanothus* and narrow anthered *bridiaea* on the project site. The MUSCI, *Biological Resource Reconnaissance Report and Special Status Plant Report, Arkenstone Winery Project, August 26, 2002*, concluded that no sensitive plant or animal species were observed within the project area or within the area of impact area. The report stated, "Although Northern Spotted Owls were reported to the north and east of the site, their territories do not extend to either the property or contiguous parcels. . . . The site is at the western edge of the (Howell Mountain) plateau and lacks the deeper soils, steep-sided canyons and watercourses more common to the north and east. There are no sensitive plant or animal species observed within the project area or within the area of impact of the project to warrant consideration. . . ."

Access to the site was provided by the existing driveway and no grading or earth-moving activities were required to develop the winery facility. The project site has been developed with winery structures since 2003 and planted in vines. The physical development proposed in the current application is limited to new parking spaces along an existing access road, an already-disturbed area, and no tree removal is proposed. Impacts on floral and biological resources will be less than significant.

- f. There are no Habitat Conservation Plans, Natural Community Conservation Plans or other approved local, regional or state habitat conservation plans applicable to the subject parcel.

Mitigation Measure(s): No mitigation measures are required.

		Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporation	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
V.	CULTURAL RESOURCES. Would the project:				
	a) Cause a substantial adverse change in the significance of a historical resource as defined in CEQA Guidelines §15064.5?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input 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-c. An archaeological resource survey, *Archeological Resource Service, Project # 02-048*, was conducted on the property in September, 2002 for Use Permit # 02221-UP. The survey concluded that the area to be developed was not likely to contain significant archaeological resources. However, a mitigation measure was adopted, similar to the standard project condition of approval below, that required evaluation of any artifacts encountered during land clearance of winery construction in accordance to recommendations made in the cultural resources survey.

The project site is already developed with a winery and proposed parking spaces will be located on existing access roads. No new grading is required; it is not anticipated that any cultural resources are present on the site and there is no potential for impact. However, if resources are found during grading of the project, construction of the project is required to cease, and a qualified archaeologist will be retained to investigate the site in accordance with the following standard condition of approval:

"In the event that archeological artifacts or human remains are discovered during any subsequent construction in the project area, work shall cease in a 50-foot radius surrounding the area of discovery. The permittee shall contact the Planning, Building & Environmental Services Department for further guidance, which will likely include the requirement for the permittee to hire a qualified professional to analyze the artifacts encountered and to determine if additional measures are required. If human remains are encountered during the development, all work in the vicinity must be, by law, halted, and the Napa County Coroner informed, so that the Coroner can determine if an investigation of the cause of death is required, and if the remains are of Native American origin. If the remains are of Native American origin, the nearest tribal relatives as determined by the State Native American Heritage Commission would be contacted to obtain recommendations for treating or removal of such remains, including grave goods, with appropriate dignity, as required under Public Resources Code Section 5097.98."

- d. No human remains have been encountered on the property during past grading activities when the public improvements were constructed and no information has been encountered that would indicate that this project would encounter human remains. However, if resources are found during grading of the project, construction of the project is required to cease, and a qualified archaeologist will be retained to investigate the site in accordance with standard condition of approval noted above.

Mitigation Measure(s): No mitigation measures are required.

		Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporation	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
VI.	GEOLOGY AND SOILS. 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 type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>

	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporation	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
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 type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" 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, defined as soil having an expansive index greater than 20 as determined in accordance with ASTM (American Society of Testing and Materials), 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:

- ai. There are no known faults on the project site as shown on the most recent Alquist-Priolo earthquake fault map. As such, the proposed facility would not result in the rupture of a known fault.
- aii. All areas of the Bay Area are subject to strong seismic ground shaking. The proposed improvements must comply with all the latest building standards and codes at the time of construction, including the California Building Code, which will function to reduce any potential impacts to a less than significant level.
- aiii. No subsurface conditions have been identified on the project site that would indicate a high susceptibility to seismic-related ground failure or liquefaction. Napa County Environmental Resource Mapping (*Liquefaction* layer) indicates that the project area is subject to "Very Low" liquefaction potential. The proposed winery must comply with all the latest building standards and codes at the time of construction, including the California Building Code, which would reduce any potential impacts related to liquefaction to a less than significant level.
- aiv. Napa County Environmental Resource Maps (*landslide line*, *landslide polygon*, and *landslide geology* layers) do not indicate the presence of landslides or slope instability on the flat subject property.
- b. Based on Napa County Environmental Resource Mapping and the *Soil Survey of Napa County, California* (G. Lambert and J. Kashiwagi, Soil Conservation Service), the subject parcel is comprised of soils classified as Aiken loam (2%-15%, 15%-30% and 30%-50% slopes) and Rock outcrop-Kidd complex (50%-75% slopes) series. The proposed project will require incorporation of best management practices and will be subject to the *Napa County Stormwater Ordinance*, which addresses sediment and erosion control measures and dust control, as applicable, to ensure that development does not impact adjoining properties, drainages, and roadways.
- c-d. Early or Mid Pleistocene fan or terrace surficial deposits underlay the soils in the project area. Based on Napa County Environmental Sensitivity Mapping (*Liquefaction* layer) the project site has "Very Low" liquefaction potential. Construction at the facility must comply with all current building standards and codes, including the California Building Code, which will function to reduce any potential impacts to a less than significant level.
- e. The Napa County Division of Environmental Health has reviewed this application and recommends approval based on the submitted wastewater feasibility report and septic improvement plans. Soils on the property have been determined to be adequate. Please see the **HYDROLOGY AND WATER QUALITY** section, below, for a discussion of proposed wastewater treatment improvements.

Mitigation Measure(s): No mitigation measures are required.

	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporation	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
VII. GREENHOUSE GAS EMISSIONS. 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	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>

District or the California Air Resources Board which may have a significant impact on the environment?

- 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?

☐☐☒☐

Discussion:

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

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

In 2011, the Bay Area Air Quality Management District (BAAQMD) released California Environmental Quality Act (CEQA) Project Screening Criteria and Significance of Thresholds [1,100 metric tons per year (MT) of carbon dioxide and carbon dioxide equivalents (CO₂e)]. While the Air District can no longer recommend the 2011 thresholds, as discussed under Section III - Air Quality, this threshold of significance is appropriate for evaluating projects in Napa County.

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

The applicant proposes to incorporate GHG reduction methods including use of steam-cleaning methods for wine barrels and bicycle access and parking. The project's 2020 "business as usual" emissions were calculated by Planning staff using California Emissions Estimator Model (CalEEMod) GHG modeling software, resulting in modeled 2005 annual emissions of 15 metric tons of carbon dioxide and carbon dioxide equivalents (MT CO₂e). The proposed project has been evaluated against the BAAQMD thresholds and determined that the project would not exceed the 1,100 MT/yr of CO₂e.

GHG Emission reductions from local programs and project level actions, such as application of the CalGreen Building Code, tightened vehicle fuel efficiency standards, and more project-specific on-site programs including those winery features noted above would combine to reduce emissions by 13% below "business as usual" level in 2020.

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

Mitigation Measures: No mitigation measures are required.

		Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporation	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
VIII.	HAZARDS AND HAZARDOUS MATERIALS. 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"/>

	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporation	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
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 checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input 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. An updated Hazardous Materials Management Plan will be required by the Division of Environmental Health. Such plans provide information on the type and amount of hazardous materials stored on the project site. The proposed project will not result in a significant risk of release of hazardous materials into the environment.
- c. There are no schools located within 0.25 mile of the project site.
- d. Napa County environmental resource mapping (*Hazardous Facilities* layer) indicates that the subject property is not on any known list of hazardous material sites nor is it located within 1,500 feet of any known hazardous releases.
- e. The project site is located within two miles of the Angwin Airport, approximately 1.6 mile (8,770 feet) to the northeast. The winery site is located outside any Angwin Airport Compatibility Zones.
- g. Existing project access complies with emergency access and response requirements; the proposed winery operational changes will not have a negative impact on emergency response planning.
- h. The project is located in an area that includes intensive irrigated agriculture. Risks associated with wildland fire in the direct vicinity are quite low; and to the extent they exist they are primarily associated with smoke related damage to wine grapes (smoke taint) and not with risks to life or structures. The Napa County Fire Marshal has reviewed this application and believes there is adequate fire service in the area. This project will not expose people or structures to a significant risk of loss, injury or death involving wild-land fires.

Mitigation Measure(s): No mitigation measures are required.

	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporation	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
IX. HYDROLOGY AND WATER QUALITY. Would the project:				
a) Violate any water quality standards or waste discharge requirements?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
b) Substantially deplete groundwater supplies or interfere substantially with groundwater recharge such that there would be a net deficit in aquifer volume or a lowering of the local groundwater table level (e.g., the production rate of pre-existing nearby wells would drop to a level which would not support existing land uses or planned uses for which permits have been granted)?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>

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

a. The proposed project will not violate any water quality standards or waste discharge requirements. The Napa County Department of Environmental Services has reviewed the existing domestic and process wastewater systems, including proposed wastewater treatment and facility expansion, and recommends approval as conditioned. Additionally, the applicant will be required to obtain all necessary permits from the Napa County Engineering Services Division, including a Stormwater Pollution Management Permit. The permit will provide for adequate on-site containment of runoff during storm events through placement of siltation measures around the development area.

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

Based on the submitted *Phase One* water availability analysis, the 42.53 acre subject mountain-area parcel has a water availability calculation of 21.27 acre feet per year (af/yr), which is arrived at by multiplying its approximately 42.53 acre size by a 0.5 af/yr fair-share water use factor. According to the applicant, existing water usage at the winery's current 48,000 gallons/year production rate has been 13.66 af/yr. With the proposed production increase to 60,000 gallons/year, water use is expected to increase to 13.99 af/yr for the winery, including domestic (consisting of residential, winery staff, visitation and increased marketing amounts), landscaping, and vineyard irrigation. The combined total falls below the 21.27 af/yr fair-share limit. As stated in its November 20, 2012 memo, the Department of Public Works has reviewed this analysis and recommends approval of this project on the basis that the project water use would be below the established threshold for groundwater use on the property and would not have a significant impact on static water levels of neighboring wells. The County is not aware of, nor has it received any reports of, groundwater shortages near the project area. The project will not interfere substantially with groundwater recharge such that there would be a net deficit in aquifer volume or a lowering of the local groundwater level.

c-e. There are no existing or planned stormwater systems that would be affected by this project. The area surrounding the project is pervious ground that is planted to vineyards and has the capacity to absorb runoff.

- f. There is nothing included in this proposal that would otherwise substantially degrade water quality. As discussed in greater detail at, "a.," above, the Division of Environmental Services has reviewed the proposed wastewater improvements and has found the proposed system expansion adequate, as conditioned, to meet the facility's septic and process wastewater treatment and disposal needs. No information has been encountered that would indicate a substantial impact to water quality.
- g. This project proposes no housing development. No housing would be placed within a mapped flood zone.
- h. According to Napa County environmental resource mapping (*Floodplain and Flood Zones* layers), no part of the Arkenstone Winery or the project area is located within a 500-year floodplain. Given the winery's partial ridge-top location, it is very unlikely that any proposed improvements would impede or redirect flood flows or expose structures or people to flooding.
- i. According to Napa County environmental resource mapping (*Dam Levee Inundation* layer), no part of the Arkenstone Winery project is located in the Bell Canyon Dam inundation area. Therefore, it is unlikely if this dam was to fail, that visitors and employees would be subject to water inundation. It should be noted that dams are subject to regular inspection by the California Department of Conservation, Division of Dam Safety, and the State's ongoing dam inspection program insures that any risks associated with dam failure are less than significant.
- j. In coming years, higher global temperatures are expected to raise sea level by expanding ocean water, melting mountain glaciers and small ice caps, and causing portions of Greenland and the Antarctic ice sheets to melt. The Intergovernmental Panel on Climate Change estimates that the global average sea level will rise between 0.6 and 2 feet over the next century (IPCC, 2007). However, the project area is located at approximately 1,380-1,640 feet in elevation and is located outside the tsunami inundation area pursuant to the *Tsunami Inundation Map for Emergency Planning*. There is also no known history of mud flow in the vicinity. The project will not subject people or structures to a significant risk of inundation from tsunami, seiche, or mudflow.

Mitigation Measure(s): No mitigation measures are required.

	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporation	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
X. LAND USE AND PLANNING. 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 is located in an area dominated by agricultural, residential, and open space uses and the improvements proposed here in support of ongoing agricultural uses county-wide, as they provide a market for grapes grown within Napa County. The project will not divide an establish community. Furthermore, the proposed project is in compliance with the *Napa County General Plan*, the *Napa County Zoning Ordinance* and related applicable County Code sections, and all other applicable regulations. There are no habitat conservation plans or natural community conservation plans applicable to the property.

Mitigation Measure(s): No mitigation measures are required.

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

Discussion:

- a-b. Historically, the two most valuable mineral commodities in Napa County in economic terms have been mercury and mineral water. More recently, building stone and aggregate have become economically valuable. Mines and Mineral Deposits mapping included in the Napa County Baseline Data Report indicates that there are no known mineral resources nor any locally important mineral resource recovery sites located on the project site (*Mines and Mineral Deposits*, Napa County Baseline Data Report, Figure 2-2).

Mitigation Measure(s): No mitigation measures are required.

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

Discussion:

- a/b. The proposed project will result in a temporary increase in noise levels during additional marketing events. No new construction is proposed therefore, no ground borne vibration or ground borne noise is anticipated. Noise generated from the proposed expansion is not anticipated to be significant. The proposed project will not result in long-term significant construction noise impacts.
- c/d. The site is currently built, therefore, the proposed additional visitation and marketing events will increase the overall anticipated level of noise in the operation of the winery; however, this would be typical of a winery. Enforcement of Napa County's Exterior Noise Ordinance is and will continue by the Division of Environmental Health and the Napa County Sheriff to reduce ambient noise levels to less than significant.
- e/d. The project is not within the vicinity of a private or public airstrip that would create noise pollution.

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

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

Discussion:

- a. The proposed increase from three to up to ten full time or part-time equivalent jobs will not induce substantial population growth in the unincorporated Angwin area either directly or indirectly.
- b/c. This application will displace neither persons nor housing and will not necessitate the construction of replacement housing elsewhere.

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

Discussion:

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

Mitigation Measure(s): No mitigation measures are required.

	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporation	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
XV. RECREATION. Would the project:				
a) Increase the use of existing neighborhood and regional parks or other recreational facilities such that substantial physical deterioration of the facility would occur or be accelerated?	<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. This application proposes few modifications to an existing winery, including the addition of three new parking spaces along existing access roads. No portion of this project, nor any foreseeable result thereof, would significantly increase the use of existing recreational facilities. This project does not include new recreational facilities of any description.

Mitigation Measure(s): No mitigation measures are required.

	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporation	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
XVI. TRANSPORTATION/TRAFFIC. Would the project:				
a) Cause an increase in traffic which is substantial in relation to the existing traffic load and capacity of the street system and/or conflict with General Plan Policy CIR-16, which seeks to maintain an adequate Level of Service (LOS) at signalized and unsignalized intersections, or reduce the effectiveness of existing transit services or pedestrian/bicycle facilities?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
b) Conflict with an applicable congestion management program, including, but not limited to level of service standards and travel demand measures, or other standards established by the Napa County Transportation and Planning Agency for designated roads or highways?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input 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 checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
g) Conflict with adopted policies, plans, or programs regarding public transit, bicycle, or pedestrian facilities, or otherwise decrease the performance or safety of such facilities?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>

Discussion:

- a-b. The applicant has submitted traffic data that concludes the winery will contribute to the overall traffic by 37 vehicle trips per day (12 PM peak trips) on weekdays and 26 vehicle trips per day (11 PM peak trips) on typical Saturdays. The Department of Public Works has reviewed this data and recommends approval of the project on the basis that the traffic volumes are below the threshold that would impact and would not require construction of a left turn pocket in accordance with the Napa County Roads and Streets Standards. There will be no residual individually or cumulatively significant traffic impacts associated with this project as regards traffic congestion and levels of service.
- c. The proposed project would not result in any change to air traffic patterns.
- d-e. The project site is accessed from the west terminus of West Lane, approximately 0.2 mile (1,100 feet) from its intersection with South White Cottage Road. The Division of Engineering Services has reviewed project access and recommends approval with standard conditions as stated in the attached December 10, 2012 recommended project conditions. The Napa County Fire Marshall has reviewed this application and has likewise identified no significant impacts related to emergency vehicle access provided that standard conditions of approval are incorporated. Project impacts related to traffic hazards and emergency access are expected to be less than significant.
- f. This application identifies that there are 14 existing parking spaces on-site to accommodate the current number of employees and daily visitation by appointment; three additional spaces are proposed along the existing access roadway, near the north cave portal. (Note: Only 11 on-site parking spaces are shown on earlier Use Permit site plan approvals; although the net increase in existing spaces is three, for the Use Permit, the increase will be six spaces). The Division of Engineering Services has reviewed the winery's existing parking layout and recommends approval with standard conditions requiring that no daily visitation or marketing events shall exceed this available parking without prior approval of a parking and traffic management plan through their office in order to ensure that adequate parking is fully

contained on-site and/or provided through other alternative means (e.g., valet parking, shuttle service, etc.). Through implementation of this condition, the project will not conflict with General Plan Policy **CIR-23**, which requires provision of adequate parking to meet the anticipated parking demand and not to provide excess parking that may stimulate unnecessary vehicle trips that could cause potentially significant environmental impacts.

- g. There is no aspect of this proposed project that would conflict with any adopted policies, plans or programs supporting alternative transportation.

Mitigation Measure(s): No mitigation measures are required.

		Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporation	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
XVI.	UTILITIES AND SERVICE SYSTEMS. Would the project:				
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 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 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:

- a. The project will not exceed wastewater treatment requirements as established by the Regional Water Quality Control Board and will not result in a significant impact on the environment relative to wastewater discharge. Wastewater disposal will be accommodated on-site and in compliance with State and County regulations.
- b. The Napa County Division of Environmental Services has reviewed the existing wastewater treatment and processing facility improvements, as well as the suitability of existing process wastewater systems and recommends approval as conditioned. Continued use and monitoring of existing wastewater treatment facilities will not result in significant environmental impacts over permitted baseline levels.
- c. The project will not require or result in the construction of new storm water drainage facilities or an expansion of existing facilities which would cause a significant impact to the environment.
- d. As discussed at the **HYDROLOGY AND WATER QUALITY** section, above, groundwater usage will remain below the property's fair share volume. No new or expanded entitlements are necessary.
- e. Domestic wastewater will be treated on-site and will not require a wastewater treatment provider. Process wastewater will likewise be treated and disposed of on-site consistent with the requirements of the Napa County Division of Environmental Health.
- f. The project will be served by a landfill with sufficient capacity to meet the project's demands. No significant impact will occur from the disposal of solid waste generated by the project.
- g. The project will comply with all federal, state, and local statutes and regulations related to solid waste.

Mitigation Measure(s): No mitigation measures are required.

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

Discussion:

- a. The project would have a less than significant impact on wildlife resources. No sensitive resources or biologic areas will be converted or affected by this project. Also as analyzed above, the project would not result in a significant loss of native trees, native vegetation, or important examples of California's history or pre-history.
- b. As discussed above and in particular under **Air Quality, Transportation/Traffic, and Population and Housing** the proposed project does not have impacts that are individually limited, but cumulatively considerable.
- c. There are no environmental effects caused by this project that would result in substantial adverse effects on human beings, whether directly or indirectly. No hazardous conditions resulting from this project have been identified. The project would not have any environmental effects that would result in significant impacts.

Mitigation Measure(s): No additional mitigation measures are required.

	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporation	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
XVIII. SUBSEQUENT NEGATIVE DECLARATION				
a) Are substantial changes proposed in the project which will require major revisions of the previous EIR or negative declaration due to the involvement of new significant environmental effects?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
b) Are substantial changes proposed in the project which will require major revisions of the previous EIR or negative declaration due to a substantial increase in the severity of previously identified significant effects?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
c) Have substantial changes occurred with respect to the circumstances under which the project is undertaken which will require major revisions of the previous EIR or negative declaration due to the involvement of new significant environmental effects?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
d) Have substantial changes occurred with respect to the circumstances under which the project is undertaken which will require major revisions of the previous EIR or negative declaration due to a substantial increase in the severity of previously identified significant effects?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>

e) Has new information of substantial importance been identified, which was not known and could not have been known with the exercise of reasonable diligence at the time the previous EIR was certified as complete or the negative declaration was adopted which shows any of the following:

- | | | | | |
|---|--------------------------|--------------------------|--------------------------|-------------------------------------|
| 1. The project will have one or more significant effects not discussed in the previous EIR or negative declaration. | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> |
| 2. Significant effects previously examined will be substantially more severe than shown in the previous EIR. | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> |
| 3. Mitigation measures or alternatives previously found not to be feasible would in fact be feasible, and would substantially reduce one or more significant effects of the project, but the project proponents have declined to adopt the mitigation measure or alternative. | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> |
| 4. Mitigation measures or alternatives which are considerably different from those analyzed in the previous EIR would substantially reduce one or more significant effects on the environment, but the project proponents have declined to adopt the mitigation measure or alternative. | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> |

Discussion:

a-e. A Mitigated Negative Declaration was previously adopted for the project site in conjunction with the approval of Use Permit # 02221-UP on April 2, 2003. The following mitigation measures, which addressed Aesthetics, Cultural Resources and Noise, were adopted as part of the project:

Aesthetics

1. A landscaping and/or vegetation retention plan will be prepared and submitted to the Planning Department for approval that will protect and maintain existing and planned vegetation that serves to visually screen the project from view of the neighboring parcels and West Lane/White Cottage Road. The screening vegetation shall be maintained in functioning condition or replaced as necessary. The plan shall also include replacement of removed trees at a 2:1 ratio.

Method of Mitigation Monitoring: As part of the final inspection and before the County grants occupancy of the structure(s), a designee of the Director shall inspect the landscaping for its adherence to the approved landscaping and/or vegetation retention plan.

Cultural Resources

2. In the event that concentrated artifacts are encountered during land clearing or construction work shall be temporarily suspended and a professional archaeologist shall be brought to the site to evaluate the discovered materials in accordance with the recommendations made in the cultural resources survey by Archeological Resource Service, Project # 02-048. The stone wall must be protected with a barrier during construction.

Method of Mitigation Monitoring: Planner to make at least one site tour with the archeologist present in the event artifacts are identified. Archeologist report shall be submitted and recommendations implemented prior to recommencing work. Planner to make two site visits at the commencement of and during construction to ensure that the stone wall has a protected barrier.

Noise

3. Construction noise shall be minimized to the extent practical. Construction activities are to be limited to daylight hours, vehicles to be muffled and back-up alarms adjusted to the lowest allowable levels and shall be in compliance with County Code Section 8.16. Exterior winery equipment shall be enclosed or muffled and maintained so as not to create a noise disturbance in accordance with the Code. There shall be no amplified sound system or amplified music utilized outside the winery buildings. All marketing activities, including clean-up, shall cease by 10:00 PM. Activities shall be properly monitored as to reduce any disturbances to neighboring properties. Outdoor noise-producing activities associated with wine production would be limited to weekdays and Saturdays from 7:00 AM and 6:00 PM (except for crush).

Method of Mitigation Monitoring: Construction restrictions shall be stated on all building and improvement plans, including the name and number of the person responsible for compliance. Noise dampening of winery equipment will be verified during building plan review. Winery operating restrictions will be checked as needed based on neighbor complaints.

New environmental effects resulting from proposed changes, altered severity, altered conditions, or new information are addressed in their respective sections are discussed above. There are no changes proposed in this project which will require major revisions to previous environmental documents. Therefore, a Subsequent Mitigate Negative Declaration is appropriate for this project.