

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

Initial Study Checklist  
(Form updated September 2010)

1. **Project Title:** Honig Vineyard and Winery LLC Major Modification (Use Permit # P11-00405-MOD)
2. **Property Owner:** Honig Vineyard and Winery LLC
3. **Contact person and phone number:** Ronald Gee, Project Planner, 707.253.4417, [ronald.gee@countyofnapa.org](mailto:ronald.gee@countyofnapa.org)
4. **Project location and APN:** Located at 850 Rutherford Road, Rutherford, CA, on a 67.0 acre site off a private road on the north side of Rutherford Road (SR 128), approximately 1.25 miles east of St. Helena Highway (SR 29); designated Assessor's Parcel Number: 030-090-003.
5. **Project Sponsor's Name and Address:** Tony Benedetti, CFO, Honig Vineyard and Winery, P.O. Box 406, Rutherford, CA 94573
6. **General Plan description:** Agricultural Resource, *Napa County General Plan, March, 2002*
7. **Zoning:** AP (Agricultural Preserve) District
8. **Background Project History:** Winery operations began with issuance of a Categorically Exempt, "Small Winery Use Permit Exemption" on June 6, 1982 for a 20,000 gallons/year winery in an existing 2,000 sq. ft. structure. Use Permit # U-38485 was approved September 19, 1984 with a Negative Declaration for a 4,608 sq. ft. total winery building expansion, annual production increase to 72,000 gallons/year and to provide public tours and tasting. Use Permit Modifications # 92150-MOD, # 93271-MOD allowed minor design changes and expansions. Use Permit # 93271-MOD expanded winery production from 72,000 to 150,000 gallons/year and expanded barrel storage facilities to 9,975 sq. ft. with a Negative Declaration. Use Permit Modification # 97238-MOD expanded the approved barrel building by 997 sq. ft. and added two offices to the winery mezzanine; Use Permit Modification # 02009-MOD added by-appointment tours and tasting and construction of 480 sq. ft. more mezzanine space for administrative purposes with a new tasting room below the mezzanine space. On September 5, 1997, Certificate of the Extent of Legal Nonconformity determined that, "1) One residence is located in part within the required 20-foot side yard setback along the south property line. The minimum distance from the property line is 2 feet and the maximum length of the encroachment into the setback is 130 feet. Of this length, 94 feet of the residence is and must remain at least 6 feet from the property line. All structures within the setback area are one-story in height; and 2) A legal nonconformity exists consisting of three structures occupied by owners or agricultural employees of the subject property, located in the southeast corner of the subject 67-acre parcel in the AP (Agricultural Preserve) Zoning District, where the zoning permits only a single owner's residence and permits no other residence except as it may be occupied by an agricultural employee after receipt of a use permit. The residences are not limited in permitted square footage by the zoning ordinance except that any residence over 1,200 sq. ft. in size occupied by an employee is nonconforming and may not be expanded." Use Permit Minor Modification # P04-0461-UP extended the winery building by 25 feet in length. Use Permit Minor Modification # P12-00132-MOD allowed construction of a new 3,300 sq. ft. administration building, reconfigured the parking lot with 32 spaces and added new landscape improvements. The 1997 and later permits were all determined to be Categorically Exempt projects.

9. **Project Description:** The proposal will modify Use Permits # 38485, # 92150-MOD, # 93271-MOD, # 95593-MOD, # 02009-MOD, # 03008-MOD, # P04-0461 and # P12-00132 to allow the following: 1) An increase in the approved annual production from 150,000 gallons per year to 300,000 gallons per year; 2) Construction of a new 10,080 square feet barrel storage building with 3,680 square feet uncovered work areas; 3) Installation of six new wine storage tanks under a covered crush pad; 4) An increase in the permitted number of employees from 12 to 25; 5) Expand visitation to increase maximum daily tours and tastings from 10 to 100 people (with an increased daily average of 60 people); 6) Expand the marketing plan to add to the existing four events per year with 50 people with four new events per year with 100 guests; 7) Increase hours of operation Monday-Sunday from 7:00 AM-5:00 PM to 7:00 AM-6:30 PM; 8) Increase visitation hours Monday-Sunday from 9:00 AM-5:00 PM to 9:00 AM-6:30 PM; 9) Allow on-site sale and consumption of wine pursuant to AB 2004; and 10) Upgrade the existing septic and process wastewater treatment and disposal system.

10. **Environmental Setting and Surrounding Land Uses:**

The pitcher-shaped lot slopes down gently to the west towards the Napa River. The USDA Soil Survey of Napa County identifies Yolo Loam (0 to 2 percent slopes) and Cole Silt Loam (0 to 2 percent slopes) soil series as the dominant soil types within the project site; the latter soil type only occurs in the north corner of the lot. These soils have a medium run-off rate and erosion hazard is slight. The property, roughly divided into thirds, has "very high, high and medium" liquefaction potential indexes that radiate east from the Napa River/west property line; the project site is located in the medium liquefaction potential area.

The west property boundary is located in the Napa River, a perennial stream and riparian area, located about 1,600 feet directly west of the project site or about 2,100 feet to the southwest along the north property line. The 100-year and 500-year FEMA-designated Flood Zone is located on approximately 80% of the property to the west and southwest. The developed winery areas of the site, except for one of three existing single family dwellings, are located outside the flood zones. The balance of the site consists of cultivated vineyards and unpaved access roads. According to Napa County Environmental Sensitivity Maps, there are no fault zones, land slides or special biological or botanical habitats located in the area. No wetlands or vernal pools have been identified on the property. Archaeological surveys have been conducted in the surrounding area but no archeological sites have been identified on any contiguous site.

The property is developed with an existing winery that includes a detached production building, a two-story retail sales, offices and tasting room building, a parking lot, detached accessory storage, maintenance and well buildings and three single-family residences. There are approximately 49.72 acres of planted vineyard; no cave is located on the site. A two-way, main access road connects the land-locked site to Rutherford Road (SR 128). Surrounding land uses include vineyards, winery and rural residential development with an adjacent commercial use for olive oil sales.

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 building permits, grading permits, and waste disposal permits.

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

**Other Agencies Contacted**

U.S. Treasury Department, Alcohol and Tobacco Tax & Trade Bureau (TTB)  
California Department of Alcoholic Beverage Control  
California Department of Transportation – Encroachment Permit

## 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.

---

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

May 2, 2013  
Date

## ENVIRONMENTAL CHECKLIST FORM

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

### Discussion:

- a. 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 Rutherford Road/SR 128 area is defined by a mix of vineyard, winery and rural residential uses, including an adjacent commercial use for olive oil sales, located on the floor of the Napa Valley.

This project will add a new, 28-foot tall, 10,080 square feet barrel storage building with 3,680 square feet uncovered work areas. Six new wine storage tanks would be installed under the covered crush pad cover. The site is accessed by an existing 1,700 feet (0.32 mile) driveway from Rutherford Cross Road/SR 128 and is surrounded by 10 different properties. Rutherford Cross Road /SR 128 is a designated "Scenic Roadway" listed in the *Community Character Element* of the Napa County General Plan 2008. The standard winery conditional approval relating to outdoor storage, screening and utilities states the following:

"All outdoor storage of winery equipment shall be screened from the view of adjacent properties by a visual barrier consisting of fencing or dense landscaping. No item in storage is to exceed the height of the screening. Water and fuel tanks, and similar structures, shall be screened to the extent practical so as to not be visible from public roads and adjacent parcels.

New utility lines required for this project that are visible from any designated scenic transportation route (see Community Character Element the General Plan and Chapter 18.106 of the Napa County Code) shall be placed underground or in an equivalent manner be made virtually invisible from the subject roadway.

With this standard condition of approval, this project will not create have a substantial effect on a scenic vista and will screen proposed buildings and other improvements from adjacent properties.

- b. This project does not involve the conversion of or damage to a scenic resource. The project is not subject to Napa County Zoning Ordinance, Chapter 18.106.030(A), *Viewshed Protection Ordinance, General Provisions, Applicability*, since all proposed new and expanded structures are not located on slopes of 15% or more or on any minor or major ridgeline. With a new perimeter landscape improvement plan, this impact would be reduced to a less than significant level.

- c. The proposed project would construct a new barrel storage building that complies with Napa County's General Plan policy that "wineries should be designed to convey the attractiveness associated with existing Napa Valley wineries." The new improvements will create a more attractive, internally-consistent design for the entire winery site to better conform to this policy. Therefore, the modification of the existing structures is considered to have "a less than significant impact".
- d. The expanded winery will result in a minor increase in night-time lighting. 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 utilized during harvest activities is not subject to this requirement.

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

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

	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporation	Less Than Significant t Impact	No Impact
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). The proposed project will not convert Prime Farmland, Unique Farmland or Farmland of Statewide importance to non-agricultural use. All new construction will take place on already-disturbed areas where the existing winery, vineyard-support facilities and parking are already located. A small amount of planted vines (approximately 0.8 acres) were removed in an earlier parking lot expansion (Use Permit Minor Modification # P12-00132-MOD). The public and service access roads comply with Fire Department access requirements, the overall project is supportive of maintaining agriculture on the site and this impact is considered less than significant.
- b. The project is not proposed on a parcel that is in a Williamson Act contract. The parcel is zoned AP (Agricultural Preserve) District which allows winery as a specific "Permitted Use."
- 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 in 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 AP (Agricultural Preserve) 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. The parcel is currently planted with approximately 49.72 acres of vineyard and developed with an existing 150,000-gallons/year winery.

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

	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:				

	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporation	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
a) Conflict with or obstruct implementation of the applicable air quality plan?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
b) 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 dust or 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 provided in Table 3-1 (Criteria Air Pollutants & Precursors Screening Levels Sizes) are still applicable for evaluating projects in Napa County. Furthermore, Air District's 1999 CEQA Guidelines (p.24) 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.

The proposed project includes up to 25 full-time and part-time employees, 60 average weekday tours-and-tasting visitors, and 300,000 gallons/year of production; meaning that this project should account for 133 maximum daily trips on a typical weekday with 50 PM peak trips. Typical Saturdays would include 16 full-time and 3 part-time employees with up to 100 visitors generating 126 daily trips with 72 PM peak trips. Due to current off-site crush operations caused by limited on-site facilities, crush Saturdays would include 17 full-time employees and 6 part-time employees with 100 weekend visitors generating up to 539 daily trips with 307 PM peak trips. (Note: Once new facilities are in place, up to 400 daily truck trips during crush will be eliminated since grapes would remain on-site). 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 87 additional trips on the day of a large marketing event.

Over the long term, emission sources for the proposed project will consist primarily of mobile sources including vehicles visiting the site. The Air District's threshold of significance provided in Table 3-1 has determined that similar projects such as a quality restaurant that do not exceed a threshold of 47,000 square feet will not significantly impact air quality and do not require further study (BAAQMD CEQA Guidelines, May 2011, Pages 3-2 & 3-3.). Given the size of the project is approximately 58,004 square feet winery (Production Building #1 – 11,015 square feet, Fermentation Building #1 – 4,650 square feet, Bottle Building #3 and Maintenance & Wine Equipment Barn – 2,880 square feet) compared to the BAAQMD's screening criterion of 47,000 square feet NOX (high quality restaurant) and 541,000 square feet (general light industry), the project would contribute an insignificant amount

of air pollution and would not result in a conflict or obstruction of an air quality plan. (Please note: a high quality restaurant is considered comparable to a winery tasting room for purposes of evaluating air pollutant emissions, but grossly overstates emissions associated with other portions of a winery, such as office, barrel storage and production, which generate fewer vehicle trips. Therefore, a general light industry comparison has also been used for other such uses.)

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. The project site lies at the central section of the Napa Valley floor, 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. In the short term, potential air quality impacts are most likely to result from construction activities. 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 thresholds of significance for construction emissions established in the May 2011 Bay Area Air Quality Management District (BAAQMD) CEQA Guidelines are 54 lbs/day for ROG and NOx, because the project includes construction of a new 3,313 square feet building, production increases and reconfiguration an existing parking lot, its construction emission would be well below the threshold. Nonetheless, the BAAQMD has recommended "best practices" during construction which will be included as a condition of approval.

Over the long term, emission sources for the proposed project will consist primarily of mobile sources including vehicles visiting the site. The Bay Area Air Quality Management Plan has determined that similar projects, such as a "high quality restaurant", that do not exceed a threshold of 47,000 square feet will not significantly impact air quality and do not require further study (BAAQMD CEQA Guidelines, May 2011 Page 3-3.). Given the 10,800 square feet size of the new winery building, compared to the BAAQMD's screening criterion of 47,000 square feet, the project would contribute an insignificant amount of air pollution and would not result in a conflict or obstruction of an air quality plan. (Please note: A "high quality



restaurant" is considered comparable to a winery tasting room for purposes of evaluating air pollutant emissions, but grossly overstates emissions associated with other portions of a winery, such as barrel storage and production, which generate fewer vehicle trips.)

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

	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 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 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 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. According to Napa County Environmental Resource Maps (Natural Diversity Database and Sensitive Biotic Aquatic), the site is not located in any designated habitat areas of any species identified as a candidate, sensitive, or special status species in local or regional plans, policies, or regulations, or by the California Department of Fish and Wildlife or U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service. Development will take place in already-disturbed areas of an existing winery originally established in 1981. This project would result in less than significant impacts on any special-status species.
- b. The Napa River is the nearest perennial stream to the project site, and is located along the southwestern border of the property, approximately 2,100 feet from the project site. No new improvements will be constructed in the river or within the vicinity of the riparian area; the existing vineyard and dirt access road adjacent to the river will be maintained. The project would have no

substantial adverse impacts on riparian habitats or other sensitive natural communities and will not result in any changes from what presently exists.

- c. Napa County Environmental Sensitivity Maps (Watershed Overlay) and the Baseline Data Report does not indicate the presence of any wetlands or potential wetlands within the project boundary. The project would result in no impacts to federally protected or potentially sensitive wetlands.
- d. The project will take place on an already-disturbed winery site and would not interfere with the movement of any native resident or migratory fish or wildlife species or with established native resident or migratory wildlife corridors, or impede the use of native wildlife nursery sites.
- e. As part of overall site improvements and a new landscape screening plan, a large number of new trees will be planted along the perimeter of the winery site. The project does not conflict with any County ordinance or requirement to preserve existing trees, and therefore is considered as not having potential for significant impact.
- f. The proposed project would not conflict with the provisions of an adopted Habitat Conservation Plans, Natural Community Conservation Plans or other approved local, regional or state habitat conservation plans. There are no 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 checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
b) Cause a substantial adverse change in the significance of an archaeological resource pursuant to CEQA Guidelines §15064.5?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
c) Directly or indirectly destroy a unique paleontological resource or site or unique geological feature?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input 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. All proposed improvements would take place in already-disturbed areas of an existing winery established in 1981. In addition, there are three existing single-family homes on the property located south and west of the project site which are not affected by the proposal. No substantial adverse changes to any historical resource would take place. Potential project impacts are therefore considered less than significant.
- b. County Environmental Sensitivity Maps (Archaeological Resources Overlay) indicate there are no known historically sensitive sites or structures located within the project site or on any contiguous parcel. There are no known archaeological resources in the development area. In the event archaeological artifacts are encountered during construction of the project, all work would cease to allow a qualified archaeologist to record and evaluate the resources 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."*

This is considered a less-than-significant impact because the project site has been previously graded.

- c. The subject site does not contain any known paleontological resources or unique geologic features and therefore is not anticipated to result in any significant adverse impacts to such resources.
- d. The presence of any formal cemeteries is not known to occur within the project area and therefore the proposed project is not anticipated to result in any significant adverse impacts on any such resources.

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

	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporation	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
<b>VI. GEOLOGY AND SOILS.</b> Would the project:				
a) Expose people or structures to potential substantial adverse effects, including the risk of loss, injury, or death involving:				
i) Rupture of a known earthquake fault, as delineated on the most recent Alquist-Priolo Earthquake Fault Zoning Map issued by the State Geologist for the area or based on other substantial evidence of a known fault? Refer to Division of Mines and Geology Special Publication 42.	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
ii) Strong seismic ground shaking?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
iii) Seismic-related ground failure, including liquefaction?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
iv) Landslides?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
b) Result in substantial soil erosion or the loss of topsoil?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
c) Be located on a geologic unit or soil that is unstable, or that would become unstable as a result of the project, and potentially result in on- or off-site landslide, lateral spreading, subsidence, liquefaction or collapse?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>

	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporation	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
d) Be located on expansive soil, a 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 type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>

### Discussion:

- a. The proposed project is not located within any designated Alquist-Priolo earthquake fault zone. According to Napa County Environmental Sensitivity Maps (Liquefaction), soil types located on the project site have medium to very high liquefaction potential. While seismic activity is endemic to the Bay Area, these structures will be constructed to California Building Code requirements and result in a less than significant risk.
- b. The project will occur on slopes with less than 15% grade. The soils on site are characterized by medium runoff with moderate erosion potential. The project is required to submit a site development plan, including implementation of storm water and erosion control Best Management Practices under the standards developed in the County's National Pollutant Discharge Elimination System, Phase II Stormwater Permit, which is required by County Code and is a standard practice on all County development projects. Therefore, the potential for impacts is considered less than significant.
- c.-d. The project site is not known to 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 or collapse. 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. Based on the RAM Engineering, Inc. Honig Vineyard & Winery Use Permit Modification *Wastewater Feasibility Study, September 1, 2011*, the existing sanitary wastewater and process wastewater septic system was abandoned and a new, combined sanitary and process wastewater pressure distribution system has replaced it. The combined system consists of separate sanitary wastewater and process wastewater septic tanks, pre-treatment via aeration, a combined sump tank and a sub-surface pressure distribution leach field system with a designated 100% expansion/reserve area. The three existing residences have separate sanitary sewage systems that will not be affected by the winery expansion. Any new septic system improvements are subject to Napa County Department of Environmental Management permit review and approval. There will be no impact to soils relative to septic tanks or waste water disposal systems.

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

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

---

Management 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 (CO<sub>2</sub>e)]. 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 the 2006 installation of a 146 kw/year solar system and shrink wrap recycling system. 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 160 metric tons of carbon dioxide and carbon dioxide equivalents (MT CO<sub>2</sub>e). The proposed project has been evaluated against the BAAQMD thresholds and determined that the project would not exceed the 1,100 MT/yr of CO<sub>2</sub>e.

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 63 MT/yr of CO<sub>2</sub>e. This amount exceeds the target 2020 "business as usual" emissions reduction level of 38% for the site at 61 MT/yr of CO<sub>2</sub>e.

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
--------------------------------------	---	------------------------------------	--------------

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

**Discussion:**

- a.-b. The proposed project will not involve the transport of hazardous materials. A Business Plan will be filed with the Environmental Services Division should hazardous materials reach reportable levels. The project would not result in the release of hazardous materials into the environment.
- c. There are no schools located within one-quarter mile from the proposed project site.
- d. The proposed site is not on any known list of hazardous materials sites.
- e. The project site is not located within an airport land use plan area or within two miles of any public airport or public use airport.
- f. The project site is not located within the vicinity of any private airports.

- g. The design of the project will not negatively impact or hinder emergency vehicle access. The project has been reviewed by the County Fire Department and Public Works Department and has been found to be acceptable as conditioned.
- h. The project would not increase exposure of people and/or structures to a significant loss, injury or death involving wild land fires. The project will comply with current California Department of Forestry and California Building Code requirements for fire safety.

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

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

	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporation	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
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 known water quality standards or waste discharge requirements. The project will discharge into an existing storm drainage system which will be modified to accommodate the drainage from this site. The applicant is required to obtain a Stormwater Permit from the California State Regional Water Quality Control Board because the project disturbance exceeds one acre. Incorporation of standard stormwater best management practices ensure that the project will have a less than significant impact to water quality and discharge standards.
- b. Based on the RAM Engineering, *Water System Feasibility Report for Honig Vineyard and Winery, September 1, 2011, revised December 15, 2011*, the 67.0 acre site has a Valley Floor Allowable Water allotment of 67.0 acre feet/year (af/yr) with an existing water system permit issued by the Napa County Environmental Services Division. There are two existing wells on-site; one for irrigation and one for domestic use. Existing water usage totals 30.185 af/yr and projected water use will increase annual water demand to 34.16 af/yr; this increase consists of additional winery process wastewater and landscaping requirements resulting from the project. Based on these figures, the project will not result in substantial depletion of 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. The County is not aware of, nor has it received any reports of, groundwater shortages near the project area.
- c-d. The proposed project will not substantially alter the drainage pattern on site or cause a significant increase in erosion or siltation on or off the cultivated agricultural vineyard site. The project will incorporate erosion control measures appropriate to its maximum slope to manage on-site surface drainage and erosion of on-site soils during construction and winter months (October to April). By incorporating erosion control measures, this project would have a less than a significant impact. No substantial alteration of existing drainage is anticipated to occur. There will be an increase in the overall impervious surface resulting from the new building, pavement and sidewalks. However, given the size of the drainage basin and the specific parcel, the increase in impervious surfaces will not discernibly change the amount of groundwater filtration or discernibly increase surface runoff from that which currently existing on site. This project would therefore result in a less than significant impact.
- e. The project will use private storm drain facilities that will connect to a storm drain that discharges towards Rutherford Cross Road/SR 128 and the Napa River. These facilities are sized appropriately to ensure that there is a less than significant impact.
- f. There are no other factors in this project that would otherwise degrade water quality.
- g. - h. Approximately 80% of the subject property, to the south-southwest, is located within both a FEMA-designated 100-year and 500-year floodplain. The existing winery is located in the north-northeast corner of the property; no new winery structures would be located within either designated floodplain zones. Three existing residences, not affected by or a part of the project proposal, are already located within the floodplain area.
- i. - j. The project site is located on generally flat to gently-sloping land. Potential for tsunami is considered less-than-significant. The project is located many miles from San Francisco/San Pablo Bay, and in the unlikely event that a tsunami enters the Bay, any surge would dissipate well before reaching the City of Napa, nine miles south of Rutherford.

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



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

**Discussion:**

- a. – c. The project would not result in physical division of an established community or conflict with any applicable land use policy. The County has designated the site for agricultural use, and as proposed, the improvement of an established winery and vineyard use is consistent with the AR (Agricultural Resource) designation of the Napa County General Plan, Land Use Element and with its AP (Agricultural Preserve) District zoning. No conflict with any applicable conservation plan or natural community conservation would take place.

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

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

The proposed project would not result in impacts to mineral resources as designated by Napa County Environmental Sensitivity maps (Soil Type, Surficial Deposits Overlays).

- a. The project site does not contain any known mineral resources.
- b. The project site is not designated as a locally important mineral resources recovery site.

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

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

**Discussion:**

The project will result in a temporary increase in noise levels during the construction of the facility. Construction activities will be limited to daylight hours using properly muffled vehicles. Noise generated during this time is not anticipated to be significant with the implementation of County standard practices.

- a. There are no off-site residential uses within close proximity to the project. Temporary construction noise will be in compliance with County noise standards, reducing the potential for impact to a less than significant level
- b. Construction activities may result in groundborne vibrations and noise levels. However, given the lack of proximity of the construction site to existing residences, the potential for impact is less-than-significant.
- c. - d. The anticipated noise levels following the completion of construction would be minimal, typical of rural uses, and are considered less-than-significant.
- e. The project site is not located within an airport land use plan or within two miles of a public use airport.
- f. The project site is not located within the vicinity of a private airstrip.

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

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

**Discussion:**

- a. – c. The project will involve expansion of an existing winery facility. The project will not displace any housing or divide any established communities. The project will not contribute significantly to a cumulatively considerable increase in the demand for housing units within the communities of Napa County and the general vicinity. The applicant, as a condition of approval for the project, will be required to pay an Affordable Housing Fee (Napa County Ordinance, Section 18.107.090 (A, H & I) for the proposed winery expansion to address the demand for additional housing either directly or indirectly.

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

	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 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:**

The proposed project would not result in potentially significant adverse impacts on public services.

- a. The project would expand production space and increase the production level of an existing winery use in an established agricultural and rural residential area. The project will not result in any additional demand on public services beyond what has already been planned for, and therefore potential impacts would be less than significant. As detailed in Sections XI.(e) and IX.(b) above, based on RAM Engineering Water System and Wastewater Feasibility Studies, adequate water sources and septic system capacity is available to support the use. All County Fire Marshal requirements shall be met.

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

	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:**

The proposed project would not result in significant adverse impacts on recreation facilities.

- a-b. The project would not significantly increase the use of existing recreational facilities.

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

	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 (i.e., result in a substantial increase in either the number of vehicle trips, the volume to capacity ratio on roads, or congestion at intersections)?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
b) Exceed, either individually or cumulatively, a level of service standard established by the county congestion management agency for designated roads or highways?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>

	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporation	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
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) Result in inadequate parking capacity?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
g) Conflict with adopted policies, plans, or programs supporting alternative transportation (e.g., bus turnouts, bicycle racks)?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>

### Discussion:

a-b. According to the Omni-Means, *Traffic Analysis for the Proposed Honig Vineyards Winery Expansion Project, January 23, 2012*, the study concluded that the proposed winery expansion,

"... would not significantly impact traffic conditions at the Honig Access/Rutherford Road intersection. Levels of service and delays would be satisfactory and for the stopped outbound and left-turn, inbound turning movements. The available sight distance along Rutherford Road is adequate. The site's internal access road is generally consistent with Napa County standards (18-foot paved road width) though some segments fall below this standard.

The potential need for a left-turn lane on SR 128 at the winery access was evaluated based on California Department of Transportation (CalTrans) guidelines. The guidelines compare the advancing and opposing SR 128 peak hour volumes with the percentage of left-turning vehicles into the access road. Volumes associated with the proposed project conditions would not require a left-turn lane based on the CalTrans thresholds."

In February 6, 2012 comments, however, the Napa County Public Works Department stated,

"No production or visitation shall increase beyond existing use permit approvals (as a result of approval of this application) until the construction of a left-turn lane has been completed on State Route 128 (SR 128) to the satisfaction of the California Department of Transportation (CalTrans). The applicant must provide a letter of approval from CalTrans indicating that all improvements have been completed as required by CalTrans.

Applicant is responsible for preparing engineered civil plans to the satisfaction of CalTrans for the construction of the required turn lane. Further County review may be required when these plans have been made available.

Applicant shall obtain an Encroachment Permit from CalTrans prior to construction of any improvements in the state right-of-way."

According to Public Works Traffic Engineering staff, "The Left-Turn Lane Warrant Graph in the *Napa County Road & Street Standards* was not changed in the revised edition published August 9, 2011. The installation of a left turn pocket is not a Caltrans requirement but a *Napa County requirement for the Use Permit* (emphasis added). The County requirements are more restrictive and thus, will govern in this case. Caltrans guidelines would govern in the case of the CalTrans requirements being more restrictive than the County requirements. The applicant will have to build the left turn pocket to CalTrans minimum highway design standards as described in the CalTrans Highway Design Manual and comply with all of the CalTrans requirements for an encroachment permit."

In cooperation with Round Pond Winery, Inc., APN 030-140-022 & -023, on the south side of Rutherford Road/SR 128, the applicant has agreed to share the cost to design, obtain required permits and install a shared left-turn-lane on Rutherford Road/SR 128. Due to the location of each property's existing access driveways on the roadway, a shared left-turn lane is required. The proposed mitigation will ensure that public health and safety will be maintained and that project increases in average daily traffic will be reduced to a less-than-significant level.

- c. The project does not have any impact on air traffic patterns.
- d-e. The project includes minor realignment and reconfiguration of the existing parking lot on the winery site for the new barrel storage building. The proposed increase in visitation will result in minor changes to levels of service which warrant installation of a new left-turn lane to the shared, private access road for this land-locked site. However, no substantial increase in hazards due to a design feature, incompatible uses or inadequate emergency access will result from the project.
- f. The existing parking lot was reconfigured to provide a total 32 parking spaces. With the increase of total employees from 12 to 25 and marketing plan expansion from 10 to 100 tours and tastings per day (60 daily average/2.3 passengers per vehicle = 23 spaces) up to 48 parking spaces are needed to accommodate the use. Although adequate space is available on the 67 acre site, as a permit condition of approval, initiation of an employee carpooling program (subject to Planning, Building & Environmental Services Department Director review and approval) will reduce minimum parking requirements and the project will not result in inadequate parking.
- g. The proposed project does not conflict with any known policies or plans supporting alternative transportation.

**Mitigation Measure(s):** 1) In cooperation with the Napa County Public Works Department and California Department of Transportation (CalTrans), the applicant shall construct a two-way, left-turn lane on Rutherford Road (SR 128) between the existing Round Pond Winery and Honig Vineyard & Winery at the project's private access road intersection with Rutherford Road (SR 128) prior to issuance of any Temporary Certificate of Occupancy/Final Occupancy, winery production increase and/or tours and tastings increase as determined by the Director of Public Works.

2) Although adequate parking space is available on the 67 acre site, the applicant shall develop and implement an employee carpooling program (subject to Planning, Building & Environmental Services Department Director review and approval) to reduce minimum parking requirements and to provide adequate parking spaces for guests and employees.

**Method of Mitigation Monitoring:** 1) A CalTrans Encroachment Permit shall be obtained for any work performed within the CalTrans right-of-way. A letter from the Director of Public Works shall be submitted to the Planning, Building & Environmental Services Department Director/Building Official to grant occupancy of the new structure, an increase in wine production and/or increased tours and tastings if acceptable levels of project traffic generation are determined to fall within or below acceptable thresholds for left-turn traffic warrants prior to left-turn lane installation. A letter from both the Napa County Public Works Department and Caltrans certifying completion of the required left-turn lane according to approved plans shall be submitted to the Planning Director.

2) The applicant shall submit an employee carpooling program for Planning, Building & Environmental Services Director review and approval for implementation prior to issuance of Building Permit issuance for the new barrel storage building.

	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporation	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
<b>XVII. UTILITIES AND SERVICE SYSTEMS.</b> Would the project:				
a) Exceed wastewater treatment requirements of the applicable Regional Water Quality Control Board?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>

	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporation	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
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:**

- a. The project will comply with Napa County Environmental Health Division requirements for its expanded, privately-maintained process wastewater treatment system, consistent with Regional Water Quality Control Board standards.
- b. The project includes replacement of existing, on-site septic and process wastewater treatment facilities that will not result in a significant impact to the environment. The project site is located in an area planned for winery uses; both existing and proposed replacement water and wastewater treatment facilities have been sized to accommodate the proposed project. The replacement system is subject to Department of Environmental Management permit review and approval.
- c. New, private storm drain lines will be constructed as part of the project, and will connect to an existing storm drain system discharging to the Napa River and Rutherford Cross Road. The storm drain lines have been sized to accommodate all runoff from the project. The project will not cause a significant impact to the environment.
- d. The project site has its own groundwater well source consisting of an existing on-site well and water tanks. Due to the increase in number of employees and production, the Napa County Environmental Management Department has required the system to be upgraded subject to new permit review and approval. Based upon the Water Availability Analysis – Phase I Study, detailed in Section IX.(b), Hydrology & Water Quality above, adequate water sources are available on the 67 acre site.
- e. See response "a." above.

f.-g. The project will be served by the Upper Valley Waste management Agency which provides waste-transfer and landfill disposal with sufficient capacity to meet the projects demands. No significant impact will occur from the disposal of solid waste generated by the project. The project will comply with 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
<b>XVIII. 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 checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input 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 type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>

**Discussion:**

- a. The project site has previously been disturbed and does not contain any known listed plant or animal species.
- b. The project does not have impacts that are individually limited, but cumulatively considerable. Potential air quality, traffic and housing impacts are discussed in their respective sections above. Installation of a left-turn lane at the Honig Vineyard & Winery access road intersection with Rutherford Road/SR 128 will reduce potential project traffic impacts to a less than significant level. Other wineries along Rutherford Road have also been required to install left-turn lanes and shared turn-lane design is encouraged. See Section XVI (a-b), Traffic/Transportation, above regarding the left-turn Mitigation Measure.
- c. The project does not pose any substantial adverse effects on human beings, either directly or indirectly.